



County of Yolo

PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

John Bencomo
DIRECTOR

292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695-2598
(530) 666-8775 FAX (530) 666-8728
www.yolocounty.org

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

CHAIR: Mary Kimball

VICE-CHAIR: Jeb Burton

MEMBERS: Leroy Bertolero; Jeff Merwin; Richard Reed; Keith Williams; Don Winters

REVISED SUMMARY NOTES

June 10, 2009

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

1. Chair Kimball called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Bertolero.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, and Williams

MEMBERS ABSENT: Burton and Winters

STAFF PRESENT: David Morrison, Assistant Director of Planning
Heidi Tschudin, General Plan Project Manager
Philip Pogledich, Senior Deputy County Counsel
Don Rust, Principal Planner
Aundrea Hardy, Office Support Specialist
Marcus Neuert, Yolo County IT
Judith Malamut, LSA Associates, Project Manager for the Draft EIR
Luke McNeel-Caird, Fehr and Peers Associates, Project Manager for circulation analysis.

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE **May 14, 2009** MEETING.

Adoption of the Minutes of the **May 14, 2009** Planning Commission meeting were postponed until the July 2009 meeting, due to the lack of a quorum.

4. CORRESPONDENCE

4.1 Great Valley Center Letter.

Chair Kimball acknowledged receipt of all correspondence sent with the packet and distributed at the beginning of the meeting.

5. PUBLIC REQUESTS

The opportunity for members of the public to address the Planning Commission on any subjects relating to the Planning Commission, but not relative to items on the present agenda, was opened by the Chair. The Planning Commission reserves the right to impose a reasonable limit on time afforded to any individual speaker.

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Brenda Cedarblade, Yolo County resident and land owner, commented on the May 14, 2009 minutes; specifically agenda item 6.4, zone file 2009-010, regarding the appeal of administrative actions related to Use Permit #2004-030. She said that a correction was needed on the statement regarding Debbie Yager reading a prepared statement. Ms. Cedarblade stated that Ms. Yager turned a letter in, but it was not a prepared statement. She added that she was going to take the tape recording and have everything translated, so that the Planning Commission would have a complete set of minutes from that meeting. Ms. Cedarblade also indicated that she would have a transcription prepared for the original meeting when they were granted their Use Permit. If the commission wanted to adopt the transcription into the minutes, it would provide a more accurate record.

Chair Kimball recommended that Ms. Cedarblade provide her recommendation on the specific items she would like to see changed rather than the full minutes.

David Morrison, Assistant Director of Planning Services, said that if Ms. Cedarblade had comments or corrections on the minutes, that she may submit those to the planning department, and they will take them into consideration; however, without a court certified transcription, staff would not recommend that they adopt them as minutes. He said that if there were elements that needed correction, then they would take the suggestions and review them for return of the adoption of the minutes at the July meeting.

Ms. Cedarblade stated that they are having a court agent transcribe the minutes, and that the reason it is important, is because the decision was challenged and would go to the Board of Supervisors. Therefore, they want to make sure that everything is transcribed.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing.

TIME SET AGENDA

6. **PUBLIC HEARING NO. 1 ON THE REVISED DRAFT 2030 COUNTYWIDE GENERAL PLAN, AND DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR)**

The Planning Commission conducted its first of up to three workshops on the revised Draft 2030

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

Public Hearing, Revised Draft General Plan and DEIR

June 10, 2009

Page 3 of 24

Countywide General Plan and Draft EIR. The purpose of the hearings was to provide an opportunity for the staff to report on recommended changes to the Draft General Plan, for the public and interested agencies to provide comments directly to the Planning Commission, and to receive recommendations from the Planning Commission for consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

a. Summary of proposed revisions to the Draft 2030 Countywide General Plan.

Mr. Morrison provided introductory comments and introduced some of the Land Use changes that staff has recommended since the January 2009, Board of Supervisors' meeting. He clarified an error in the materials showing the Covell property recommended for a land use change from AG to SP. He corrected the record to show that staff recommendation for the site as remaining IN with the addition of the SPO overlay. A error in the staff report was also identified – item 13 on page 10 of the staff report should be deleted. He recommended that the commission start with Chapter 1 and move forward through each subsequent chapter.

Heidi Tschudin, General Plan Project Manager, went over some of the major policy changes, reviewed the staff report, comments that they had received, and answered clarifying questions from the commission.

Ms. Tschudin also indicated that for the Dunnigan area, they are introducing a new quantifiable threshold for VMT. It would be implemented through the Dunnigan Specific Plan that is in the process of being developed, and would be a mandated maximum threshold. Its implementation would affect how the community is designed, and would involve ongoing monitoring to ensure that actual VMT levels are being achieved. It would also identify a process for making modifications in the future, should the VMT not stay at or below the threshold. Additionally, the EIR identifies that the same threshold should strive to be achieved in other specific plan areas, but it would not necessarily be a mandate. She said that the scope and intensity of proposed land use changes in Dunnigan require the VMT threshold to be enforced, compared to the amount of growth recommended in other communities.

Ms. Tschudin said that she is sure that many commissioners have been following the climate change issue. It is a significant issue for the planning profession, and will have impacts on all aspects of land use development. The manner in which communities are designed and built has direct consequences for the amount of green house gasses generated, which in turn effects global climate change. In fact, the majority of green house gasses are the result of infrastructure and development decisions. The Draft General Plan is establishing a land-use pattern that will accommodate residents, businesses, and infrastructure in a way that will reduce future greenhouse gas emissions. Limiting contributions to climate change has been a primary focus of the General Plan process and EIR.

Ms. Tschudin went on to say that motor vehicle use is responsible for between 30 and 40 percent of green house gas emissions, depending on location. The three variables involved are vehicle technology, fuels, and vehicle use. There is only one of these variables that local government can affect, and that is vehicle use. The other two are controlled at the federal level. The General Plan proposes to reduce emissions associated with vehicle use through several means: by providing transportation alternatives, by managing the demands for transportation, by modifying how future communities are designed, and how existing communities are redeveloped. The General Plan also embodies a new way of measuring our effect on the environment by looking at vehicle miles traveled as a way to measure the generation of green house gasses, and the effect on climate change. Overall, the number of vehicle miles travelled per household will decline as there is an increase in the accessibility between land-uses, the density of land-uses, and the mix

of land-uses. As an example, the target density in new developed areas allowed in this General Plan will be eight dwelling units per acre, as compared to the four to six units per acre that is typical now. The General Plan also provides a mix of land-uses in all of the areas where new development is allowed, including strong downtowns that allow people to use alternate transportation modes as opposed to having to drive everywhere. The General Plan even addresses the width of roadways, the capacity of roadways, the need for a grid pattern, etc. All of those factors will contribute to lowering the VMT threshold.

