

Adjourn

Unapproved Minutes
Dunnigan Advisory Committee
Wednesday, November 18, 2009

Country Fair Estates
5130 County Road 99W
Dunnigan, Ca

Call to order: 7:06 pm by Chairman Weber

ATTENDANCE

- 14 members in attendance, quorum present
- 3 members absent, Karene Harris, Erich Linse, Willard Ingraham
- 4 county representatives were present at this meeting
- 10 residents and guests
- Total in attendance 28 members, guests and county representatives

MINUTES

Chairman Weber called for the approval of the minutes of Oct. 21; he asked if there were any corrections or additions to the minutes. None were noted and he called for the motion to approve the minutes as written.

Corrections:

Two small errors were brought to the secretary's attention after the meeting was adjourned. Spelling error; word barrier and a word inserted incorrectly; remove the word "to". Both corrections are noted but were not brought to the floor during the approval of the minutes. Both corrections were in the review of the Standing Rules section of the minutes of Oct. 21.

Motion by M. Smith to adopt minutes, Second by W. Gullatt

Vote: Yes 12; No 0; Abstain 1 (1 member absent from 10/21 meeting). Only 13 members were present for the approval of the minutes. One member entered late.

CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Weber announced

- Notice referencing a negative dec mitigation to protect the Garter Snakes. Chairman Weber explained the notice.
- Workshop scheduled for February 2010; Yolo Land Trust and Yolo County Resource Conservation District concepts regarding conservation easements, there will be some mitigation for offsetting land.

No further Correspondence noted; Correspondence closed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairman Weber opened Public Comments.

- W. Gullatt referenced Planning Commission workshop, very informative, left feeling very comfortable with the commissioners, they had good points.
- Encouraged members to attend meetings; get involved, stay active. It will take all of us to have an impact and make a difference. Need to keep our eyes on what is taking place.
- Chairman Weber indicated there was good representation at the meeting.

Chairman Weber called for additional Public Comments; none were brought to the floor, Public Comments Closed.

PRESENTATION

Chairman Weber introduced Regina Espinoza from Yolo County to give us some information on Community Service Areas and Districts.

- Chairman Weber referenced the CSA for lighting in the Hardwoods subdivision and stated there is indication it can be expanded.
- Ms. Espinoza provided informational handouts referencing “What a County Service Area” is, why it’s formed and the type of services it covers. .CSA are managed by the county
- Dunnigan has two CSA associated with the Hardwood Subdivision, CSA 3 which is considered a Road Maintenance District and CSA 11 for lighting.
- Maps provided to indicate the areas covered by the CSA 3 Road Maintenance, not all areas of the Hardwoods is included in this district.
- The purpose of a CSA formation is to allow small communities in the unincorporated areas of the county to pay for and receive specific services from the county. Formation is a LAFCO process
- Funding mechanism is through property tax assessments of the property in the designated service area. She referenced a legal Prop 218 election which allows the fees to be charged at a rate needed to provided the services or a special tax election that requires a 2/3 vote to set fees. A CSA charge continues until services end.
- CSA 3 has been in existence since 1972, CSA 11 since 1981
- Reference to the maps which indicate the districts and what portion is included. The blue section on the map indicates the lighting district, referenced as Dunnigan CSA. Red hash marks depict the road maintenance district.
- Resident choice to participate in road maintenance district at the time it was formed. Not all residents wish to participate.
- B. Langfield questioned the meaning of road maintenance, what is done to maintain the roads. Ms. Espinoza indicated it is up to the district and the type of service they want. She indicated there was \$16,000 in the Road maintenance fund at present.
- B. Stucker question the philosophy of who would receive repairs and who wouldn’t based on the map presented if some people paid and other didn’t.
- Question on process to included everyone in the district, would require a Prop 218 election. Election would be funded by the requesting parties. Cost would go to the CSA
- Special Tax election could also be a method to accomplish expanding the CSA to include the entire area in question.
- CSA 11, Lighting district has its own funds, which can only be used for this CSA and has a governing advisory committee in place.
- Road maintenance funds are strictly for road maintenance. Question as to why the funds have not been used to do some repairs, i.e. potholes.
- D. Rust indicated the county can not spend the road maintenance funds, a contractor would have to be hired to fill potholes.
- At present there is no governing board for the road maintenance district
- Chairman Weber questioned who would be included in an election and how would the zone be expanded? Ms. Espinoza responded a Prop 218 election would have to be held for the affected area desiring services, the vote is in protest, would be looking for 50%+1.
- Chairman Weber question how the territory covered would be expanded referencing the new development to the south. Ms. Espinoza responded in order to expand the boundary, the board or a certain percentage of the voters within the current CSA would have to act on this, it would trigger a LAFCO procedure.
- B. Stucker suggested we put together a sub committee to start the mechanism to investigate the expansion of the CSA.
- Two methods to request expansion: Board of Supervisors Resolution to LAFCO or people within the area to be affected would draft a letter to the Board of Supervisors requesting the expansion, which in turn would trigger the resolution by the Board to LAFCO.

