

MINUTES

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 17, 1996

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Gray called the meeting to order at 8:40 a. m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lea, Heringer, Rodegerdts,
Walker, Lang, and Gray

MEMBERS ABSENT: Webster

STAFF PRESENT: Stephen L. Jenkins, Director
David Flores, Senior Planner
Mike Luken, Senior Planner
David Morrison, Resource Management
Coordinator
Heidi Tschudin, CAO Contract Planner
Charles Mack, County Counsel
Linda Caruso, Planning Commission
Secretary
John Joyce, Public Works Director
Tom To, Environmental Health Director
Elizabeth Kemper, LAFCO Executive
Director
Ray Perkins, Agricultural Commissioner

MINUTES
COMMISSION

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING
APRIL 17, 1996

Services Agency Larry Rillera, Parks Manager, General

Keith Ott, General Services Director

Mary Stephens, County Librarian

Beverly Howard, Principal Analyst,

CAO's Office

Marty Doty, Yolo Transit

CONSULTANTS PRESENT: Bob Berman, Nichols Berman

Dennis Criss, Psomas & Associates

Don Jones, Psomas & Associates

David Zehnder, Economic & Planning

Systems

◆ ◆ ◆

2. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Commission Action:

The Minutes of the April 2, 1996 Planning Commission Meeting were approved with no corrections.

MOTION: Lea SECOND: Lang

AYES: Gray, Lea, Heringer, Rodegerdts, Lang and
Walker

NOES: None

ABSENT: Webster

ABSTAIN: None



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.

Nancy Lea, Planning Commissioner acting as a member of the public, told the Commission of an adjacent property owner from her property, who constructed a road which encroaches on her property about eight feet. The property owner is using the Dubach Pit as a dumping ground for asphalt, concrete, and rebar. She added her concern for habitat, traffic safety, and dust created by the trucks. She suggested the Ordinance regarding this issue be revisited.

Director Jenkins indicated that the person in question had been cited on April 16, 1996 for not obtaining the required permits.

Commissioner Gray asked Staff to schedule a future agenda item regarding issues pertaining to borrow pits.

Charles Mack, County Counsel, arrived at the meeting at 8:50 a.m. He stated that the borrow pits have been left over from the construction of Interstate 5.

◆ ◆ ◆

4. CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Gray acknowledged receipt of the correspondence in the packet as well as the following items distributed at the beginning of the meeting.

- (1) A letter from Dr. Fern Tablin regarding Equestrian facilities.
- (2) Numerous letters submitted regarding the Dunningan General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report.

◆ ◆ ◆

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.

There were no items on the Consent Agenda.



6. REGULAR AGENDA

6.1 Presentation of the 1994-1995 Annual Monitoring Report by Ecological Research Associates, the Technical Review Panel for Homestake Mining Company's McLaughlin Gold Mine. (D. Flores)

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

David Flores gave the Staff Report. He added that the mining operation is in its final phase.

Darrel Slotton, an environmental research scientist at UCD, said the presence of the dam on Davis Creek, does not present any additional mercury-related hazards to downstream regions.

Commissioner Walker was concerned with what would happen with mercury levels in the event of a sudden release of water.

Delora Koontz, the Senior Environmental Engineer from Homestake Mining Company, said she agreed with the report and the recommendations made.

John Ceteras, the public member of the Homestake Mining Technical Review Panel, gave a brief history of the Technical Review Panel. He said the panel would like to continue to review and report back for at least two more years.

Commissioner Gray said the Panel provides assurances to the citizens of Yolo County.