Ms. Tschudin continued by explaining that the reason she was providing all of this information is that it is important to understand the connection between the abstract number used in VMT analysis, and why it is being recommended in the EIR as a policy with which all new development will have to comply. In the EIR, Fehr and Peers did a ground-breaking analysis, using regional data to compare VMT per household data between urban areas, such as Woodland or Davis, with rural areas. Previously, there was little analysis available regarding climate change issues in agricultural areas and small towns. Fehr and Peers also evaluated the proposed General Plan policies to see what impact they would have on reducing VMT, and concluded that they would result in a major reduction. This is significant, as the policies being proposed in this General Plan have not been adopted anywhere else in the State of California.

The Planning Commission began review of the Final Draft Version of the Draft General Plan. Chair Kimball provided an opportunity for members of the public to provide public comment prior to the commission's review of each chapter.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION AND ADMINISTRATION

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Ms. Cedarblade requested a thirty-day extension, due to the changes that were proposed at Spreckels. She explained that the changes were very significant to her and her husband, and that she needs time to review those proposals with their consultants and land use attorneys. In addition, she commented that the copy of the Draft General Plan that she obtained the prior week from the county is different than the latest online edition. She said that other residents had issues with changes being made in Esparto and Dunnigan, and hadn't realized newer revisions were available online. Ms. Cedarblade said that she didn't understand the changes proposed for Spreckels because the wording was too small to read on the map handed out at the beginning of the meeting. She added that the Farm Bureau specifically said during the Clark Pacific General Plan Amendment process that they would not support additional land being changed from Agriculture to Industrial at the Spreckels' site.

A discussion followed regarding extension requests and when the request should be made.

Frank Siefertman, President of the Yolo County landowners association, commented that he did not have an opportunity to look at the latest Draft General Plan, and that he was there to request a thirty-day extension for further review of the latest document.

Yvonne LeMaitre, Wild Oak Farms, requested an extension of time, as they didn't know of the existence of the revised Draft General Plan document. She said that she was still reviewing the January 2009 document, and that they still need time to go over the revised Draft General Plan with the people they hired to review it. She commented that if the public is looking at living with this document for the next twenty years, the process needs to slow down to provide more time for input, and ensure that it is something that they all can live with. Ms. LeMaitre also indicated that staff may not be aware that there

have been discussions of lowering the Fremont Weir and flooding the Yolo Bypass up to 45 days a year. That action would take away all of the farming that is currently being done within the Bypass, including the rice farming owned by the State of California.

Rita Moore, representing the Yolo County Fairground, requested an extension of time for the Draft General Plan, because they haven't had time to review the plan in its final form.

Chair Kimball clarified that this hearing is not the only opportunity to present comments on the Draft General Plan, and that the Board of Supervisor's will be considering the Planning Commission's recommendation the week of July 20, 2009.

Mr. Morrison confirmed that the deadlines for comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report as June 12, 2009. He stated that they allowed for a 45-day comment period as required under state law. He further clarified that the public may comment on the recently released final version of the Draft General Plan up until the Board of Supervisors' meeting the week of July 20, 2009. Mr. Morrison added that the schedule for the General Plan is set by the Board of Supervisors, and it is not within the purview of the Planning Commission to change the schedule; therefore, any requests for an extension should be directed to the Board of Supervisors.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bertolero said that it seemed very straightforward.

Commissioner Reed had no comment on Chapter 1.

Commissioner Williams had no comment on Chapter 1

Commissioner Merwin said that it looks good.

Chair Kimball said that the changes look satisfactory, and she had no further comment.

Commission Action

That the Planning Commission recommend approval of Chapter 1, Introduction and Administration, with no changes:

MOTION: Reed SECOND: Bertolero
AYES: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, and Williams
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Burton and Winters

CHAPTER 2 VISION AND PRINCIPLES

Chair Kimball opened and closed the public hearing.

No one from the public came forward.

The commission had no comment.

Commission Action

That the Planning Commission recommend approval of Chapter 2, Vision and Principles, as presented by staff.

MOTION: Merwin SECOND: Williams
AYES: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, and Williams
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Burton and Winters

CHAPTER 3 LAND USE AND COMMUNITY CHARACTER

Ms. Tschudin provided information on the chapter and answered questions from the commission.

Commissioner Reed recommended that they modify Policy LU-6.11 as follows:

- e) Life science, biotechnology and related research uses. ~~along the Interstate 80 corridor.~~
- f) *The possibility of* commercial and mixed uses at Covell Boulevard/Pole Line Road and coordinated planning with the Hunt Wesson site.

Commissioner Reed further recommended that they modify Policy CC-3.1 as follows:

Prepare a Specific Plan ~~or Master Plan~~ for the Covell/Pole Line Road property. (DEIR MM LU-2a)

Chair Kimball asked for further information regarding Policy LU-6.12:

Coordinate with and encourage the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians to prepare, adopt, and implement a long-range tribal general plan for tribal trust land and meet or exceed a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) threshold of 44 miles generated per household per weekday.

Ms. Tschudin explained that it was intended to apply to all tribal trust holdings in whatever manner they choose to develop them.

Mr. Morrison added that Commissioner Kimball is correct in that the 44 mile per day threshold is primarily geared towards residential uses, and is not applicable to the casino resort. In adapting this to their operations, the tribe would have to come up with equivalent measures to reduce VMT. The proposed policy would be a way to encourage more car-pooling, more busses for employees, and other alternative transportation for customers to reduce their overall VMT, and in turn, that of the casino resort. Because the county has set VMT up as a residential threshold, it would have to be adapted to other types of land-uses in the future as needed.

Ms. Tschudin said that currently, the Tribal Trust property is a job center with no workforce housing. One of the issues that the EIR identified is that Tribal Trust land is one of several areas within the unincorporated area (UC-Davis and DQ University are other examples) where the county does not have

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

Public Hearing, Revised Draft General Plan and DEIR

June 10, 2009

Page 7 of 24

land-use authority. However, what occurs within these areas may have significant effects on the county's job/housing balance, as well as vehicle trip distribution and generation. Therefore, from the perspective of CEQA, there is an obligation to identify reasonable feasible mitigation measures, to the extent that the county can assist in implementing such measures. The reason the mitigation measure is included, is that the county has a formal relationship with the tribe and could strive to implement the policy language through the various tribal-county agreements. The county obviously can't tell the tribe what to do on trust land, without mutual agreement. Ideally, with any large job center, the operators would be willing to work with the county to create workforce housing to reduce greenhouse gas emission impacts.

