



3. 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 from the public came forward.



4. CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Lang acknowledged receipt of all correspondence sent with the packet and distributed at the beginning of the meeting.



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 **G-1** - A continuation of a request to increase financial assurances for the Syar Industries processing plant site and to release financial assurances for reclaimed in-channel lands. The project is located within the stream channel and south of Cache Creek, between County Road 85 and 89, near the towns of Esparto and Madison. A Categorical Exemption has been prepared and will be considered for certification. APNs: 048-210-03, 048-220-15 & 16, 049-060-13 & 14, 049-120-01,02 & 03, 049-130-01 & 29. Applicant/Owner: Syar Industries (D. Morrison)

David Morrison presented the staff report and answered questions from the Commission. He stated that the number of acres should be changed from 80 to 60 in the last sentence under Project Description.

this term, from a legal standpoint, means to put everybody back the way they were as if there was never a Williamson Act Contract, as opposed to cancellation which requires a payment and/or a non-renewal.

Commissioner Lang asked what phases this goes through. Steven Basha stated that it will go to the Board of Supervisors, whether approved or denied, since it's an issue from the Board. It will also go to the Department of Conservation and other entities.

Commissioners Woo asked for clarifications of wording on Pages 8 and 11 of the staff report.

Commissioner Stephens asked for clarifications of the staff report.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Lumbrazo, the Applicant, gave a presentation of the project and answered questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Heringer asked what the tax base is on that property when it's rescinded out of the Williamson Act. Mr. Lumbrazo said the recision value is around \$12,500 an acre.

Commissioner Stephens asked why the parcel to the south which is owned by the Russell property was not considered for the replacement easement land. Mr. Lumbrazo said that the Russell family said they'd like to continue to farm and to remain in the Williamson Act.

Commissioner Lang asked if all of Russell's land is farmed by Heidrick. Mr. Lumbrazo said that this is his understanding. Mr. Lumbrazo clarified that the Russell's are the landowners. Commission asked who decided on the ratio 1 to 1. Mr. Lumbrazo said the state law says specifically that you must replace at least to the acreage that you are taking out, which is 162 acres in this case, and it may be greater depending on the formula of value.

Mr. Gamper, Director of Taxation and Land Use with the California Farm Bureau Federation, who is involved with the drafting and passage of Senate Bill 1240, offered a different perspective and some expertise on what the bill was intended to do. In summary, he stated that it's critically important to the agricultural community to keep the integrity of the Williamson Act intact. He'd hate to see it interpreted as a back door, a way for people to get out of the Act.

Ms. Kelly, Executive Director of the Yolo Land Trust, amplified the comments of Mr. Lumbrazo about the Land Trust role in this project. She said he is correct in that they do not endorse this project; in fact the Land Trust does not endorse, support, or oppose any development project. Their role as a land preservation organization makes them very concerned when they see the potential for a cancellation or a recision of a Williamson Act Contract because it is such a strong tool for land preservation. She stated that they have not been involved with Turn of the Century and have not been in negotiations on the conservation easements nor in the language that would be used in the conservation easements. They are concerned at the potential of one day holding a conservation easement on land that was chosen by a developer with an easement language that was negotiated by the developer and the landowner without their involvement, because they will have responsibility to monitor, manage, and protect that land in perpetuity.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Heringer moved that the project be denied. There was no second to the motion.

This item will be continued at the end of the Regular Agenda.

A ten minute recess was called.

The public hearing was reopened and closed. No one from the public came forward.

Commissioner Stephens stated that she has serious reservations about the use of a Negative Declaration to analyze this project because she doesn't think it deals adequately with the need for mitigation. She is concerned that it relies on future studies. She expressed that she cannot approve this recision.

Commissioner Woo said that she has reservations and wants to be sure that it is completely addressed that we do what's fair for the County tax-wise.

Commissioner Rodegerdts had no comment.

Commission Walker stated that he has major concerns, that have not been addressed, about sewage disposal, and environmental consequences. He believes that the City of Woodland and the County of Yolo should be addressing the long-term economic and environmental impacts of this kind of development. He said he appreciates the effort that Turn of the Century people put into it, but he cannot support this project.

