

MINUTES

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 24, 1995

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Pollock called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lea, Pollock, Walker, Gray, Webster and Lang

MEMBERS ABSENT: Heringer

STAFF PRESENT: Stephen L. Jenkins, Director  
Paul Kramer, County Counsel  
Heidi Tschudin, Contract Planner  
David Flores, Senior Planner  
Linda Caruso, Commission Secretary

2. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

**Commission Action:**

The Minutes of the May 10, 1995, Planning Commission Meeting were approved with corrections to page 3, paragraph 7, should read Ray Krone, and on page 4, in paragraphs 5 and 12, the addition of the words County and Davis General Plan, and on page 5, paragraph 3, should read 4/10 of an acre...

MOTION: Walker SECOND: Lang  
AYES: Lea, Pollock, Walker, Webster and Lang  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Heringer  
ABSTAIN: Gray

◆ ◆ ◆

## 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 Chairman. The Planning Commission reserves the right to impose a reasonable limit on time afforded to any individual speaker.

No one came forward to address the Commission.



## 4. CORRESPONDENCE

Chair Pollock acknowledged receipt of the items of correspondence received in the packet and at the beginning of the meeting.

Director Jenkins discussed the letter from the City of Woodland regarding the Notice of Preparation for Woodland General Plan Update and advised the Commission that the deadline for written comments would be June 15, 1995 at 5:00 p.m.



## 5. CONSENT AGENDA

Items on the Consent Agenda are believed by staff to be non-controversial and consistent with the Commission's previous instructions to staff. All items on the Consent Agenda may be adopted by a single motion. If any commissioner or member of the public questions an item, it should be removed from the Consent Agenda and be placed in the Regular Agenda.

- 5.1 95-032 - A request for an extension of time for an existing Use Permit (ZF 4125) for a cardlock fueling facility. Property is located at 597 North East Street (near I-5) near Woodland in a M-1 (Light Industrial) zone. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared for this item. Applicant: Ramos Oil/Lee Humes. (L. Srinivas)

### Commission Action:

1. **CERTIFIED** a Class 1 Categorical Exemption as the appropriate level of environmental review for this project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines (CEQA); and
2. **ADOPTED** the Findings as presented in the staff report.
3. **APPROVED** the Extension of the Conditional Use Permit and Variance (ZF-4125), subject to the proposed Conditions of Approval.

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. The extension of the original Use Permit and Variance (ZF#4125) shall be granted for a period of two years and the extension shall expire on October 6, 1996 unless renewed.
2. All the conditions of approval (listed as Conditions of Approval #3 to 13 in this report) for the original Use Permit and Variance (ZF#4125) shall be continued and complied with. Failure to comply with the conditions of approval for ZF#4125 shall result in the revoking of the extension, legal action and/or non-issuance of future building permits.
3. The applicant shall obtain permit approval from the Yolo County Environmental Health Department, the Woodland Fire District, Yolo County Building Department and the Yolo-Solano Air Pollution Control District prior to construction of below and above ground fuel facilities.
4. Applicant/owner shall sign an agreement with the Yolo County Public Works Department to pay for future street improvements (pavement, curb, and gutter) when adjacent properties are required to do the same.
5. Applicant shall contact Underground Service Alert (USA) prior to movement of dirt on-site for location of underground utilities.
6. On-site fire hydrants will be required for the facility with appropriate main sizes to meet the fire flow requirements for the fueling and storage facility. Applicant is to contact the Woodland Fire District as to this requirement.
7. All storage and dispensing operations will be stipulated as required under Article 79 of the 1991 Uniform Fire Code. Future storage of and dispensing of LPG will fall under Article 82.
8. A minimum eight (8') foot wide landscape planter will be installed behind the railroad tracks parallel to East Street.
9. A landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Yolo County Community Development Agency for conformance with the State Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.
10. The property owner must agree in a written and recorded agreement with the City of Woodland, binding successors, heirs, and assigns, to annex the property to the City when so required in accordance with the Yolo County Woodland Area General Plan.
11. The sign variance is approved for the height requirement of 40 feet to 45 feet, and face area of the sign from 200 square feet to 240 square feet. A signboard indicating prices and services shall remain the same as indicated in the Yolo County Code. This sign shall extend no more than seven (7') feet above the surface of the ground, and the sign shall not exceed a face area of twenty (20') feet.
12. The approach of the access road onto East Street (Highway 113) shall be upgraded to CALTRANS commercial road approach standards, with a 50 foot radii and a 10 foot wide