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Chris Ferenze, representing John Deterding, submitted a comment letter for the 2030 Draft General Plan to the commission, related to seventy-acres located southeast of Esparto. He said that in their view, there has been a disconnect in the land use designation of the seventy-nine acre subject site between the direction provided by the Board of Supervisors (dating back to 2007) and staff's recent recommendation. Despite the unanimous direction from the Board of Supervisors to designate this site as mixed use, staff initially defined the uses in 2008 and then unilaterally reversed the Board of Supervisors' action by recommending that the site designation be left as industrial. As an observer and active participant in the General Plan update, Mr. Deterding asked that the commission assist in returning the designation of this property back to mixed use, as explicitly directed by the Board of Supervisors in 2007, which represents the aligned interests of Yolo County and the landowners. Mr. Deterding is specifically seeking a mixed-use designation, which will provide flexibility to respond to changes in market demand, and to minimize the potential need for a future General Plan amendment. The mixed-use designation will also allow the project to resolve the agricultural buffer needs, when a specific development proposal comes before the commission for approval. It is the owner's belief that a mixed-use designation for the site has a much higher job creation potential, compared to typical light industrial uses, which have very low job creation rates on a per acre basis.

Lydia Delis-Schlosser, representing the Davis Neighbors Inc, formally known as North Davis Land Company, and owners of the Pole Line property, said that they welcome any discussion with Yolo County in conjunction with the City of Davis regarding the Covell/Pole Line property. They understand that it may be in the best interest of both the county and the city to require that any proposed development at the Covell/Pole Line property be evaluated through the Specific Plan process. She said that it is their belief that the direction of the staff report, regarding Policy CC-3.1, is a sound approach. Their current intentions are described in a letter submitted to the Board of Supervisors on November 20, 2008.

Eileen Samitz, former Davis Planning Commissioner, addressed the Planning Commission regarding the land use designation of the Covell/Pole Line site. She submitted a letter to the Planning Commission and expressed her concern over both the current industrial designation, as well as the proposed Specific Plan overlay. She said that there are major problems with the site, and many reasons as to why the site should be re-designated as agriculture. Ms. Samitz provided a map of the site and said that almost two-hundred, out of the three-hundred and eighty-three acres of the project site, are within the 100-year floodplain. She added that there is now a flood control law, which states very clearly that cities and counties that are foolish enough to build on flood plains will no longer have the state to bail them out. The same issues apply to this site as were revealed during the Covell Village debate, which was voted down. The existing industrial designation isn't appropriate, because the area is now surrounded by residential uses. In addition, there was a recent fatality involving a semi-truck and a UC Davis student. It is clear that an industrial designation is no longer appropriate for this site. The area within the flood zone should not be built at any time in the future. Ms. Samitz asked that the commission keep in mind the amount of water that would need to be provided by the community, as well as other municipal service

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

Public Hearing, Revised Draft General Plan and DEIR

June 10, 2009

Page 8 of 24

impacts. Ms. Samitz added a final comment to the commission regarding her support of a one hundred acre business park along Interstate 80.

Debbie McEvers, Yolo County landowner, spoke to the commissioners regarding their decision on the choice of designating one of two properties as General Commercial along Interstate 505. She said that this particular item had come up on December 19, 2006. It was voted on, and staff recommended dropping the County Road 12A location, in favor of the County Road 14 interchange, which is a full interchange and centrally located. A follow-up discussion and vote, at a March 27th Board of Supervisors meeting, also confirmed that the County Road 14 location was the best location for development. In addition, during the July 17th meeting, there was specific wording in the document which said that the County Road 14 alternative was better. The reasons cited included being situated on flat terrain within a hilly area, and its existing development as a paintball park, which will minimize the loss of agricultural land. This site provides an area for future infrastructure to be consolidated, and avoids area drainages. After the vote, however, the County Road 12A alternative was reintroduced back into the wording, due to arguments made by the attorney for the landowner. The board directed that this issue be considered in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), but the EIR showed nothing different between the two properties. Ms. McEvers reiterated the positive aspects of utilizing County Road 14 and explained why County Road 12A would not be the better selection.

Jay Ziegler, on behalf of Don Clark and Clark Pacific, reviewed a brief chronology of actions pertaining to the Spreckels/Clark Pacific site in order to provide context for their request that the area designated as Industrial be reconfigured to avoid dedicated Open Space lands, and instead relocate Industrial land to the west, to facilitate access to the existing rail line.

Ms. Cedarblade, neighbor to the Spreckels site, advised the commission that she was going to first comment on the impacts to their ranch, and then on the policies within the document where she thinks the additional language is needed. She said that comments she had submitted previously were not included in the packet. She said that with regards to Clark Pacific, they are not shown as an LLC on the ownership title, and that they are closing down next week. The problem with the proposed change to designate more land as Industrial, is that she doesn't know what businesses may be located in any future new industrial area. Once it changes, there will be little to protect the surrounding agricultural businesses, including hers.

Ms. Cedarblade went on to say that last year there was a hurried change to designate a portion of the site as Industrial for Clark Pacific. The Draft General Plan is largely silent concerning the protection of agricultural uses from nearby heavy industrial facilities. There are organic farmers that may be impacted by dust coming off of the Clark Pacific site, and now additional unknown heavy industrial operators will also locate there. Ms. Cedarblade stated that she does not feel that the Draft General Plan is fair or equitable to their use, and is encroaching on their ranch. She feels it will result ultimately in an inverse condemnation of their property. She also said that they are the only horse barn in the county that has its Use Permit, Business License, and is compliant with zoning. Clark Pacific has resulted in a loss of boarders to their business. She explained that her property is not just farmland, it is a sensitive ancillary agricultural use. They put on high-end horse shows, operate riding programs for adults with disabilities, and provide an organic community garden, all of which is basically incompatible with heavy industrial users and their off-site impacts. She said that her stable doesn't provide the number of jobs that Clark Pacific does, but they do generate a large amount of sales tax and hotel tax when people come in for shows. When Clark Pacific was approved for industrial use, they were allowed to operate twenty-four hours. She and other farmers in the area do not have adequate screening to protect them from the changes to the nighttime views. They are also not protected from the heavy truck traffic or vibration created by the Clark Pacific facility. Considering the amount of change being proposed at this site, a Specific Plan needs to be done, so that it is fair for all of the neighbors that live around the industrial

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

Public Hearing, Revised Draft General Plan and DEIR

June 10, 2009

Page 9 of 24

area. Finally, Spreckels is a California brownfield area. In 2000, Yolo County tested the surrounding wells for Hexavalent Chromium. The EPA found PCBs on the site.

There was a discussion regarding the comment process and time limits for addressing the Planning Commission.

Chair Kimball encouraged Ms. Cedarblade to work with staff to submit further detailed comments.

Bill Weber, Dunnigan Citizens Advisory Committee Chairman, said that the committee is concerned about how future growth in Dunnigan will be addressed. He explained that the committee put together a packet of concerns addressing the Draft EIR, which are being submitted at this time for the commission's consideration. In particular, the committee felt that the jobs/housing section was very important for the success of the community. Job creation is needed, as well as a monitoring program to ensure that the balance with housing is maintained. The monitoring program should limit housing growth when an insufficient number of jobs are being created.

Mel Smith, Dunnigan resident, and member of the Dunnigan Citizens Advisory Committee, explained the process that the committee used to review the Draft EIR, and how they identified suggested policies and mitigations that they believe would help to reduce identified significant impacts. He concluded his comments with a summarized version of their written comments.