Charles Mack, County Counsel, regarding the liability issue, said the risk is very unlikely and should it occur, it would be of a limited nature.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

Commission Action:

1. **ACCEPTED** the reports of Ecological Research Associates and the Technical Review Panel for the Homestake Mining Company, McLaughlin Mine and approved the TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS.
2. **ACCEPTED** the reports submitted by the Homestake Mining Company and the University of California, Davis dated February 22, 1996 and April 5, 1996 (Exhibit "D") that addresses the safety aspects of Davis Creek Dam in the event of a potential Dam Failure.
3. **RECOMMENDED** that staff and County Counsel prepare a revised contract with Ecological Research Associates and the University of California to reflect the reduced frequency of monitoring as recommended by the Technical Review Panel. The revised contract will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

Water Quality:

1. That Davis Creek Reservoir water continue to be monitored for iron, manganese and quarterly field profiles.
2. That a continuous flow recorder and sampler shall be installed at DC-5 and total suspended solids are monitored to assess sediment input into the reservoir. Homestake shall contact Dr. Turid Reid as to the appropriate time for the installation of the recording device.
3. That DC-5 continue to be monitored for mercury associated constituents appropriate to the mercury research program.
4. That DC-6 be sampled annually at the time of the first flush of storm water for compliance with regulatory monitoring provisions.

Public Concern:

5. That Homestake finalize an agreement with UCD regarding security of Davis Creek Reservoir, and a copy of the agreement provided to the TRP members at the next scheduled meeting of the TRP in January of 1997.
6. The TRP review process shall be continued through at least two more reports, ie. 95-96 and 96-97.
7. That Yolo County cooperate with UCD, ERA, and Homestake to use the decommissioned mine site and facilities as a research center and teaching facility.
8. Accept ERA's recommendations to eliminate most of the now extraneous elements from the monitoring efforts in favor of more mercury studies. The exceptions are water column sulfate and sulfide analyses, which seem to be desirable for DCR as a measure of an essential

nutrient for sulfate-reducing bacteria, argued by others to be the principal methylator of mercury in sediments.

A q u a t i c E c o l o g y :

- 9 . That Homestake Mining Company request from National Environmental Testing Laboratory an explanation of significant QA/QC problems experienced by this lab for certain sediment and water column metals and that the explanation be forwarded to the TRP at the next issuance of the quarterly reports.

10. Sediment mercury synoptic studies shall be conducted after any high rainfall year and during one or two representative low rainfall years. Deep core sediment Hg profiles from the most heavily impacted arms of the reservoir shall be conducted at an interval determined by Ecological Research Associates, and Dr. Doug Nelson. This will provide data to the TRP on how well we can estimate the cumulative reservoir burden of Hg by summing the annual input estimates.

11. An explanation for the recent high sediment Hg values at DC-6 shall be sought, by Homestake and ERA and a report provided to the TRP members with the next issuance of the quarterly reports.

- 12 . T h a t w a t e r c o l u m n s u l f a t e a n d s u l f i d e a n a l y s i s
s h a l l c o n t i n u e a s a m e a s u r e o f e s s e n t i a l
n u t r i e n t f o r s u l f a t e - r e d u c i n g b a c t e r i a .

- 13 . T h e a n a l y s i s o f m e r c u r y i n f i s h f l e s h f r o m D a v i s
C r e e k a n d D a v i s C r e e k R e s e r v o i r s h a l l c o n t i n u e
t o b e t a k e n i n i n t e r v a l s n o w i n p l a c e .

H y d r o g e o l o g y :

- 14 . Monitoring to detect changes in sulfate, boron, and ph shall be continued. Monitoring frequency shall be (every two years) or at a frequency based on assumed flow rates.

- 15 . The Technical Review Panel would support the reduction of monitoring frequency for groundwater parameters to an annual basis. This would require approval by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Groundwater elevation data should continue to be collected at an optimal basis (at a minimum, quarterly).

Vertebrate Toxicology:

16. Continue monitoring Davis Creek Reservoir wildlife species as in the current ERA report.

17. Change reporting of bird and mammal species in the HMC report to include species observed, rather than species not observed.
18. Continue Big-eared Bat monitoring, and include summary of results in the Annual Monitoring Report.
19. Institute a tree swallow nest box monitoring program for evaluating mercury intake by swallows from aquatic insects on Davis Creek Reservoir by the spring of 1996. (**Note:** Nest box program was initiated in March 1996)
20. Ecological Research Associates shall monitor sediment loads in spillway water to evaluate the mercury in sediments going over the dam.