Commissioner Lang asked for clarifications about the project which were answered by staff.

Commission Action

Recommend that the Board of Supervisors:

- (1) **DENY** the Negative Declaration attached to the Planning Commission staff report dated January 14, 1999 as the appropriate environmental document for this project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines (CEQA);
- (2) **DO NOT ADOPT** the FINDINGS for this project as presented in this report;
- (3) **DENY** the tentative parcel map (TPM No. 4386) and agricultural preserve contract division of Agricultural Preserve Contract No. 71-067 subject to the conditions listed under CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL presented in this report;
- (4) **DENY** the recision of a portion of Agricultural Preserve Contract No. 71-067 covering Parcel 1 of the tentative parcel map and the simultaneous placement of an equal valuation of property within an agricultural conservation easement as per Section 51256 of the Government Code;
- (5) **DO NOT ADOPT** the resolution rescinding Agricultural Preserve Contract No. 71-067 from Parcel 1 of the tentative parcel map and the simultaneous placement of an equal valuation of property within an agricultural conservation easement as

per Section 51256 of the Government Code.

MOTION: Stephens SECOND: Walker
AYES: Walker, Woo, Stephens, Lang, and Rodegerdts
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Gerber
ABSENT: Heringer

Commissioner Gerber abstained from the vote of this item due to a conflict of interest.

Following presentation of the application and the recommended action, a public hearing was held at which three persons from the public appeared, followed by the deliberations of the Planning Commission which lasted approximately fifteen minutes.



6.3 **98-063** - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to expand the existing sewer treatment for the Esparto Community Services District. Project is located on the north side of State Highway 16 east of Esparto in the Agricultural Preserve (A-P) zone. A Negative Declaration has been prepared for this item. APN: 049-120-21. Owner/Applicant: Esparto Community Services District (M. Hamblin)

Mark Hamblin gave the staff report and answered questions from the Commission. He said that this morning he received a copy of follow-up information from Caltrans which was not included with the agenda packet.

Commissioner Rodegerdts commented that this is probably the first Negative Declaration they've seen in some time that has as many checks off to the left of the No Impact column on the Environmental Check List. Mark Hamblin stated that this is a policy call.

Commissioner Gerber asked for clarification about the number of acres next to the treatment plant that was mentioned on Page 1 of the staff report. Mark Hamblin said this question will have to be deferred to the District representatives. He also clarified that the expanded pond area should take care of the full buildout of the town of Esparto up to that 3,000 figure mentioned in the staff report.

Commissioner Walker asked questions about the concerns of the possibility of flooding from the slough, overflowing into this ponding area. Mark Hamblin said that there will be some berming that will protect the ponding sites.

Commissioner Walker asked if vegetative plantings and trees and shrubs as screens can be placed so that the ponds are not so obvious. Mark Hamblin said that the proposal is to put in a tree line to address that concern. John Bencomo said that Condition 6 in the staff report addresses this issue.

Commissioner Walker stated that he shares the concerns expressed by the Commission concerning the use of agriculturally viable soils for these kinds of activities, but, on a positive side, these ponds could be converted back to asparagus plots. He thinks the County should pursue more vigorously the business about effluent disposal through means other than

evaporation and percolation; in other words, by irrigation of non-consumptive crops by humans. He suggested that this item be discussed seriously by the Commission.

Commissioner Rodegerdts asked Mark Hamblin to comment on the water supply situation in Esparto now and in the future. He said he would like to see the water needs in Esparto addressed. Mark Hamblin said it would better be answered by the Community Services District people.

Commissioner Woo asked questions regarding the zoning of the property on Pages 2 and 3 of the Negative Declaration. Mark Hamblin explained that the existing ponds are in the parks and recreation area (the current facility), the expansion area is in the A-P zone which is right next to it, as shown in the staff report.