paved shoulder at least 100 feet long to the north of the driveway. The pavement widening should be designed for high truck volumes. The wide shoulder will allow for vehicle storage waiting to turn right from the Highway while a train is passing through the area, without blocking a through lane. Applicant shall contact Caltrans representative Ken Champion for the necessary encroachment permit for work conducted within State right of way.

13. The applicant shall contact Southern Pacific in reviewing the anticipated increased truck and vehicle volumes to this site as related to the safety features of the at-grade railroad crossing. The applicant shall provide a statement to the Community Development Agency affirming any improvements that Southern Pacific may require.

## **FINDINGS**

(A summary of the evidence to support each FINDING is shown in italics)

In accordance with Section 8-2.3205, Article 32 of Title 8, the Planning Commission has determined the following:

- (a) The circumstances under which the original Use Permit and Variance were granted have not changed;

*The applicant has agreed to the continuation of all the conditions of approval for the original Use Permit and Variance and therefore, the circumstances under which the original Use Permit and Variance were granted have not changed. Since the original Use Permit and Variance expired on October 6, 1994, the extension is being requested to confirm the continued validity of the Use Permit and Variance while the sale of the property is being negotiated.*

- (b) Such extensions shall be approved for no more than two (2) years.

*Condition of Approval #1 grants the extension of the original Use Permit and Variance (ZF#4125) for a period of two years (until October 6, 1996). The extension is to expire after two years (on October 6, 1996) unless renewed.*

◆ ◆ ◆

## 6. REGULAR AGENDA

- 6.1 ZF4142 - A request for an Agricultural Preserve Split to create separate 162.1 acre and 101.58 acre Williamson Act Contracts. Creation of this separate Agricultural Preserve Contract will be consistent with the ownership of the legal parcels and farming boundaries. Property is located on CR 29 and CR 101A near Davis. A Negative Declaration has been prepared. Applicant: Andrew Johas (D. Flores)

The Staff Report was given by David Flores.

Commissioners Pollock and Lea questioned why there was a request for a road dedication of 12 feet along County Road 29 by the Public Works Department.

Commissioner Gray also had concerns that he would not be able to support this condition unless there was a clear nexus between the particular issue and the right-of-way.

Public Hearing was opened at this time.

No one came forward to address the Commission.

The Public Hearing was closed.

Tom Tracy, Assistant Director of Public Works, addressed the road dedication issue, saying that Public Works does have plans to widen County Road 29, which is designated as an arterial road, but he also agreed that he could not see a reason for the dedication since the Agricultural Preserve Split would be so far away from County Road 29.

**Commission Action:**

1. **CERTIFIED** that the attached Negative Declaration is the appropriate level of environmental review for this project.
2. **ADOPTED** the proposed FINDINGS for this project as presented in the staff report;
3. **APPROVED** a request to divide two existing Williamson Act Land Use Contracts into one, 162.1 acre contract and one, 101.58 acre contract, subject to the conditions listed under "CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL".

MOTION: Walker SECOND: Lea  
AYES: Gray, Lea, Pollock, Walker, Webster, and Lang  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Heringer  
ABSTAIN: None

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

### **Community Development Agency:**

1. Within sixty (60) days of the approval of the recommended action, the applicant shall submit, for review and approval to the Community Development Agency, the revised agricultural preserve legal descriptions to be incorporated into the revised Land Use Contracts for the subject properties.
2. After approval of the legal descriptions by the Community Development Agency, the applicant shall transmit the above information to the Yolo County Counsel's Office and shall execute two (2) new contracts as reflected in this report.
3. Further parcelization of either parcel shall be prohibited prior to either parcel/contract exiting from the Williamson Act.