Erich Linse, Dunnigan resident, told the commission about one of the mitigations that the Dunnigan Citizens Advisory Committee voted on the prior evening. It would require monitoring of the job/housing balance in the Dunnigan Specific Plan after construction of the first two thousand housing units, as well as after two years, instead of five years as proposed. They also recommend requiring the specific plan to ensure a balance of 1.2 jobs per house at every review point before approval of further development is allowed. The balance calculations should take into consideration the number of retired people. He said that he thinks that the focus on the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is helpful to the community and that he is glad that it is being considered now. This will force the developer to do a better job along the way, and can save individuals a lot of trouble. Mr. Linse concluded by explaining why he felt the VMT would prove to be useful in the long run.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing.

A short recess was called.

The Planning Commission reconvened and Chair Kimball requested that Mr. Morrison explain the newly submitted Spreckels/Clark Pacific map.

Mr. Morrison explained his understanding that Clark Pacific is asking to move 20 acres of industrial (IN) from the southeast area of the property to the northwest – basically an equal exchange. Mr. Morrison showed these areas to the Planning Commission and audience on the overhead projector. Because the EIR examined the effects of a total of 160 acres of IN at the site, staff believes this will not result in a change in the EIR conclusions. The Chair then moved to commissioner's comments on the Land Use and Community Character chapter.

Commissioner Merwin said that he was pleased to see the suggestions that were made at their previous series of hearings, and how well they have been incorporated along the way. He explained that it is a large document, and he is very comfortable with the effort that has gone into it.

Commissioner Williams had no further recommendations for Chapter 3.

Commissioner Bertolero asked for clarification on the zoning of the Covell site, and the process for analyzing flooding on that site through the specific plan. He also asked for clarification on the Interstate 505 interchange selection. He acknowledged the written comments from the Dunnigan Citizens Advisory Committee and asked if their comments would be addressed in the specific plan.

Staff provided clarification for Commissioner Bertolero in that site-specific flooding issues would be addressed through future development applications. Staff confirmed that the Interstate 505 interchange decision would be decided later, after further analysis per Policy CC-3.15 and Action CC-A14. Staff agreed that much of the CAC's comments appeared to apply at the specific plan level.

Commissioner Bertolero addressed the changes to the Spreckels' site, and said that he felt that if they were giving up open space acreage, he doesn't see any reason why they shouldn't be entitled to reacquiring that on another part of their property. He added that he does see a lot of potential there with the railroad spur, and personally thinks that in moving that industrial away from neighboring conflicts, there is actually going to be less conflict with neighboring uses than the way it is currently laid out. He would like to see the commission approve that recommended change.

Commissioner Reed reiterated his recommendation for the two specific language changes that he spoke of earlier, and added that he is in agreement with the change for the Spreckels' site.

Chair Kimball echoed what several others said about the addition of the VMT evaluation, and job/housing balance. She said that it is certainly ground breaking in California, and is happy to see that Yolo County is leading the pack. In regards to the Covell site, she is very comfortable with the specific plan overlay for that area, as well as the Elkhorn Specific Plan, and has no concerns with the addition of potential high density, upper level housing there. She addressed the industrial zoning of the Esparto area staying the same, and said that she is glad to see that the Esparto Advisory Committee concurs with that decision. She explained that she is a little torn on it, but is going to support the staff on keeping it industrial. She acknowledged the comments made by Debbie McEver and the two possible interchange sites, and concluded her comments by saying that in regards to the Spreckels' site, she concurs with her fellow commissioners that use of rail is better for the environment, roadways, and neighbors than trucks.

Commission Action

That the Planning Commission recommend approval of Chapter 3, Land Use and Community Character with the recommended staff changes as well as the following changes:

Policy LU-6.11:

- e) Life science, biotechnology and related research uses. ~~along the Interstate 80 corridor.~~
- f) *The possibility of* commercial and mixed uses at Covell Boulevard/Pole Line Road and coordinated planning with the Hunt Wesson site.

Land Use and Community Character, General Action:

Make other edits throughout the Chapter to recognize and reference the Covell Specific Plan consistent with the approach taken for the other specific plans.

MOTION: Reed SECOND: Bertolero
AYES: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, and Williams
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Burton and Winters

CHAPTER 4 CIRCULATION ELEMENT

Mr. Morrison and Ms. Tschudin provided information on the Circulation Element and answered questions from the commission. There was discussion of the VMT threshold. Policy CI-3.18 was clarified as being a “second tier” of actions. The “first tier” are community design principles, which are already incorporated throughout the Draft General Plan. The commission and staff discussed an error on Figure CI-3B. The future bike trails on the deep ship channel through Clarksburg and along South River Road were to have been deleted based on the commission’s direction back in November. The commission also discussed that the word “biennial” should be deleted from CI-3.20, to provide flexibility in the frequency of monitoring

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Ms. Cedarblade said that one of the major impacts to their ranch is the truck traffic generated by industrial uses, and the vibration created by the trucks. Clark Pacific is required to use County Road 100B to Highway 113, so that the trucks don’t run past their ranch. However, if there is a change in use, or additional industrial operators, there won’t be the same kinds of restrictions, so she would like additional policies, or a plan added, so that their property is protected from the significant industrial changes going on next door. Ms. Cedarblade stated that she does not agree with the industrial changes that are being proposed on land that is Class I soil. The circulation problems and amount of dust coming off of trucks will impact the surrounding properties. She provided further information on the dust and the traffic from the neighboring Clark Pacific site, and recommended protection or coverings on trucks for industrial uses in agricultural areas to protect organic farms and crops from exposure to unnatural chemicals. This would be similar to requirements on trucks hauling concrete or aggregate.

Ms. Cedarblade concluded her comment by stating that she can’t read the map regarding the Clark Pacific site provided at the hearing today, which prevents her from effectively commenting on the proposed changes shown on the map. This is a violation of the public process and her rights. The proposed change is an addition that was not originally in the staff report, so it wasn’t like the public was able to study it beforehand. She stated that she is being singled out regarding the ag exempt status of her stable buildings, and that no other horse facilities in Yolo County are having to go through what they are being required to do. She added that Yolo County is going through a process to circumvent her rights and to get her to shut up and that she feels that what the county is doing is wrong.

Ms. Samitz expressed her concern regarding the level of acceptable level of services defined for County Road 102. She said that levels of service (LOS) D and E are very serious matters that do not take into account the 1800-unit project that is being proposed at Covell and Pole Line. She wanted them to understand that during the Pole Line overcrossing issue, there was a huge process involved in preparing the corridor plan. Through this process, the City of Davis made peace with the residents along Pole Line Road regarding the impacts expected to occur, by not imposing additional severe impacts to make the neighborhood unlivable. Ms. Samitz read the definitions for service levels D and E, and said that the LOS D and E would not be tolerable, especially because of the past history of proposed development on that site. She added that County Road 102 currently has impacts, and she thinks that it is being significantly underestimated because of the Spring Lake community and the proposed new project that is under discussion.