Commissioner Woo asked how odors (Condition 3) would be stopped from becoming a public nuisance. Mark Hamblin said if there is a situation where odors are becoming a problem, that Health Department takes an action or it comes back to this Commission for further review as either an enforcement action or a review matter, or something along that line. John Bencomo added that the Environmental Health Department as well as the Air Quality Management District are involved, and the Water Quality Board oversees both of those.

Commissioner Walker commented that he doesn't believe there will be any odor problems.

The public hearing was opened.

Charles Mack of County Counsel, representing the District, asked that the Commission approve this request for a Use Permit. He stated that the District is here doing its part to carry out its responsibilities in the progress in the County's General Plan for the Esparto area. It's the District's hope to present a project that resolves the problems and will support the buildout under the approved General Plan for the next generation. He said that present with him today are a number of representatives of the District, including four members of the District's governing body.

Charles Mack addressed each of the Commission's questions and concerns. He believes that the District has very fairly mitigated each potential and that a mitigated Negative Declaration is before the Commission.

Tom Marking, Superintendent of the District, addressed the Commissioner's questions about current infrastructure and facilities regarding water. He said there is adequate water in the area. He believes the real issue is that the town needs to have a ground surface reservoir placed with a pump station to provide proper pressure. He stated that the purpose of the ponds is to provide enough containment to hold the winter supply.

Charles Mack distributed a sign-off letter from Caltrans, dated February 10, 1999, with comments regarding their review of the project.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Rodegerdts said that he is not satisfied that the water issue is being properly addressed.

5. Any lighting and/or glare generated from the subject property shall be directed away from the public right-of-way and adjoining properties.
6. The applicant shall install and maintain perimeter landscaping to visually screen the Esparto Sewer Treatment Plant. Prior to the granting of an entitlement to initiate grading on the subject property, or issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a comprehensive landscaping plan for review and approval by the Planning and Public Works Department. This landscaping plan shall conform to the State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. The applicant may submit a phasing plan for landscape installation to the satisfaction of the Planning and Public Works Department. The applicant shall install said landscaping within six (6) months of completion of each phase of sewer pond expansion.
7. This Conditional Use Permit (Z.F. No. 98-063) shall commence within one (1) year from the effective date of the Planning Commission's approval of the Conditional Use Permit or said permit shall be deemed null and void without further action.

Public Works Division

8. Prior to granting of an entitlement to initiate grading on the subject property, or issuance of a building permit the applicant shall prepare a drainage plan for the site and submit it for approval to the Building and Public Works Divisions. Said drainage plan shall be prepared by a registered Civil Engineer in the State of California.

Esparto Fire Protection District

9. Applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Esparto Fire Protection District including the provisions for all weather access drive and turn around.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

10. All site improvements shall be built outside of the state public right of way along State Highway 16. Said improvements shall at the minimum be located fifty (50) feet from the centerline of State Highway 16.
11. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans for any work (i.e. driveway apron, installation of culverts, curb and gutter, etc.) conducted in the State public right-of-way.
12. The applicant shall upgrade the existing roadway access at post mile 29.265 (Oakdale Ranch Lane) to Caltrans public road standards for the largest vehicles

that will use this approach on a regular basis. Said upgrade shall be subject to Caltrans permitting and approval. A copy of said approved plans shall be submitted to the Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department prior to the issuance of a final inspection for a sewage pond.

13. The applicant shall provide Caltrans with project design plans and information regarding the surrounding soil characteristics. The applicant shall also provide the following information: (1) what proportion of the expanded facility ponds will be underground and above the existing ground surface; and (2) what design measures will be used to prevent pond, leach field or other water sources from percolating downward and spreading outward, potentially undermining the subgrade structure of State Highway 16.
14. The expansion of the Esparto Community Service District Sewage treatment facility shall be designed/constructed so as to preserve the existing drainage pattern of State Highway 16. Cumulative runoff from the expansion shall not create a highway drainage problem.
15. Tree screen planting shall be given adequate set back distance from the State Highway 16 edge of pavement so that root system growth will not reach highway drainage channels interfering with maintenance and cleaning functions. Trees should also be set back far enough to maintain a clear vehicle recovery zone for the traveling public. Six (6) meters (18 feet) is the minimum recommended distance from the edge of traveled way cited in the Caltrans Traffic Manual.