### **Yolo County Public Works Department:**

- ~~4. The applicant shall dedicate an additional 12 feet along County Road 29 for a total of 42 feet from the section line.~~

Failure to comply with the **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL** as approved by the Planning Commission may result in the following:

- \* **legal action;**
- \* **non-issuance of future building permits.**

## **FINDINGS**

*(A summary of the evidence to support each FINDING is shown in italics.)*

In accordance with Section 8-2.408. of Article 4 of Title 8 and provisions of the Blue Ribbon Ordinance No.1157, the Planning Commission finds:

- (1) That the parcels created are consistent with the zone by preserving the agricultural use from the encroachment of nonagricultural uses;

*The proposed split is consistent with the minimum acreage requirement as established in the Blue Ribbon Ordinance No.1157.*

*The applicants have indicated their intent to continue farming the parcels (currently in row crop). This statement and the fact that surrounding lands are currently under contract, prevents the encroachment of nonagricultural uses other than the possibility of construction of one (1) single family home within the Williamson Act contracted parcel which is currently allowed under the zoning code.*

- (2) That the parcels tend to maintain the agricultural economy;

*The applicant has stated that they intend to continue farming the parcels, which are in row crop production. This statement, and the fact that surrounding lands are currently under contract, supports the finding that the parcels tend to maintain the agricultural economy.*

- (3) That the parcels tend to assist in the preservation of prime agricultural lands;

*The proposed split will continue the preservation of agricultural lands as classified by the Soil Survey of Yolo County by continuing the row crop production on the 162 acre Williamson Act Contract.*

- (4) That the parcels preserve lands with public value as open space;

*The subject property is being utilized for open space and agricultural purposes. The possibility of allowing one (1) single-family homesite within a single Williamson Act Contract, is currently allowed under Title 8 of the Yolo County Code, and will not significantly degrade the public value of open space of the subject property.*

- (5) That the proposed use is consistent with the General Plan;

*The applicant has stated that he intends to continue farming the parcels. This statement, and the fact that surrounding lands are currently under contract, supports the finding that the proposed split is consistent with the preservation of agriculture as mandated by the Yolo County General Plan.*

- (6) That the proposed contracts in question were created in conformity with and complies with all the requirements of the Subdivision Map Act of the State.

*The Community Development Agency staff and the Yolo County Public Works and Transportation Department have reviewed the application for conformance with the Subdivision Map Act.*

- (7) That the two parcels are at least 80 acres in size of irrigated land.

*Assessor's Parcel No. 41-090-07,08 & 09 are currently irrigated. Water is available to the property by the means of wells, and from the Yolo County Flood Control District. The Williamson Act Contracts to be created will be 162 acres and 101 acres respectively.*



- 6.2 ZF4133 - A request for an Agricultural Preserve Split of an existing 1,675 acre property into four separately owned Agricultural Preserve Contracts which will be consistent with the ownership of the legal parcels and farming boundaries. In addition, a request for a Lot Line Adjustment to the Ahlstrom property and property owned by the St. Joseph Catholic Church. Property is located on South River Road, west of the Freeport Bridge in Clarksburg in an

A-P (Agricultural Preserve) zone. A Negative Declaration has been prepared. Applicant: Gus Ahlstrom (D. Flores)

The Staff Report was given by David Flores.

Commissioner Walker asked if there would be any severance of riparian rights, assuming they exist, to the Sacramento River. It was answered no by David Flores. Director Jenkins stated the reason it was configured this way was so that all the property owners would have access to River Road.