Chair Kimball requested clarification from staff on LOS D and LOS E.

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

Public Hearing, Revised Draft General Plan and DEIR

June 10, 2009

Page 12 of 24

Jim Burchill commended Ms. Tschudin and Mr. Morrison and stated that the Draft General Plan was very good. He requested clarification on an item in the Draft EIR document related to Policy HS-2.8 in the Health and Safety Element. He read, "Consider and allow for ecological benefits of flooding while balancing public safety and protection of property."

Chair Kimball asked Mr. Burchill for direction on where he was reading from, and then explained that the commission was currently on the Circulation Element, and had not yet moved into the review of the Health and Safety Element or the Draft EIR.

Mr. Burchill said that he would submit his comments in writing.

Mr. Mel Smith made a comment regarding a policy located under CI-2 impact, where the county standard is that no development shall be approved that reduces the level of service beyond LOS C except in limited cases (Policies CI-3.1 and CI-3.2). He said that in a specific plan area like Dunnigan, the funding mechanism should be to get the road improvements necessary to keep the roads at LOS C or better. If they can't do that, then they shouldn't be allowed to build their houses. That is why the first policy that the Dunnigan Citizens Advisory Committee asked to be included is to maintain LOS C or better for roadways and intersections in the Dunnigan Specific Plan. In no case should land use be approved that would either result in worse than LOS C, or require additional improvements to be made at a later date using county funds. He said that the county cannot let a developer come into an area and build housing without building the roads to handle the additional traffic being brought into the community. Public funds will have to be used to upgrade these roads at a later date, due to the traffic congestion projected at all intersections and roads. There are two policies that this impact has concluded in the DEIR to be significant and unavoidable. He stated that these impacts aren't unavoidable. Mitigations and policies should be identified to reduce the impact to less than significant. The advisory committee has identified three policies and nine mitigations to keep their roads at a LOS C or better.

There was discussion about the LOS concept. Staff pointed out fundamental differences between the Draft General Plan and what the Dunnigan citizen representatives were advocating. There was also discussion about whether the county can require trucks to cover their loads.

Mr. Linse spoke of where they may want speedy access and egress in Dunnigan so that they could be a highway services stop and raise money for the county.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing.

Ms. Tschudin and Mr. Morrison provided the commission with feedback from the public comments and answered questions.

Commissioner Bertolero commented that there will be a possibility of success in using VMT in Dunnigan, because it is going to be all new, and there will be a large volume of growth. In an existing community, when you add in a housing project or some small commercial, it is difficult to effect the overall VMT, due to the incremental nature of infill development. Commissioner Bertolero said that in the letter from the Dunnigan Landowner Group, they indicated that they would like 40 percent of the Economic Development Officer's time. He expected that they would want more time than that because Dunnigan is going to represent most of the growth.

Commissioner Reed said that he thinks that the Dunnigan Specific Plan will address many of the issues under discussion, and he appreciates Mr. Morrison taking the time to explain the LOS.

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

Public Hearing, Revised Draft General Plan and DEIR

June 10, 2009

Page 13 of 24

Commissioner Williams stated that for the first time, he really understands the impact that the VMT will have, and also said that he appreciated the explanation. He is looking forward to when the commission reviews the Dunnigan Specific Plan, because it is going to be a great exercise.

Commissioner Merwin concurred with his fellow commissioners regarding the explanation of the LOS, as is excited about the VMT threshold. He also spoke to the language on page CI-12, item 9, regarding the definition of different bikeway classes. He expressed concern about proposed Class II bike lanes on Old River Road between West Sacramento and Woodland, as well as South River Road through the Clarksburg area. He said that those are exceedingly dangerous corridors for bicyclists. There is limited room to add a striped bike lane one way, let alone two. He recommended removing the references to bike routes on those roads, due to the potential liability.

Mr. Morrison advised the commission that he had a correction. He had indicated earlier that the bike lane along the deep ship channel was in error; that it should have been omitted. However, in talking to Mr. McNeil-Caird, the map was directly taken out of the adopted Yolo County Bicycle Transportation Plan from 2006. It is an existing county policy document, so he wanted to ensure that the commission was aware that if they change that map, then the county will have to go back and change the Yolo County Bicycle Transportation Plan, once the General Plan is adopted.

Commissioner Merwin recommended that they correct the map, and shared his idea for an alternative. He recommended that they use existing county roads that are lightly traveled, to place a Class III designation. He proposed designating Willow Point Road, from Clarksburg to Z Line Road, and then south to Courtland Road .

Mr. Morrison clarified the direction given by Commissioner Merwin regarding the bikeways and classifications.

Chair Kimball commented on the LOS and said that she strongly supports the change of thought on this issue. She referenced a trip that she had recently taken to Orange County and how LOS was treated there. She said her experience in Orange County is not what she wants to see for Yolo County.

Commission Action

That the Planning Commission recommend approval of Chapter 4, Circulation Element with the proposed changes to figure CI-3B – Eliminate the bike trails on the deep ship channel levee, Old River Road, and South River Road; add a Class III route as described by Commissioner Merwin.

MOTION: Merwin SECOND: Reed
AYES: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, and Williams
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Burton and Winters

**CHAPTER 5
PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES**

Ms. Tschudin provided information and responded to questions from the commission, including a discussion of whether Policy PF-4.6 is still relevant.

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Mr. Smith said that his group only has one mitigation item, which is listed under the PUB-1 impact. Their request was that the Dunnigan Specific Plan include a continuation of County Road 5 to County Road 6. The reason is to facilitate access from the proposed location of the fire station in the Specific Plan. Otherwise, there would be delayed response time due to the roundabout way required to get from the new fire station to the County Road 5 neighborhood.

Ms. Cedarblade commented on Policy PF-2.3, regarding the definition of open space, and the design of new storm water facilities to enhance recreational, habitat, and/or aesthetic benefits, as well as to integrate with existing parks and open space features. She recommended that they add language to ensure that additional mitigation be required if mitigated open space is subsequently developed. In addition, she spoke on Policy PF-10.2, to streamline the permitting process for the production of energy alternatives (including but not limited to photovoltaic, solar, wind, biofuels, and biomass), Ms Cedarblade said that alternative energy was great, but there are significant environmental impacts that also need to be addressed. There needs to be proper CEQA review and protection for adjacent properties.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Merwin asked for clarification regarding Action PF-A9.

Commissioner Williams said that he appreciated Action PF-82, which would integrate school facilities with adjoining community parks. He recommended that if growth occurs in Dunnigan, the idea of combining a community library with a local school library be investigated.

Mr. Morrison informed the commission about a couple of local communities that are joining libraries with the school district and directed the commission to PF-7.3 about pursuing joint use agreements.

Commissioner Bertolero agreed with the language change for Item 8 on page PF-28, from Dependent Child Care to Dependent Care, and said that he does not see any problems with chapter 5.