California Fish and Game Department

16. Prior to granting of an entitlement to initiate grading on the subject property, or issuance of a building permit the project proponent shall pay the appropriate fee per acre in conjunction with participation in the Yolo County Habitat Conservation Plan or enter into a formal consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Section 2081 which may involve securing a management agreement for the conversion of habitat for threatened and endangered species, and the granting of a habitat conservation easement.
17. The applicant shall pay to the California Department of Fish and Game the required assessment of fees under Public Resources Code Section 21089 and as defined by Fish and Game Code Section 711.4. Said fees (\$1,250.00) are payable upon the filing of the Notice of Determination by the Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department with the Yolo County Clerk/Recorder.

County Counsel

18. In accordance with Yolo County Code §8-2.2415, the applicant shall agree to indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the County or its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding (including damage, attorney

fees,

and court cost awards) against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the County, advisory agency, appeal board, or legislative body concerning the permit or entitlement when such action is brought within the applicable statute of limitations. The County shall promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action or proceeding and that the County cooperate fully in the defense. If the County fails to promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding, or if the County fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold the County harmless as to that action. The County may require that the applicant post a bond in an amount determined to be sufficient to satisfy the above indemnification and defense obligation.

Failure to comply with the CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL as approved by the Planning Commission may result in any or all of the following:

- **the revoking of the Use Permit;**
- **non-issuance of a future building permit;**
- **legal action.**

FINDINGS

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

California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines (CEQA)

In accordance with CEQA the Yolo County Planning Commission finds:

A Negative Declaration has been prepared as the environmental assessment for the project in accordance to the California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines.

Yolo County Zoning Regulations

In accordance with Section 8-2.2804 of Article 27 of the Yolo County Zoning Regulations the Yolo County Planning Commission (acting as the Board of Zoning Adjustment) finds:

- a. The requested use is listed as a conditional use in the zone regulations or elsewhere in this chapter;

Section 8-2.404(h) of the Yolo County Zoning Regulations states the following uses are conditional uses within the A-P Zone:

Publicly-owned facilities incidental to the supply of essential services by a public entity, such as wastewater treatment ponds,

sewage facilities pump stations, water supply facilities and pump stations, and solid waste disposal sites;

- b. The requested use is essential or desirable to the public comfort and convenience;

The existing Esparto Community Services District sewer treatment plant is considered to be at capacity. Additional ponding area is needed. The area needed for the new ponds may vary with the expected demand generated by any proposed new development. The draft General Plan designated an approximate 25 acres next to the treatment plant for such an expansion. The requested use must be completed to avoid serious health and safety problems associated with sewage effluent.

- c. The requested use will not impair the integrity or character of the neighborhood and be detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare;

The requested use will be under the permit authority of the California Regional Water Quality Control. This permit requires that the sewage treatment facility be designed and operated so as not to cause a public nuisance as a result of odor, spillage or other nuisance factors.

- d. The requested use will be in conformity with the General Plan;

The requested use is in conformity with the following General Plan policies:

Conservation Policy 18. Sewer Plant Consolidation

Yolo County shall encourage the most efficient long term arrangement of sewer plant facilities, including consolidation, where appropriate.

Administration Policy 19. Developers Provide Facilities and Maintenance Plans

Yolo County shall require that all developers of new developments provide community facilities, both on and off site, that adequately meet the demands of the new development in the context of the existing community, and that the developer provide a plan for the maintenance of the level of service commensurate with future growth relative to that new development.

Administrative Policy 21. Insure Community Services

Yolo County shall insure that adequate, high quality public services and facilities, schools, parks, and public buildings are provided.

Administrative Policy 29. Coordinate/Community Services

Yolo County shall coordinate with Districts and Cities to insure that adequate, high quality public services and facilities, schools, parks, and public buildings are provided.