Y o l o C o u n t y R e c o m m e n d a t i o n s :

21. Homestake Mining Company or its successors in interest will continue to be responsible to the Division of Safety of Dams for the maintenance and operation of the Davis Creek Dam and the liability that accrues to any owner of property that contains such a structure.

STAFF SUMMARY FINDINGS

Following the on-site inspection of the mining operation and participation by the Community Development Agency staff with the Technical Review Panel, and supporting data from Homestake Mining Company, University of California, Davis and Ecological Research Associates, staff has established that the gold mining activities of Homestake Mining Company are in conformance with the operating standards and conditions of the mining permit and reclamation permit issued in 1983.

As indicated earlier, staff has reviewed the recommendations provided by the Technical Review Panel and determined them adequate in addressing continued compliance with the mitigation program for the Homestake mining operation.

MOTION: Heringer

SECOND: Walker

AYES: Rodegerdts, Lea, Lang, Heringer, Walker
and Gray

NOES: None

ABSENT: Webster

ABSTAIN: None



6.2 A Public Hearing to accept comments on the Draft EIR for the Dunnigan General Plan and specific development projects. (M. Luken)

Mike Luken presented the Staff Report. He described the history of the Dunnigan General Plan process. Mr. Luken described the Draft Dunnigan General Plan, the Dunnigan Facilities Plan (Infrastructure Study) the proposed expansion areas and the specific development projects. Mr. Luken went over the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), highlighting the major significant impacts that have been mitigated. He finished his presentation with a summary of the significant unavoidable impacts as well as the impacts that cannot be presently mitigated.

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Bob Berman, of Nicholls-Berman, the preparer of the Draft EIR, explained the Draft EIR is project specific. Future development projects would be subject to CEQA and their own EIR's.

Keith Williams, Chairman of the Dunnigan General Plan Steering Committee/Dunnigan Citizens Advisory Committee (DCAC), said that the DCAC had been working on the Draft General Plan for some time. Mr. Williams confirmed that a former consultant hired by the County, Bob Grunwald, had not been able to bring the community together and had in fact recommended things that were contrary to adopted County Policy such as provision of housing. Mr. Williams said the people of Dunnigan are not against nor are they in favor of development. The Community has achieved a consensus in the 1992 Plan on the amount of growth that would be acceptable to the Community. They are concerned with some of the implementation aspects of the Draft Dunnigan General Plan. These have been listed in the Staff Report as well as in letters submitted.

The Commission took a five minute recess at 11:00.

Steve Thinglum, Vice President of Lakemont Development Inc./Lakemont Homes (project proponent for Dunnigan Village/Expansion Area #1, #2), strongly supports the DEIR. He added that working with Stephen Jenkins and Mike Luken has been refreshing. They have worked very hard and diligently on this issue. Most Planning Departments take their job as an 8 to 5 job. They take it seriously and are both very dedicated. He feels that the development proposed will use less

water than the farmland that it is replacing. They are proposing lakes within the project that will serve as water features and for groundwater recharge. The mitigation proposed in the DEIR will assure that adequate water supply is found and that assurances to protect area wells will be done prior to development occurring. The sewer pond location is a practical economic matter and that placing the sewer on the west side of the freeway will not allow for a gravity fed sewer system. New technology for sewer ponds will mitigate any odor problem. He suggested an education program to have members of the public visit newly built sewer plants using this new technology. Commissioner Lang asked Mr. Thinglum what amount of additional development would allow the community to use Tehema Colusa Canal Water and move the sewer ponds. Mr. Thinglum answered that he is not sure that simply adding more development would financially allow the change to surface water and movement of the sewer ponds. Chairman Gray asked Mr. Thinglum what his absorption rate was and what his market is. Mr. Thinglum answered that buildout would be over 10-15 years, that there is a lot of demand for commercial development in the area at present. Initially Dunnigan would provide a cheaper alternative for housing for other areas in Yolo County (Price Range \$90,000-140,000). Chairman Gray encouraged and Mr. Thinglum agreed to look at an alternative location for the sewer plant. Mr. Thinglum reiterated that economics would drive a lot of the infrastructure locations and types of systems. Chairman Gray asked the developers and staff for additional detail on absorption and phasing at a later date.