Director Jenkins also stated that the Kirtlan parcels, which will be non-conforming, will be restricted from issuance of any new County permits until such time that a new Williamson Act is executed.

Commissioner Pollock asked if all the parcels were separate, legal parcels when the Federal Land Bank closed escrow. It was answered yes by David Flores.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Gus Ahlstrom, the applicant, said that this project has taken three years and he wanted to get his affairs in order.

**Commission Action:**

1. **CERTIFIED** that the attached Negative Declaration is the appropriate level of environmental review for this project.
2. **ADOPTED** the proposed FINDINGS for this project as presented in the staff report;
3. **APPROVED** a request to divide the existing 1,659.95 acre Williamson Act Land Use Contract into four, separate contracts subject to the conditions listed under "CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL".
4. **APPROVED** Tentative Parcel Map No. 4150 as shown on Exhibit "B-1" and "B-2" subject to the conditions listed under the "CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL".

MOTION: Walker SECOND: Webster  
AYES: Gray, Lea, Pollock, Walker, Webster, and Lang  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Heringer  
ABSTAIN: None

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

**Community Development Agency:**

1. Within sixty (60) days of the approval of the recommended action, the applicant shall submit, for review and approval to the Community Development Agency, the revised



agricultural preserve legal descriptions to be incorporated into the revised Land Use Contracts for the subject properties.

2. After approval of the legal descriptions by the Community Development Agency, the applicant shall transmit the above information to the Yolo County Counsel's Office and shall execute Three (3) new contracts as reflected in this report.

**Yolo County Public Works Department:**

3. That prior to issuance of new Williamson Act contracts, the Final Parcel Map will be recorded reflecting removal of all substandard parcels underlying the proposed Land Conservation Contract (identified as APN #44-050-05), including but not limited to "Swamp Land Survey No. 361" filed in the Office of the Recorder of Yolo County on June 13, 1942 and recorded in Book 12 of Maps and Surveys at Page 92.) This lot size is inconsistent with the minimum lot area provisions of the A-P zone and agricultural policies within the Yolo County General Plan. The Community Development Agency shall review the final map prior to submitting to the Yolo County Public Works Department for recordation.
4. The Final Parcel Map, as described within this report (TPM-4150), shall be filed with the Director of the Yolo County Department of Public Works within two years from the date of the Planning Commission's approval of the tentative parcel map, or said tentative map (TPM-4150) shall be deemed null and void without further action.
5. The Final Map shall be prepared with the Basis of Bearings being the California Coordinate System, Zone 2, NAD 83.
6. Further parcelization of parcels shall be prohibited prior to either parcels/contracts exiting from the Williamson Act.
7. Prior to recordation, the applicant or successors in interest shall submit to the Yolo County Public Works Department all outstanding fees established by the current Fee Schedule to cover the costs incurred by the County for the Final processing of Final Map.

Failure to comply with the **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL** as approved by the Planning Commission may result in the following:

- \* **legal action;**
- \* **non-issuance of future building permits.**

**FINDINGS**

*(A summary of the evidence to support each FINDING is shown in italics.)*

In accordance with Section 8-2.408. of Article 4 of Title 8 and provisions of the Blue Ribbon Ordinance No.1157, the Planning Commission finds:

- (1) That the parcels created are consistent with the zone by preserving the agricultural use from the encroachment of nonagricultural uses;

*The proposed split is consistent with the minimum acreage requirement as established in the Blue Ribbon Ordinance No. 1157.*

*The applicants have indicated their intent to continue farming the parcels (currently in row crop and vineyard). This statement and the fact that surrounding lands are currently under contract, prevents the encroachment of nonagricultural uses other than the possibility of construction of one (1) single family home within the Williamson Act contracted parcel which is currently allowed under the zoning code.*

- (2) That the parcels tend to maintain the agricultural economy;

*The applicant has stated that they intend to continue farming the parcels, which are in row crop and vineyard production. This statement, and the fact that surrounding lands are currently under contract, supports the finding that the parcels tend to maintain the agricultural economy.*