Commissioner Reed had no comment on chapter 5.

Chair Kimball asked about buffers between schools and agricultural land. She recommended that they include some language in the General Plan to that effect.

A discussion followed about buffers for schools, jurisdiction, buffer requirements, and future schools in Dunnigan. Staff clarified that school site criteria is set by the state.

Commission Action

That the Planning Commission recommend approval of Chapter 5, Public Facilities and Services as presented by staff.

MOTION: Bertolero SECOND: Reed
AYES: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, and Williams
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Burton and Winters

CHAPTER 6
AGRICULTURE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Tschudin and Mr. Morrison answered questions and provided further clarification on subjects from Chapter 6, to the commission. There was discussion of agricultural buffers in Policy LU-2.

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Ms. Cedarblade commented on the 300-foot setbacks and said she would like to see them maintained, especially where there are adjoining incompatible land uses. She also requested that they add a policy specifically requiring a minimum 300-foot buffer between industrial and agricultural uses, due to the potential for off-site industrial impacts on farming and habitat. She also discussed the policy regarding farm labor housing, and cautioned the commission that they should take into consideration the green buffer between Davis and Woodland. She said she would like to see more farm labor housing in the county; however, developers use the concept as a way to get housing into agricultural areas. She thinks that either the county should be proactive in ensuring that housing is directed to farm labor, or the policy should be removed that from the General Plan. In addition, she asked that they include a definition of what a truck farmer is, and also suggested removing the word "production" under Policy AG-1.5, C.

Ms. Cedarblade said that she would like to see the Williamson Act maintained on entire parcels to prevent developers from allowing incremental development in the agricultural areas. On Action AG-A14, Ms. Cedarblade recommended adding the word "historic structures." On Action AG-A13, she said that those have many offsite impacts, and if they are put next to ag areas, there is the threat of fires, and things that are being brought in and stored, and they really need to require permits. In regards to Action ED-A1, she said that she believes that the policy should be deleted, as it refers to tasks that are responsibility of the Chambers of Commerce and tourism bureaus. The county shouldn't take on additional projects as it is already broke. The citizens need county employees to work on real projects, not building websites.

Ms. Samitz agreed with all of Ms. Cedarblade's comments and expressed her concern about the 1:1 ag+ mitigation policy currently in effect in Yolo County. She stated that Davis has a 2:1 mitigation policy and that it works very well. If Yolo County is really committed to preserving ag land, they need to step up to the plate, because the developers are very anxious to pave over as much ag land as possible. She commended the idea of the 300-foot setback; however, she understands if a lesser standard is adopted. A minimum 150-foot buffer is what Davis uses and it works well. She asked that the Covell/PoleLine site be preserved as farmland, particularly the northernmost two-thirds. She said it is successfully farmed every year, and with the risk of the floodplain, it does not make any sense to develop there.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bertolero asked for clarification from Ms. Cedarblade regarding the version of the Draft General Plan to which she was referring.

There was clarification about the version being used at the hearing and the version that Ms. Cedarblade was using. It was found that Ms. Cedarblade was using an older version, as the new version was released immediately after her purchase. The policy numbering was the same; therefore; her policy references matched the book being used by the commissioners; however, the page numbers were different which was causing quite a bit of confusion.

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

Public Hearing, Revised Draft General Plan and DEIR

June 10, 2009

Page 16 of 24

Commissioner Bertolero commented on the 1:1 mitigation policy and verified that it was a policy voted on by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Morrison clarified that the 1:1 ag mitigation policy requirement was acted on previously by the Board of Supervisors and is in the County Code . The county also requires separate 1:1 or greater mitigation for habitat impacts. The two requirements can not be “stacked”,

Commissioner Bertolero said that in regards to the 100-foot ag buffer, it is best that there is a minimum in place, and then make the decision for expanding it on a case-by-case basis.

Commissioner Merwin said he was pleased that many of the comments and input that they discussed in January had been incorporated into the current document. He acknowledged Ms. Cedarblade’s concerns regarding biofuels production, and said that he thinks the intent was not to allow the industrial production of such fuels in agricultural lands, but to enable a farmer to produce his own biofuel and not make him have to go through extensive regulatory hurdles. He is comfortable with the language as written.

Commissioner Reed thanked Mr. Morrison for his clarification on the buffer.

Chair Kimball concurred with Commissioner Reed, and advised Ms. Samitz that there are many that would like to see a 2:1 agricultural mitigation policy, and that the issue will continue to be worked on. She thanked Ms. Tschudin and Mr. Morrison for the great deal of work they had done on the General Plan and for including most of comments that had been previously made by the commission.

Commission Action

That the Planning Commission recommend approval of Chapter 6, Agriculture and Economic Development as presented by staff.

MOTION: Reed SECOND: Bertolero
AYES: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, and Williams
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Burton and Winters

CHAPTER 7
CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE

Staff provided clarification and answered questions from the commission. There was discussion regarding Policy CO-2.44 and the source of the 3:1 ratio for Tiger Salamander habitat.

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Ms. Cedarblade said that she would like to see a minimum 300-foot agricultural buffer. She also requested that the definition of ag exempt (as it relates to building permits) be included in the General Plan due to her past experience. Ms. Cedarblade clarified her earlier comments regarding biofuels and biomass. She also commented on Action CO-A2, which would establish permanent areas of agriculture and open space between cities and unincorporated towns to ensure the continued distinctiveness of each community. She said that the Draft General Plan needs to define open space. In addition, she spoke of an item that had been struck from the current document regarding agricultural lands in Yolo County. She said that Yolo County has one of the highest densities of nesting Swainson’s Hawks in

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

Public Hearing, Revised Draft General Plan and DEIR

June 10, 2009

Page 17 of 24

California and she would like to see their protection kept in the Draft General Plan because it is part of what makes Yolo County special. She also addressed Policy CO-2.15 (from the January version of the General Plan), regarding minimizing the loss and supporting the restoration of suitable habitat for rare and threatened endangered species. This had also been struck from the current document. She requested that they reinstate the deleted policy, because it was well written and strengthens Yolo County's commitment to Swainson's hawk preservation. In addition, she requested that they correct the name of her ranch by replacing the language "farm" with "ranch." Ms. Cedarblade said that Action CO-A97, which would require service hook-up for all water users within a community when new domestic water services are made available, could be detrimental to farmers that rely on ag wells for their fields or houses. She added that the Draft General Plan needs to allow exemptions to this policy. She also indicated that she would like to see habitat areas included in Action CO-A106.

Chair Kimball encouraged Ms. Cedarblade to submit further comments in writing because Ms. Cedarblade was using the page numbers from the January 2009 Revised Version of the General Plan, rather than the recently released copy, and the references were unclear.

Ms. Samitz commented on the process and said that she just heard several significant comments, and there is a huge problem when the public can't really articulate what the important issues are because of the discrepancy between the two documents. She stated that she isn't sure what happened, but it has been badly handled, and she wishes that the commission would reconsider an extension because of the importance of this issue. She said that there should have been a better way of cross-referencing, and that her issue is the process. She agreed with Ms. Cedarblade's comments.