- V. Lovell questioned the county's access to the lighting funds and the disappearance of funds in the past.
- Commissioner Williams indicated there was a movement at one time to place the church maintenance within the lighting district, but did not take place. He also commented on the confusion at that time referencing PG&E. PG&E would not provide an accounting of the number of lights. Ms. Espinoza indicated there was confusion referencing the number of lights that were turned on.
- Chairman Weber questioned the use of two CSA's. Ms. Espinoza indicated this typically does not happen based on the LAFCO goal to keep everything efficient and conducive to local government. Two CSA competing is not good; one is preferred with a directing advisory committee.

Chairman Weber thanked Regina for her presentation and the information she provided.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Standing Rules: Chairman Weber referenced the draft handout of the Standing Rules. He indicated this was not moved forward as an action item as we were not prepared to present a document which has been viewed and approved by all committee members. We now have a draft this evening which is open for discussion.

- Secretary Kirkland read the document a section at a time and asked for changes to each section. Noted changes were entered on the draft document to be added, deleted or rewritten and represented at the January meeting for final approval.
- Article I approved as presented
- Article II has suggested changes: section on Number of Members, add section on Special Meetings, corrections to Attendance section.
- Article III addition to Applicant Presentation, question on time limit, 5 minutes not sufficient; add Chairman's discretion.
- Article IV no changes
- Article V no changes, discussion on subject of new applicants requesting appointment having to attend two meetings prior to accepting application. Comment indicated it was good to come and listen to determine if you want to make the commitment. Remainder of section good after discussion.
- Article VI question on this section whether to remove entirely or reword.
M. Smith indicated it was very definite the Standing Rules were the opportunity for the advisory committees to govern themselves. All information included in the Standing Rules is in addition to the By Laws. Considerable discussion continued on this section. Final decision on this section to be made in January after suggestions on rewording this section, for now it will be stricken.
- Article VII no changes, accepted as written
- Commissioner Bertolero indicated we should add a statement at the end indicating Standing Rules can be changed at any time after being announced as an agenda item.
- New document to be presented at January meeting. If members have suggestions, contact the Secretary prior to the January meeting. This will be placed on our January agenda as an action item.

DUNNIGAN SPECIFIC PLAN

Chairman Weber recognized Don Rust.

- D. Rust provided information handouts which referenced SACOG comparisons on current population, population projections, ethnicity, age distribution, employment, household size, a chart depicting existing land use patterns within Yolo County, explanation of principles and Tables LU5, 8, 9 and 11 which is the community planning guidelines for General Plan designations.
- Also had copies of the Staff Report on the Specific Plan for members who did not come to the Planning Commission meeting.
- D. Rust indicated he did not discuss the Planning Commission workshop at the Oct. meeting as he was not sure it was going to take place.
- On November 10 the Board of Supervisors adopted the 2030 General Plan. He indicated there was a 90 day window for legal challenges; this will continue until February 2010.