- (3) That the parcels tend to assist in the preservation of prime agricultural lands;

*The proposed split will continue the preservation of agricultural lands as classified by the Soil Survey of Yolo County by continuing the agricultural production on the 1,675 acres in the Williamson Act.*

- (4) That the parcels preserve lands with public value as open space;

*The subject property is being utilized for open space and agricultural purposes.*

- (5) That the proposed use is consistent with the General Plan;

*The applicants have stated that he intends to continue farming the parcels. This statement, and the fact that surrounding lands are currently under contract, supports the finding that the proposed split is consistent with the preservation of agriculture as mandated by the Yolo County General Plan.*

- (6) That the proposed contracts in question were created in conformity with and complies with all the requirements of the Subdivision Map Act of the State.

*The Community Development Agency staff and the Yolo County Public Works and Transportation Department have reviewed the application for conformance with the Subdivision Map Act.*

- (7) That the two parcels are at least 80 acres in size of irrigated land.

*Assessor's Parcel No. 44-050-05, 12, 13; 44-070-02; 44-080-03; 44-090-03,04, 05 and 44-120-13 are currently irrigated. Water is available to the property by the means of wells, and water right allocations from the Sacramento River. The Williamson Act Contracts to be created will be 96 acres, 251 acres, 571 acres, and a remainder contract of approximately 757 acres respectively.*

Subdivision Map Act / Parcel Map:

Section 66463(a) Except as otherwise provided for in this code, the procedure for processing, approval, conditional approval, or disapproval and filing of parcel maps and modifications thereof shall be as provided by local ordinance.... The Planning Commission finds that:

- (a) That the proposed map is consistent with the applicable general and specific plans as specified in Section 65451.

*As discussed in the General Plan Review Section of this report, the proposed project was determined to be consistent with the Yolo County General Plan.*

- (b) That the design or improvements of the proposed subdivision are consistent with applicable general and specific plans.

*As discussed in the General Plan Section of this report, the approval of the parcel map was determined to be consistent with the Yolo County and Clarksburg General Plan and in accordance with the Blue Ribbon Ordinance.*

- (c) That the site is physically suitable for the type of development proposed.

*The proposed sites are in compliance with the minimum lot area requirements of the Blue Ribbon Ordinance and will have to meet all requirements imposed by all local jurisdictions.*

- (d) That the site is physically suitable for the proposed density of development.

*The proposed site area is in compliance with the zoning requirements relative to the density requirements for the area.*

- (e) That the design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

*The proposed subdivision (parcel map) was reviewed for any potential environmental impacts and determined to be void of any significant impacts, as discussed in the attached Negative Declaration, Exhibit "E".*

- (f) That the design of the subdivision or type of improvements are not likely to cause serious public health problems.

*The proposed map and subsequent future improvements do not appear to pose any serious health impacts, however, any proposed development (additional homesites) on the properties will be reviewed by the Yolo County Community Development Agency and County Environmental Health Department for approval.*

- (g) That the design of the subdivision and the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of, property within the proposed division.

*The proposed subdivision will not pose any detrimental impacts to any existing public easements, and access is available to each parcel from South River Road.*

Delta Protection Act of 1992 (SB 1866)

The Delta Protection Act, sponsored by Senator Patrick Johnson was approved by the Governor on September 24, 1992. This bill creates the Delta Protection Commission which will be required to prepare, adopt, review and maintain a comprehensive long term resource management plan for the delta by July 1, 1994 which must meet specified requirements for the Primary Zone. The project area is located within this Primary Zone. The Primary Zone is described as the delta land and water area of primary state concern and statewide significance which is situated within the boundaries of the delta as described in Section 12220 of the Water Code, but which is not within either the urban limit line or sphere of influence of any local governments general plan or currently existing studies as of January 1, 1992.