Wayne Stoops, of Wayne Stoops and Associates/Capitol Eagle Investors II & III (project proponent for Dunnigan Park), made a correction to the Staff Report indicating his involvement with Expansion area 3 not 2. He said the DEIR is very harsh on new development, but that the developers realize that this is what they must do. He also offered the services of a professional wastewater expert from Sacramento to look at alternative solutions to the wastewater plant location issue. Commissioner Walker asked Mr. Stoops why his development is attractive for highway commercial users. Mr. Stoops explained that Dunnigan is the location of the last undeveloped intersection of two interstate highways in California and that it is an ideal location for this type of highway commercial development. Mr. Stoops pointed out two market studies, one of which was sponsored by the County (Robert Fountain, Real Estate and Land Use Institute), for this type of development in Dunnigan.

Jay Donaldson, of John Korean and Associates (representing the proponent for the Aulman Property), complemented Director Jenkins and Mike Luken for their hard work in trying to come to some sort of compromise that works for both the developers and the County. He gave his approval of the DEIR as it stands. Commissioner Lang questioned the market for truck related commercial. Mr. Donaldson responded by saying that due to the traffic projected for Interstate 5 (presently 25,000 cars per day), that the market is there now and will continue to grow for truck related commercial development.

Catherine Reyes, of the Dunnigan Advisory Committee, said if the new development can't provide schools, sewer, etc, then the Community does not want the development. She felt that the EIR does not adequately address the fiscal impacts of the Dunnigan General Plan. She expressed a concern that the owners on the southwest corner of I-5 and County Road 6 have expressed an interested in development. This area was designated urban reserve by the November 1992 General Plan. She does not agree with the removal of the urban reserve from the plan to make the remaining projects fiscally sound. She feels that the amount of development proposed in the Plan will "open the flood gates" to additional development in the Dunnigan Area. She asked staff to investigate a federal law that she had heard about that prohibited certain types of development when you have an offramp one mile from an Interchange (I-5/I-505).

Patrick MacAravy, a resident of Dunnigan living on County Road 5 east of Dunnigan, said he disputes the design of the drainage system. He is concerned with where the runoff is discharged. He said the errors are in the Dunnigan Facilities Plan. He feels that the detention ponds are not sized properly for the proposed increases in the size of culverts, pipes, etc. He finds that the projections in the fiscal impact report for 1.9 million square feet of commercial/industrial development unrealistic. He feels that the cost burden analysis should also reflect a "reduced commercial scenario" that was used in the fiscal analysis.

Willard Ingraham, resident of Dunnigan, said the new development will drive people out of their homes due to the extra costs for schools, water, sewage, etc. He feels that new development should pay for upgrading the Hardwood Subdivision area and that the current residents should not bear any of the cost for the services that they would potentially receive. Commissioner Walker stated that he was familiar with the income levels of Dunnigan residents due to his experience in working with members of community of Dunnigan. Commissioner Lea asked if Mr. Ingraham was concerned that he might have to pay for ongoing maintenance of facilities that existing residents would use such as parks. Mr. Ingraham answered in the affirmative. Commissioner Walker stated that he would ensure that the Planning Commission would not approve a Plan that would have residents pay for additional services that they receive as a result of new development.

Don Peart, Trustee of the Pierce Unified School District, stated that he supports the provision for a school in the Dunnigan proposed by the General Plan. He stated that he and the District have had 100% cooperation with the Planning Staff in the way they have worked with the school district in addressing important issues. All students in Dunnigan are now bussed to Arbuckle. Mr. Peart understood that new court cases have limited CEQA review of schools. He questioned whether or not having 600 more students at the time of total build out, would really could be an "insignificant"

impact after mitigation. However, he stated that language proposed by staff for "full mitigation" for schools in the Draft Dunnigan General Plan would mitigate any concern on behalf of the District.