Chair Kimball clarified the process of where and when comments would be received, along with the timelines to receive comments.

Commissioner Reed followed up to clarify that some of the comments that are being offered by the public concern decisions that have already been made by the Board of Supervisors.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Reed restated his support for a change in Policy CO-2.regarding the buffer requirement.

Commissioner Bertolero said that of all the documents that they had to go through, the DEIR was the most important. Since they had already gone through the prior versions of the Draft General Plan, he had focused on the underlined recommendations by staff, and did not see any problem with the changes.

Chair Kimball agreed with Commissioner Bertolero and with the change to the wording for the buffer requirements in regards to the riparian area.

Commission Action

That the Planning Commission recommend approval of Chapter 7, Conservation and Open Space, with the changes recommended by staff; and

Policy CO-2.22 Include a new second sentence: "A larger buffer is preferred."

Policy CO-2.38 Change "implementation" to "development of approved projects."

MOTION: Reed SECOND: Bertolero
AYES: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, and Williams
NOES: None

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

Public Hearing, Revised Draft General Plan and DEIR

June 10, 2009

Page 18 of 24

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Burton and Winters

**CHAPTER 8
HEALTH AND SAFETY**

Ms. Tschudin pointed out that the odd numbered pages are incorrectly shown with HO coding and they will be corrected to HS coding. Staff answered questions from the commission.

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Ms. Cedarblade addressed the commission regarding previous comments on the policy numbers. She discussed the confusion between the different versions of the Draft General Plan and expressed her displeasure at the process. She said that it was a violation of her Brown Act rights. She explained that she has an event that will prevent her from having time to type out her comments; therefore, she felt that she should be granted extended time beyond the three minutes granted to each speaker.

Ms. Tschudin explained the timelines for the DEIR and the Draft General Plan and clarified that everyone has until June 12 to comment on the DEIR, but until, at least, July 20, 2009, to comment on the Draft General Plan.

There was a discussion regarding the different versions of the Draft General Plan that had been posted and/or released, as well as the confusion between them. Ms. Tschudin offered to sit down with any member of the public and go over the documents with them.

Chair Kimball again recommended that any member of the public that would like to provide comments for the Draft General Plan could do so directly with staff.

There was further discussion of the three-minute limit allotted to members of the public for addressing the commission on each chapter.

Ms. Cedarblade again stated that there was a violation of her Brown Act rights. She went on to say that she was going to turn her complaint over to the authorities, because she should have three minutes to comment just like everybody else.

In an effort to move forward, Chair Kimball provided Ms. Cedarblade with an additional three minutes.

Ms. Cedarblade informed the commission that there was not a policy in Chapter 8 to fix existing levees, with a preference to wide setback levees. To provide 100-year flood protection for Cache Creek, the existing levees need to be fixed. The Draft General Plan should include a policy to that effect. In regards to Action HS-A 20, she felt that it was great, but they also need a policy to encourage raising the existing levees. If the existing levees along Cache Creek between County Road 102 and Highway 113 were to be raised three to seven feet, they will have sufficient freeboard to meet the 100-year level of protection set by the Army Corp of Engineers through the FEMA process for the City of Woodland. In addition, Ms. Cedarblade stated that she had submitted a letter of comment that had not been included in the commission's packet, although it seemed that everybody else's document had been provided to the commission. She felt that she was being singled out in her exclusion from the public process.

Ms. Cedarblade continued her comment on the Health and Safety Chapter, specifically concerning Actions HS-A33 and HS-A35. She said that if industrial uses such as the Agri-Form facility are going to be placed in an agricultural area, the Draft General Plan needs to include a policy to require emergency

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

Public Hearing, Revised Draft General Plan and DEIR

June 10, 2009

Page 19 of 24

response plans for heavy industrial users with hazardous materials. This is especially true when dealing with chemicals that have the ability to cause problems for nearby populated areas. She said that FEMA informed her that such companies must provide her with an evacuation plan, due to the horses and the people that she has at her public events.

Ms. Samitz commented on the problems with the process of the Draft General Plan hearing. She also commented on flood issues, AB 70 flood liability, its correlation with the Covell site, and the need not to build within a flood plain.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bertolero said that there seemed to be some confusion as Ms. Cedarblade seemed to be referring to the DEIR and at the moment they were speaking on the Draft General Plan. Other than that, he said that he did not have anything additional regarding the chapter.

Commissioner Reed had no comment on the chapter, and thanked Ms. Tschudin for taking the time to respond to public concerns and comments on the documents and process.

Commissioner Williams had no further comment.

Commissioner Merwin also thanked staff and the consultants for doing their best and guiding them safely through the documents. He commented on the numerous documents, and said that it is a complicated and confusing process, no two ways about it. He said that they are not reading and digesting the entire document again, but rather reading the changes that were made since the last time they went over the entire document. He said that he is uncomfortable when people feel like they aren't being heard. However, when a person has been repeating the same thing over and over again since the start of the process, they can only be accommodated to a certain extent without disrupting the process. He said that he is sorry that people are upset, but at some point, everyone has to move on. He added that he is comfortable with the Health and Safety chapter.

Chair Kimball agreed that she is comfortable with the session, and reiterated that in the past, she has found public testimony valuable in her experience, but has found it even more valuable to submit comments in writing or to work one-on-one with staff.

Commissioner Reed added that sometimes it is difficult for people when their recommendation is not followed. He has offered a lot of comments that decision-making bodies have chosen not to follow, and he has also had to accept that and move on.

Commission Action

That the Planning Commission recommend approval of Chapter 8, Health and Safety, as presented by staff.

MOTION: Reed SECOND: Bertolero
AYES: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, and Williams
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Burton and Winters

CHAPTER 9
HOUSING ELEMENT

Ms. Tschudin answered questions from the commission including an inquiry regarding a countywide groundwater ordinance. Staff responded that County Counsel's office is working on this item.

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

Mr. Smith said that he is confused by the General Plan process. He said that he came here today thinking that the commission was going to take action on the Draft EIR.

The commission explained that they intend to do that immediately after review of the changes in the Draft General Plan.

There was further discussion on the DEIR comment period and the Draft General Plan comment process.

Ms. Samitz agreed with Mr. Smith's comments and concerns. She said that this is nothing like the process in Davis. She added that she did not have time previously to respond to a comment made earlier by one of the commissioners regarding the coordination of mixed uses at the Covell site with the adjoining Hunt-Wesson property. She said that such an action would clearly go against a policy made by the Davis Housing Element Steering Committee. The Davis policy keeps development of the two parcels separate, because one is subject to Measure J and the other is not. Combining the two properties would compromise the planning of each individual property. She said that none of the discussion on this subject was valid, as she didn't have a chance to make that point before the commission voted. Therefore, the commission's policy recommendation should be reversed.

