

SEENO PROJECT TIMELINE

(Jan. 2007 - June 2008)

Jan. 15, 2007 Seeno/LSA publish DEIR.
Public Comment period begins on DEIR....

Feb. 24, 2007 Council votes to extend public
comment period on DEIR.

May 7, 2007 DEIR Hearing. Council frustrated
(esp. Patterson, Schwartzman) that Seeno had
not provided sufficient info to questions relating
to environmental and GP issues. Council
refused to vote on the DEIR, instead they vote to
"continue" the hearing until such time as Seeno
can come back with more info and answers to
their concerns about GP and environmental
issues, and a modified project that dispels those
concerns.

July 2007 – Seeno/LSA publish Response to
Comments document

Aug. 7, 2007 Seeno comes to Council with a
slick Powerpoint presentation and hardcopy
version of the presentation, but no written report
addressing the previous concerns and
questions, and with essentially the same project
as before.

Nevertheless, the **Council votes 3-2 to
approve DEIR**. (Whitney, Hughes, Messina, vs
Patterson, Schwartzman)

Dec. 2007 (12/12?) – Seeno/LSA publish Final
EIR and Supplemental Response to Comments.
Public Comment period begins on FEIR...(Jan.
2008)

Feb. 19, 2008 – FEIR Public Hearing. Patterson
& Campbell vote yea on Option 2: to defer action
on FEIR until the actual final project is brought
forward for consideration. Defeated due to lack
of 3rd vote.

Schwartzman proposes amendments to Option 1
– directing Seeno to come forward with a CEQA
Initial Study based on Hillside Upland alternative
project, and adding some additional (nonbinding)
environmental conditions and mitigations.
Patterson joined him in adding more specific
conditions and mitigations.
Option 1 passes (Campbell voting no), **Council
votes to certify the EIR as complete** but noting
that the current project as proposed cannot be
approved due to numerous conflicts with GP
policies.

March 20, 2008 – Seeno submits a project
description document briefly outlining revisions
to project. This is all the documentation the
Planning Commission is provided.

April 10, 2008 – Planning Commission. Seeno
gives Powerpoint presentation, and a brief
written description of the revised project, but no

detailed documentation. **Planning Commission
votes to deny the project** due to lack of
information regarding GP inconsistencies,
environmental and health and safety impacts,
and due to lack of time to review documentation,
and Seeno's unwillingness to extend time. They
also recommend that Seeno begin work with city
staff to refine the project into a more acceptable
form and enter into a Development Agreement
(contract) with the city.

City staff begins working with Seeno to add over
200 (non binding) "Conditions of Approval" to the
project (Seeno declines to enter into
Development Agreement).

April 29, 2008 – **Seeno/LSA publish Draft EIR
Addendum which presents a drastically
revised version of the project**, partially based
on Hillside Uplands alternative, with 50% less
industrial, reduced grading, etc. It is essentially
a new project, but they claim it is just a mitigated
version of same project, so it doesn't need a new
EIR.

May 6, 2008 – City Council Initial Public Hearing
on revised project Draft EIR Addendum. (By
law, Council must vote on project approval by
June 3.) City Manager gives update on 216 (?)
Conditions of Approval, praises the revised
project, and recommends approval. Seeno
gives Powerpoint presentation. Public
comments. Council discussion.

May 20, 2008 – City Council Hearing on revised
Seeno project. BeniciaFirst! gives Powerpoint
presentation. Public comments. Mayor asks
Seeno for more time to review documents and
opportunity to have the Planning Commission
review the Conditions of Approval. Seeno
declined sending back to PC, or time extension.
Council discussion.

June 3, 2008 – City Council Hearing on revised
Seeno project. Staff discussion. Public
comments. Hearing closed. Council discussion.
Patterson proposed a resolution to deny the
project (read by Campbell) but no vote was
taken.. At 2 AM Seeno agrees to a time
extension to Oct. 7 City Council meeting in order
to do an additional traffic study in August.
Meanwhile, Council noted that they can use the
additional time to look at some of their other
concerns, and can send the project back to
Planning Commission for review. Seeno rejects
suggestion of Development Agreement, Specific
Plan, or urban decay study. Seeno agrees that
at Oct. 7 meeting, Council can discuss all
aspects of project, but public can only comment
on the traffic study.