Jack Schredar, with Jack Schredar and Associates (consultant to Pierce School District), said that there was some question of the impact of the legal case of *Goleta Union School District V. Regents of the State of California*. Lowering the standards of the school district is not a physical impact according to the DEIR. He stated that the DEIR takes a very conservative stance in regards to this law case. The Dunnigan General Plan would double the population of the Pierce School District from 1150 to 2323 students 640 from Dunnigan Village). However, through the cooperation of the Planning Staff and the School District, they have come up with language for Draft Dunnigan General Plan Policy D-S-7 to mitigate the impact created by the Dunnigan General Plan (conditioned upon zoning approval). He recommends that the Planning Commission include such language in the General Plan. Lakemont Development has begun negotiations with the school district and even though they are far apart, Mr. Schredar stated that he was glad that Lakemont took the initiative to meet.

Jim Lutz, Superintendent of the Pierce Joint Unified School District, stated that he has appreciated the work that Steve Jenkins and Mike Luken have done over the last two weeks. He and most likely the School Board would support the modification to Draft Dunnigan General Plan Policy D-S-7 that would require full school mitigation.

He disagrees with the finding of the DEIR that there is no significant impact even though the *Goleta* case limits the CEQA review. He feels that Dunnigan needs a school of their own (K-6) right now and especially with the new development being proposed. He stated that the price of new schools are exorbitant (K thru 6 in Arbuckle cost \$3 million) and that the state will fund approximately 45-55%. He stated that the School District would be looking at the developers funding the remaining 45-55%. Commissioner Herringer asked Mr. Lutz what the current budget of the School District was. Mr. Lutz answered that it was approximately \$4.5 million. Commissioner Lea asked if there are any legal constraints to "full mitigation" of school impacts. Mr. Lutz stated that "full mitigation plans" were in place in many districts in the area.

Charles Mack, County Counsel, spoke on school issues and the legal decision of the *Goleta Union School District V. Regents of the State of California* case. He referred to a legal opinion prepared by the County Counsel on this case for the Dunnigan General Plan process enclosed in the staff report.

Mr. Mack stated that the police power of a jurisdiction would allow the use of the "full mitigation" plan. *Goleta* only limits the impact analysis in EIR's for schools to physical changes.

The question is not if the County has legal authority, the question is how to go about requiring "full mitigation."

Chairman Gray asked Mr. Lutz what the threshold student population was before a new school is warranted in Dunnigan. Mr. Lutz said that they would phase the school in as a K-3, putting in the

core facilities and build it out from there. He stated that the School District has not studied this in detail. A \$1.5 million dollar revenue stream would be needed initially with assurance for additional \$1.5 million that could be a Mello-Roos District or equivalent funding mechanism. Mr. Lutz said that costs can be reduced with 30% of school being portable.

Mr. Schredar stated that in the Southeast Area of Woodland, the threshold for a new school is the 300th child. An agreement was negotiated that when the 200th home was built it would trigger a financial mechanism to pay for a new school. This is very common practice with school districts and is very effective.

Mr. Luken stated that developers have stated that they would be willing to waive their AB1600 rights so that school fees would not have to be returned after the 5-year statutory limit.

Gareth Schaad, Officer on the DCAC and one of the Directors of the Dunnigan Water District, said the land in expansion areas 1, 2 and 3 have been unable to sustain irrigated agriculture. He stated that wells should not be located in Expansion Areas 1, 2, or 3 because of the effect agricultural wells have historically had on surrounding wells. South of County Road 6, west of I-5 had no water. Expansion Area 4 had dry well holes. Development based solely on groundwater will not work in Dunnigan. It will have to be dual use using groundwater and surface water from the Tehema-Colusa Canal. Agricultural irrigation is dual use. He stated that he does not think that stormwater