Prior to the adoption of the resource management plan and the approval of the general plan amendments of local governments by the Commission, local governments may approve development within the Primary Zone only after making all of the following written findings on the basis of substantial evidence in the record:

(Evidence to support each finding is in italics):

- (a) The development will not result in wetland or riparian loss.

*The proposal will not result in wetland or riparian loss because the property is outside of any riparian area or canal. The properties are currently being farmed.*

- (b) The development will not result in the degradation of water quality.

*The proposal will not result in the degradation of water quality in the area because the proposal will not change the current agricultural operations now underway.*

- (c) The development will not result in increased non-point source of pollution or soil erosion, increased subsidence or sedimentation.

*The project will not result in increased non-point source of pollution, soil erosion, increased subsidence or sedimentation due to the high water table within the Clarksburg vicinity.*

- (d) The development will not result in the degradation or reduction of the Pacific Flyway habitat.

*The project will not result in the degradation or reduction of the Pacific Flyway habitat because the proposed request is outside of any existing riparian zone.*

- (e) The development will not result in reduced public access, provided that access does not infringe upon private property rights.

*The project will not result in reduced public access, as access from each parcel will be off an existing county road fronting all properties.*

- (f) The development will not expose the public to increased flood hazards.

*The proposed lot line adjustment and Williamson Act contract split proposal is within a 100 to 500 year flood zone (Flood Zone B) which may expose the public to increased flood hazards, although the applicants currently have homesites on their properties.*

- (g) The development will not adversely impact agricultural lands or increase the potential for vandalism, trespass, or the creation of public or private nuisances on private or public land.

*The proposal will not remove any agricultural lands from productive usage. The proposal will enhance agricultural productivity which conforms with the County's policy of protection of agricultural lands.*

- (h) The development will not result in the degradation or impairment of levee integrity.

*The project will not result in the degradation or impairment of levee integrity as South River Road is situated on the levee system and normal access for vehicular and farming equipment occurs.*

- (i) The development will not adversely impact navigation.

*The location of the proposal will not adversely impact navigation.*

- (j) The development will not result in any increased requirements or restrictions of agricultural practices in the primary zone.

*The proposal will not increase the chance of conflict with neighboring farming operations as existing agricultural use of the land will continue on the separate properties.*



Paul Kramer arrived at the meeting at 9:55.

### 6.3 A discussion on the "Rules of Order" of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Gray brought the Commission up to date regarding the progress in revising the Commissioner's "Rules of Order". A sub-committee, composed of Commissioners Gray, Lea and Walker have met with Director Jenkins to discuss the following:

1. The Election of Officers
2. Regular Meetings

3. Order of Business
4. Conduct of Business
5. Minutes
6. Rules of Evidence
7. The "Tone of the Meetings"
8. Change of Format
9. Appeal Procedures
10. Zoning Administrator Applications
11. Rules of Conduct
12. Accessibility of Commissioners
13. Regular meetings with the Board of Supervisors, LAFCO, and other agencies.
14. The Press

This matter will be Agendized in a couple of months for further discussion.



A ten minute recess was called at 10:05 and reconvened with the following item.

- 6.4 94-065 - Public Hearing to receive public comments on the Draft EIR for the Short-Term Mining and Reclamation Project on the Madison Site. Subject property is located immediately south of Cache Creek, north of St. Highway 16 and west of I-505 in the A-1 (Agricultural General) and A-P (Agricultural Preserve) zones. Applicant: Solano Concrete, 1601 Cement Hill Rd. Fairfield, CA 94533 (H. Tschudin)

Heidi Tschudin gave an overview of the project. She reminded the Public that this Hearing was only to hear about the merits of the Draft EIR. She also spoke about the State regulation of a Financial Assurances Plan, which insures that there are monies available should the reclamation not be performed as proposed.