There was clarification from the commission about their decision.

Erich Linse explained to the commission that the process is difficult, but that the next time they go through a General Plan, it will probably be easier for them. He also commented on the need to prove water availability before growth in Dunnigan is allowed. Mr. Linse said that many people were comfortable with the idea of using municipal and industrial water from the canal, but the action earlier this year to limit users to only a 5% allocation requires another look at its viability as a water source. He believes that a grant has been applied for by Dunnigan Water District to drill wells and develop better knowledge regarding the extent of local aquifers. He said that a well was drilled this spring at County Road 6 and County Road 88. It was about 1,000 or 1,100 feet deep, but not very productive. That is why one of the water experts in Dunnignina has been very concerned about proposed growth from the beginning. Comments have been submitted requesting that water availability be re-evaluated.

Chair Kimball closed the public hearing.

Ms. Tschudin took a moment to address some of the earlier comments from the public regarding the General Plan process and timelines for submitting comments.

Mr. Morrison added his thoughts and comments to Ms. Tschudin's explanation, and reiterated it was appropriate to move forward with the process.

There were no further comments from the commission.

Commission Action

That the Planning Commission recommend approval of Chapter 9, Housing Element, as presented by

staff with the following change to page HO-49 (3rd bullet under i) – clarify “distance requirements”.

MOTION: Reed SECOND: Merwin
AYES: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, and Williams
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Burton and Winters

b. Summary of the Draft Environmental Impact Report

Ms. Tschudin provided information on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and answered clarifying questions from the commission.

Commissioner Bertolero had some minor editing changes that he will provide in writing to Ms. Tschudin at a later date.

A short recess was called.

The commission reconvened, and discussion continued on the DEIR. There was discussion that the jobs/housing numbers do not reflect self-employment. There was also discussion of water meters. Staff indicated that use of meters will be up to the water provider. In addition, there was discussion of the preference for urban areas to be on surface water and for rural areas to be on groundwater.

The commission directed staff, when translating Mitigation Measure UTIL-2b into the policies, clarify that the intent is not to supplement groundwater, but rather to replace it with water obtained from other sources. In addition, the intent of the commission is to allow for more efficient use of water, and to transition municipal services from ground water use to surface water.

Chair Kimball opened the public hearing.

No one from the public came forward. . Chair Kimball closed the hearing.

Commissioner Bertolero made a motion to approve the Draft Environmental Impact Report with the changes discussed, and accepted by the commission today, including the rejection of Mitigation Measure NOI-2 as duplicative of policies and actions already in the Draft General Plan, and rejecting the alternative General Plan scenarios in the Draft EIR.

Commission Action

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend the following actions to the Board of Supervisors:

1. **RECOMMEND** certification of the Draft Environmental Impact Report including rejection of Mitigation Measure NOI-2 as duplicative of policies and actions already in the Draft General Plan, rejection of the alternative General Plan scenarios analyzed in the DEIR, and the following clarification to Mitigation Measure UTIL-2b and related policies CC-3.7E, CC-3.9H, CO-5.31: add “as an alternative source of water.” to the end of each sentence.

MOTION: Bertolero SECOND: Reed

AYES: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, and Williams
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Burton and Winters

Commission Action

RECOMMEND adoption of the Final Draft General Plan (dated June 10, 2009) including:

- a) revision to Figure LU-1 and elsewhere throughout the General Plan to include appropriate references to the Covell Specific Plan;
- b) revision to Figure LU-7 and elsewhere throughout the General Plan to include appropriate references to the added residential component of the Elkhorn Specific Plan area;
- c) corrections to tables and text to reflect final land use acreages and other final numbers; and
- d) any other modifications directed by the Planning Commission as documented in earlier actions in these minutes.

MOTION: Reed SECOND: Bertolero
AYES: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, and Williams
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Burton and Winters

Commission Action

DIRECT staff to transmit the Planning Commission's actions in writing to the Board of Supervisors pursuant to state law.

MOTION: Merwin SECOND: Williams
AYES: Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, and Williams
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Burton and Winters

Commissioner Bertolero commended the Draft General Plan team on their work

REGULAR AGENDA

- 7. DISCUSSION ITEMS
- 7.1 None

8. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A report by the Assistant Director on the recent Board of Supervisor's meetings on items relevant to the Planning Commission and an update of the Planning and Public Works Department activities for the month. No discussion by other commission members will occur except for clarifying questions. The

commission or an individual commissioner can request that an item be placed on a future agenda for discussion.

David Morrison brought the commission up to date on the following:

8.1 Mr. Morrison had nothing to report.

9. COMMISSION REPORTS

Reports by commission members on information they have received and meetings they have attended which would be of interest to the commission or the public. No discussion by other commission members will occur except for clarifying questions.

- 9.1 Commissioner Bertolero brought the commission up to date on the progress of the Ad Hoc subcommittee. In addition, he attended two Esparto Advisory meetings, a Capay Valley, a Madison, and a Dunnigan Advisory committee meeting. He plans to attend the Knights Landing Advisory meeting. He also spoke to Clark Pacific regarding their proposed General Plan change.
- 9.2 Commissioner Reed reported that he met with a representative of the Clark Pacific company regarding the change they had discussed earlier.
- 9.3 Commissioner Merwin stated that he attended the Yolo County Farm Bureau meeting ,and spoke with Don Clark, in addition to receiving an email from him. He also attended the Ad Hoc subcommittee meeting in May.
- 9.4 Commissioner Williams reported that he has attended several of the advisory committee meetings including Knights Landing, Dunnigan, and Yolo-Zamora. He also attended a Dunnigan Water Board meeting, and a TANC meeting.
- 9.5 Chair Kimball reported that she also received a call yesterday from Jay Ziegler representing Clark Pacific and spoke to him about the changes. She updated the commission on the Yolo Ag Alliance progress and thanked Mr. Pogledich for his work with that group.

Mr. Morrison thanked the commission for all of their hard work.

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

The opportunity for commission members to request that an item be placed on a future agenda for discussion. No discussion by other commission members will occur except for clarifying questions.

- 1. Use Permit request from University Retirement Community in Davis.
- 2. Knaggs Family lot line adjustment.
- 3. Draft Ordinance on ag conversion to habitat.

4. Draft Ordinance on transmission lines.
5. Presentation about Farm Credit Financing, and how it related to property division.
6. Wind Energy Ordinance.
7. Sign Ordinance.
8. Parking Ordinance.

11. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission was adjourned at 3:43 p.m. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is July 9, 2009, in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers.

Any person who is dissatisfied with the decisions of this Planning Commission may appeal to the Board of Supervisors by filing with the Clerk of the Board within fifteen days from the date of the action. A written notice of appeal specifying the grounds and an appeal fee immediately payable to the Clerk of the Board must be submitted at the time of filing. The Board of Supervisors may sustain, modify, or overrule this decision.

Respectfully submitted by,

David Morrison, Assistant Director
Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department