detention ponds will work because he feels that detention ponds proposed west of County Road 88 cannot be farmed. He acknowledged that detention ponds are allowed in the Agricultural Preserve but a detention pond would limit the type of crop that could be grown there. Commissioner Lang asked how deep Mr. Schaad had drilled for water. Mr. Schaad said that the wells south of County Road 6 were at 1300 feet. Holes south of Expansion Area 1 did not have sufficient water for agriculture. Commissioner Herringer asked if there is surplus water in the Tehema Colusa Canal. Mr. Schaad stated that the current 3-year interim contract between the Dunnigan Water District and the Bureau of Reclamation (Central Valley Project) would allow for Municipal and Industrial water service. He stated that it is all tied to the federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) being done for the Central Valley Project. The Dunnigan Water District contract is for 19,000 acre feet and 10,000 acre feet are currently used. If they District agricultural use or irrigation water was maximized, there would not be enough water. He stated that a joint water use approach for development would work and is the only option. He stated that agricultural and domestic consumption of water was the same. In replying to a question by Commissioner Walker, Mr. Schaad stated that wells should be drilled east of the Railroad where water supply has been better. He also answered that he has a fear that even those wells east of the railroad would cause area wells to go dry. He does not agree that you can seal off wells to a depth and not affect surrounding wells. He stated that there is a hydrological continuity from the water table on down unless there is lateral flow

such as there is near Cache Creek. Mr Schaad stated that he has confidence in the staff and commission to come to an equitable solution. Mr Schaad finished by stating that he was a leader and proponent of in the Measure G election a number of years ago.

Charles Mack, County Counsel left the meeting at 12:15.

Neil Bush, a resident of Dunnigan, was concerned about the proposed location of the Wastewater Treatment Plant near his property. He used a map to illustrate to the Commission that the wastewater treatment plant location could not work given the mitigation measures presented in the DEIR and the flooding in the area. He was concerned about the effect on property values in the area of a wastewater treatment plant. He disagreed that there would not be odor problems. He objected to the placement of a solid waste transfer station near or at the proposed location of the sewage treatment plant because of litter and vector problem.

Diane Kindermann, an attorney representing Ms. Chun Mei Dodge, a resident of Dunnigan, indicated her client would like the zoning on her parcel to remain Highway Service Commercial, instead of the proposed Truck Related Highway Service Commercial. **Victor "Shorty" McCollough, Chief of the Dunnigan Fire District,** was concerned about the proposal for a six person professional fire crew supplemented by a volunteer force. He acknowledged that this number was based on an industry criteria standard (1 person/1000 residents) and confirmation from the

City of Woodland and Dunnigan Fire District. He was concerned that this was insufficient at full build out due to rural spread out nature of Dunnigan Fire District.

Eric Lindsey, resident of Dunnigan, was concerned with noise, air quality, and seismic geology. He suggested that staff not just rely on UCD or USGS data. Staff should investigate Blind Thrust Faults and new hazard areas being proposed. Mr. Lindsey agreed with the DEIR that Air Quality could not be totally mitigated to less than significant levels. Language should be added to encourage industry with clean air trucks, encourage clean fuel stations, attract industry that reuses rice straw, and provide an rail ramp for industrial use. A telecommuting center should also be built in Dunnigan.

Adella Backus, Co-owner of Cliff's Auto Wreckers in Dunnigan, said she was in favor of the new development and would like to see additional housing built in the area. They have no housing for their employees right now. She stated that a sheriff's substation is needed in Dunnigan to combat crime that is occurring right now. Additional fire protection is also needed.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

The Commission made the following comments:

Commissioner Heringer: "Water is a major problem of course, as everybody knows. The sewer has got to be solved, whether its Mr. Stoops that had the plan with the professional coming in with a lot

smaller area for ponding. There are some major problems to be cured in those two areas alone."

Commissioner Lea: "My attitude about new development is that people have to have places to live and we have to recognize that they have to have places to live. But, development has to be a situation where both the old residents and the new residents come out, and everybody, every reasonable person, is pleased. So, starting with that, I have real concerns about protecting the existing residents. I want the EIR to really carefully address these. They need to protect the existing well structure, water structure that's in the area, and I certainly think that Mr. Schaad told us all some very interesting statistics about the water situation out in the Dunnigan area.