Anthony Russo, Vice President and General Manager of Solano Concrete Company, gave the history of the application. He spoke about Resolution 94-82, which allowed companies which proved to have less than three years in reserve, to apply for an Interim Permit. According to the Resolution, those companies that were conducting off-channel "wet pit" mining, would be allowed to continue those uses and mine in similar conditions. They are now requesting an expansion of the existing operation.

A brief discussion on Boron levels took place.

Commissioner Lea said that on Hudson Parcel where tomatoes were farmed in 1989 after reclamation, did not seem to be a particularly high yield.

Commission Walker asked for clarification on what difference in elevation will be after the area is reclaimed. He also asked who installs the monitoring wells and it was answered that Cache Creek drilling does.

Commissioner Webster asked why they chose Poplar trees to plant as a potential agricultural enterprise, because they blow over so easily.

Key Aoyama, owner of Ag West Resource, gave the reasons why Poplar trees were chosen. He stated that there is a very definite economic market for the pulp wood, they are fast growing, they don't break, etc.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Mitzi Speirs, representing the Environmental Issues Committee of the Western Yolo Grange #423, submitted her comments to the Planning Commission and was concerned about "wet pit" mining.

Sally Oliver, read written comments on behalf of Janet Levers, of the Cache Creek Basin Coalition. She also gave her own concerns regarding Boron, net gain, and how much water is used in growing Poplar trees.

Robert Speirs, representing the Environmental Issues Committee of the Western Yolo Grange #423, had concerns on public safety and the toxic effects of asphalt.

Heidi Tschudin pointed out that the application does not include any request for an asphalt plant nor any change to existing permits to the asphalt plant.

Jan Lowrey, Operations Manager for Sagara Farms in Rumsey, told the Commission of his experience with farmability of reclaimed ground.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

Commissioner Lea asked for more information about suitability of high dollar crops on reclaimed ground.

Commissioner Pollock wanted more information on protected plant species.

Commissioner Gray wanted to see more information on existing levels of regulations regarding safety.

**Commission Action:**

- 1) Conducted a public hearing to receive oral and/or written comments from the public and the Commissioners regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
- 2) Informed the public that the comment period for the Draft EIR closes on June 10, 1995 at 5:00pm.

- 3) Directed the consultants to prepare responses to all comments received and submit the Final EIR to the Commission and public.



## 7. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A report by the Director on the recent Board of Supervisor's meetings on items relevant to the Planning Commission. An update of the Community Development Agency activity 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.

Director Jenkins brought the Commission up to date on the following items:

- 1) The applications for Knight Landing (Warren, Hope, and County of Yolo) will be heard by the Board of Supervisors on June 27, 1995.
- 2) The appeal of the North Davis Golf Course Expansion Project and 39-Unit Residential Subdivision application will be heard by the Board of Supervisors on June 20, 1995.
- 3) He addressed Wallace Edson's concern of additional flow of drainage onto their property in Knights Landing by imposing an additional Condition of Approval prior to the approval of the Final Maps on those projects.
- 4) He said that there have been no code violations reported by anyone in Knights Landing.
- 5) The status of the Esparto Infrastructure Study.
- 6) Board approval of the Dunnigan General Plan to re-do some portions of the Administrative Draft EIR and the Infrastructure Study based on the financial in feasibility of the development project.



## 8. 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. The Commission



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

- 1) Commissioner Pollock said she met with Anthony Russo on May 23, 1995, on the Solano Concrete application.
- 2) Commissioner Pollock also said that she sent former Commissioner Germeshausen the plack which was to be presented to him when he resigned but could not receive due to illness.
- 3) Commissioners Pollock and Walker said they met with Joe Scalmanini, on the Teichert application.



9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 p.m. and the next meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is scheduled for June 14, 1995 at 8:30 a.m. 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 that Board within fifteen days a written notice of appeal specifying the grounds. The Board of Supervisors may sustain, modify, reject or overrule this decision. There will be an appeal fee payable to the Community Development Agency and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Respectfully submitted by,

Stephen L. Jenkins, Director  
Yolo County Community Development Agency