- Planning Commission workshop was held for the purpose of getting input from the Planning Commission and the public with regards to land use plan that had been presented from the applicant through the pre-application process to the staff. Importance is that it helps makes determination for patterns to be included in the plan. No specific information is available at this time.
- An official formal application has not been presented as yet, all information, including the map which is a conceptual drawing, was part of the pre-application process.
- The formal application will include technical studies, regarding traffic, economics, water/sewer, biological and other studies that will be used to help with the plan. No changes since the last meeting.
- D. Rust indicated the number one issue at present is water, no water, no project. SB 610 is the guideline that obligates the county staff, over 500 homes or equivalent industrial/commercial has requirements which mandate a water assessment study be completed and the water required must be there.
- Continues to stress connectivity to the Hardwood subdivision to tie whole community together. He feels the applicant is coming to the realization that this is important.
- Chairman Weber asked if it would be feasible to have a workshop in Dunnigan with authors of the Specific Plan prior to the application. D. Rust indicated it was possible. When the EIR document begins there will be scoping meetings.
- M. Smith questioned policy C13.2 referencing Level of Service E, when was it added to the General Plan. D. Rust indicated he would check on this.
- Secretary Kirkland, referenced the people directly involved with the Specific Plan for Dunnigan, Don Rust and Heidi Tschudin, Project Manager, she indicated in her opinion it was very important that everyone involved with the Specific Plan needs to know Dunnigan and is totally aware of the boundaries and where the different types of development and or amenities are going to be placed.
- Point in question was a rail spur; D. Rust indicated it was a spur that would go into the industrial area, going west from 99W at Road 8. Discussion on the light industrial areas of the map. Secretary Kirkland indicated Ms. Tschudin's comment was confusing.
- Chairman Weber questioned how the project grew to 9000 homes. He indicated the supervisors and General Plan only allowed for 7500 homes which included all existing residences and would like to challenge that number.
- D. Rust indicated 7500 homes were new homes and the additional numbers were the existing homes and other not previously accounted for. This was approved by the Board of Supervisors.
- B. Stucker questioned if bonus densities were going to be allowed if the developers due more than they would normally due. D. Rust indicated bonus densities are allowed.
- V. Lovell stated David Morrison came here knowing how the community is, knowing we're basically low income and poor out here, were losing people as it is. And here he comes wanting to put all this development out here, we don't have the water, we don't have the infrastructure, what is this guy thinking, what is the Board of Supervisors thinking. I don't understand all this, are we going to be another West Sac with all the foreclosures and crime. I just don't understand it.
- D. Rust stated the general plan process has taken seven years, started in 2002, all of this has been available for this seven years; the General Plan process is over. Currently the zoning in Dunnigan is SP, meaning the Specific Plan. Whether anything comes of this is up to applications and private developers, it has nothing to do with David Morrison, he reports to the Board.
- V. Lovell questioned the poverty level here in Dunnigan and reference the number of low income residents in the area. D. Rust answered by stating David Morrison or the Board is not sticking anything here. The only action they have taken is to make available the area for development to occur. The Specific Plan is a whole other process, at best it could take eighteen months at worst it could take 5 – 10 years.
- V. Lovell questioned who to talk with about this. D. Rust referenced K. Fichtner.
- Chairman Weber indicated he wants to be involved in what is in front of us.
- D. Rust stated we need to be involved in the process, show up and state your concerns.
- Secretary Kirkland referenced the numerous times we have voiced our concerns both verbally and in writing and nothing has been listened to.

- D. Rust stated he totally understood our concerns; this is going to be a long process. He indicated he would do his best to keep us informed.
- Chairman Weber indicated the desire to have a workshop prior to the application being presented.
- D. Rust referenced the teamwork which is important to make this all work.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Community Clean Up

- V. Lovell referenced the Waste Management dump trucks dropping debris on 99W. If noticed please contact Vaughnette or Waste Management.
- Comment made about cats being run over by the dump trucks.
- Lots of empty homes, people losing homes, if you see anyone leaving animals behind, contact Vaughnette or the SPCA.
- Suggestion to send a letter to Waste Management putting them on notice.
- V. Lovell stated she had not personally witnessed this happening and would like to have more information prior to contacting them.

PLANNING COMMISSIONER UPDATE

Chairman Weber recognized the commissioners present this evening.

- **Commissioner Williams:** Planning Commission first suggestions after viewing what the Specific Plan would be like had concern about the 7000-9000 residences at build out and suggested not moving forward until a water source is identified.
- **Commissioner Bertolero:** Thank the committee members who attended the Planning Commission workshop and the work the committee did on the General Plan.

Chairman Weber thanked the commissioners for being at our meetings. He also complimented them for representing the comments we make to the people involved in the process.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Action Item – Standing Rule
- Committee Business - Election of Officers
- Ad Hoc Sub Committee on Specific Plan process
- David Morrison recap General Plan
- Yolo Land Trust Workshop February 17, 6-7:15pm
- Keith Fichtner, Water/Flood for new development – Presentation Item

Being no further business, Chairman Weber asked for a motion to adjourn.

Motion by: N. Busch, **Seconded by:** G. Bickford; **all in favor.**

Meeting Adjourned: 9:15 pm

Respectfully Submitted
Deanna Kirkland, Secretary
Dunnigan Advisory Committee