I'm very concerned also, about the location of the new sewer plant. Especially when I realize that there is an option of locating on the west side of the freeway. I think its important to realize that people are living in that area, and their needs have to be protected. And certainly, even when I look at like page eighteen of the Staff Report, the Fiscal Impact Analysis states the probable anticipated change. The Fiscal Analysis has to consider anticipated change over time in the value of land and improvements within and near such areas. So, I certainly think we could have a diminution of the value of the land surrounding that sewer plant, which has to be factored into the Fiscal Analysis to be accurate.

I'm concerned about the situation as Harry and Jim has also commented on. I'm very concerned about

persons who are not developers and who are existing residents having their monthly costs increase. I think we have to look at that. And again, this is where I say, the development has to be a positive one for everyone for it to be a reasonable development in the area.

I thought as far as the traffic, Interstate 5 impacts the idea that we don't have countywide funding mechanisms for regional highway improvements and we don't have a model in the Central Valley. I'm wondering are there models elsewhere in the state that can be used to start this process so we can have a mechanism to solve traffic problems.

And basically, I think that we had a wonderful cross section of opinion from Dunnigan and I know that Staff took notes and I'm looking forward to seeing them addressed in the EIR. I would also want to know, I think Kent Lang was referring to it also, what does it take to do it right? And I realize there's a reality of phasing here. But, maybe a "Mello Roos" to pay for the needed infrastructure."

Commissioner Rodegerdts: "I've heard little if anyone comment as to why we need five hundred new homes on the plains of Yolo County. This development, the plans we've seen here, it seems to me, are at the expense of the folk who are already there. What we need in the area is rural redevelopment. What we've heard today has pointed out a lot of problems in the Dunnigan area. So, rather than address the problems that are already there, we are going to possibly visit on the area,

a whole new number of problems. But do it just by abandoning the area and moving elsewhere, starting all over again. And I think this is illustrated by the location of the sewage treatment plant. We move across the freeway, but its more economical to put the sewage plant next door to the folks who are already there. So as I say, what we need is rural redevelopment. I haven't heard the phrase used yet, but I look at this as nothing more than urban sprawl. We're twenty minutes down the freeway from Woodland. And I hope that someone would address these concerns that I have the next time we come together, because that's what I'm looking for. I'm going to try to keep an open mind about this. There are a whole lot of growth proponents out there, but you're going to have to sell me. An EIR does not present to me a viable economic approach to what's being presented."

Commissioner Lang: "I would just like to echo what Nancy said about the water and the sewer. I didn't think the EIR addressed the Hardwood facility at all. I drove through there...it looks like the County has kind of ignored our Hardwood area or the grove. There's not much zoning. The streets there...there's no services, absolutely none. I mean, they might as well be on little farms out there. Each one has their well right in front and each one has there septic tank right in front. So, if we talk about the plan, it shows we're going to put a sewer line through it. Who's going to pay for that sewer line. They have their septic tank.

And the other thing that I'm really upset about is, which we learned about on the Davis Project, was on

fiscal policies. Costs do not seem to generate if all these facilities were to fill up and you went phase 1, phase 2...I'd like to see how you would phase. Because the County, the Board of Supervisors, and that's why their kind of pushing for it, these different outlet places, is that it generates sales tax. And if we don't have enough sales tax, by the time you add that many sheriffs up there, and that many police up there, where does that money come from? I live in a rural county. I also see that same sheriff that's in Knights Landing, that Dunnigan sees today... and Clarksburg. So if we have five new sheriffs and they all go to Dunnigan, I just lost my Knights Landing sheriff. I think we really have to take a look. I'm not opposed to the housing. I think they need it because Adam's Grain has gone up north, fertilizer companies and a couple tomato packing companies, that like to go in there. There's a need for homes in that area. But I don't see a hurting the people in the Hardwood area or the water or the sewer. We've got to do some real addressing on this issue."

Commissioner Walker: "There is no way I could envision my approving this in its present form. I see many of the recommendations or decisions involved with this as being decisions of convenience. The water problem has not really been addressed. Its been alluded to. The location of the waste disposal is really a matter of convenience. I could go on and on. But, I guess what I would look for is simply greater attention to the economic and social implications of what is proposed. I'm with Henry. I don't see any overriding need for "x" number of units. So, until

some of these basic questions have addressed, I would have to say no way."

Commissioner Gray: "I'm concerned with this overall plan and the way its pulled together. I don't think we've done a very good job as planners tying together these three distinct elements of the Hardwood area, the downtown and the Road 8 section. And I think that we need to recognize that they have circulation through them, they have land uses along them that we're not addressing properly. And I would like to see this, if it is a General Plan for that Community area to try and weave that fabric together...that quilt together a little better. I also believe that one of the reasons that were considering this is that originally there was an idea that Dunnigan could be a community in Yolo County that could provide other commercial retail, economic activities. As I've looked at the General Plan and the catalyst right now, its actually a 500+unit residential development. That seems to be the principal catalyst. That development, while it looks attractive, looks like it might be acceptable. I questioning whether its acceptable in the Community of Dunnigan. That looked to me like something that belongs in the Mace Ranch area of Davis, in the southeast area of Woodland, in an area of Natomas or Laguna in Sacramento. It really looks to me like a small town suburban subdivision in its design. I'm not being critical of that as a land use, but I am being critical of that as a land use in this area because I'm not sure that we have the facilities, the infrastructure, the service districts, the community amenities that can actually support 550 new houses there.

And then I hope that after saying all that, that we can look at some alternative ways to keep the idea of getting a General Plan done, approved, governing and steering the future direction of Dunnigan and permitting activities there. And I personally would like to see a greater emphasis on AG related industries finding a home along this Interstate corridor. I believe that because of the Interstate there, that ideas that have to do with distribution, that with food processing and handling, are good ones...and maybe make sense there. And having enough housing to take care of those employees that might live there. I think we've shifted this plan somewhat and its become overly residential."

Commission Action:

1. **CONDUCTED A PUBLIC HEARING** to receive comments from the public on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Draft Dunnigan General Plan and Specific Development Projects (State Clearinghouse #93053066)
2. **DIRECTED STAFF TO MAKE ANY NECESSARY REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR** recommended by the Planning Commission and as a result of comments received from the Public and Responsible Agencies.
3. **DIRECTED STAFF TO PREPARE A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** for consideration by the Planning Commission based upon these revisions and comments.

MOTION: Lea SECOND: Lang

MINUTES
COMMISSION

YOLO COUNTY PLANNING
APRIL 17, 1996

AYES: Gray, Lea, Lang, Rodegerdts, Walker, and Heringer
NOES: None
ABSENT: Webster
ABSTAIN: None



The Commission took a fifteen minute recess and reconvened with the following item.

Commissioner Rodegerdts indicated that due to possible conflicts of interest, or what could be perceived as conflicts by interested parties, he would be abstaining from this item.

96-020 - Public Workshop to discuss the Off-Channel Mining Plan (OCMP) and a Public Hearing to accept comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report on properties generally located along Cache Creek, between the Capay Dam and the Town of Yolo in the A-1, A-P, A-1/S-G, A-P/S-G Zones. Applicant: County of Yolo (D. Morrison)

The Staff Report was given by David Morrison and Heidi Tschudin.

John Pelka, of EDAW, addressed some of the following areas of the EIR; land use and planning, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, agriculture, biological resources, air quality, traffic and circulation, noise, esthetics, etc..

The Public Hearing was opened at this time.

Lois Linford, of the League of Women Voters, was concerned with traffic and circulation, water quality and the alternative.

Avery Tindell, of Rumsey, commented on the importance of having a public member on a review panel.

Percy Howglan, questioned why this channel management plan was initiated, and did some private enterprise or organization indicate their intent to expand mining operations.

Gretchen Ceteras, of Capay Valley, was concerned with the depletion of ground water.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

Commission Action:

None

◆ ◆ ◆

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.

There were no reports made by the Director.

◆ ◆ ◆

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.

Commissioner Rodegerdts attended a workshop at the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Lang visited Dunnigan with Keith Williams.

◆ ◆ ◆

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is scheduled for May 1, 1996 at 8:30 a.m. at the Yolo County Planning Commission Chamber at 292 W. Beamer Street, Woodland, CA. 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