- e. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, sanitation, and/or other necessary facilities will be provided.

The Esparto CSD Sewer Treatment Facility retains adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, sanitation and other facilities necessary for its safe operation.

Ingress and egress to the site is from State Highway 16. Therefore the applicant is required to obtain approval and permitting from Caltrans for any work conducted in the State public right of way.

The requested use will be under the permit authority of the California Regional Water Quality Control. This permit requires that the sewage treatment facility be designed and operated so as not to cause a public nuisance as a result of odor, spillage or other nuisance factors.



6.4 Consideration of a Draft Amendment to the Knights Landing Community General Plan, Amendment to the Zoning Map and Addendum EIR (J. Bencomo)

John Bencomo presented the staff report and answered questions from the Commission and/or the public. He stated that the Draft Document includes strikeouts which are those portions of text that will be deleted and the text that is highlighted is the new language that has been introduced. In addition, there are inserts for the General Plan map and a copy of the black and white which is the current version for the Community of Knights Landing. Also included is the revised zoning map that is the second mapping in the packet, and the comparison of the existing and current approved zoning map. He said the members of the Community of Knights Landing have seen the document and to the best of his knowledge there's full consensus on the approval from the Community.

Commissioner Rodegerdts asked if there are any significant changes since the preliminary presentation John made a couple of months ago. John Bencomo said there were no meaningful changes.

The public hearing was opened.

Audrey Garner, one of the members of the Knights Landing Advisory Committee, said that John Bencomo has done a marvelous job of putting both the new map and the text together, and that the Community of Knights Landing appreciates and is very pleased with the results.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Lang expressed his appreciation to John Bencomo for taking on this major effort.

John Bencomo said this is an example of one Community Plan that really does, in large part, represent the Community in that it wasn't developer driven. He thinks it's a great effort from a lot of people.

Commission Action

- (1) **ADOPTED** the attached Proposed Resolution recommending to the Board of Supervisors the adoption of the Knights Landing General Plan (Attachment "A"):
 - A. Certification of the Addendum Environmental Impact Report for the Amended Knights Landing General Plan, and;
 - B. Adoption of the proposed Knights Landing General Plan amending the Yolo County General Plan and the 1992 Knights Landing General Plan.

- (2) **RECOMMENDED** that the Board of Supervisors adopt the attached Ordinance amending the Zoning Map of the County of Yolo, as reflected in this report (Attachment "B").

MOTION: Heringer SECOND: Stephens
AYES: Walker, Woo, Stephens, Heringer, Lang, Rodegerdts, and Gerber
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

Following presentation of the application and the recommended action, a public hearing was held at which one person from the public appeared, followed by a short deliberation of the Planning Commission.



- 6.5 Review and discussion of proposed changes to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) along lower Cache Creek and its tributaries. The project is located between County Road 14 and State Highway 16, and between Capay Dam and the Settling Basin. Applicant: Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department (D. Morrison)

David Morrison gave the staff report and answered questions from the Commission and/or the public. He said this is a workshop presentation on the Draft FEMA flood maps for Cache Creek and its tributaries.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Dewey, property owner along the Creek, asked what the impact is in regard to credit. David Morrison said he will research this information.

Mrs. Oliver, property owner on County Road 98, said she supports the new FEMA maps. For the record, she read and distributed correspondence she and her husband had written, and a letter from Caltrans dated January 20, 1999, and photos regarding flooding on their ranch. She stated that gravel mining should not be allowed along the creek and that Federal money should not be given to Yolo County until gravel mining is stopped in and along Cache Creek. She suggested that an intermediate solution is to remove the sediment that causes the creek to overtop at the Correl property.

Mr. Falkner, property owner to the north of Cache Creek, brought to the Commission's attention that there is some conflict between the Army Corps of Engineers map and the FEMA map.

Ms. Thompson, property owner north of Cache Creek, stated that she would like to see some data on projected depths. She suggested that at some point in time focus is needed on alternatives, such as mini reservoirs, a series of reservoirs to not only take care of the flood situation but to also help with providing necessary water. David Morrison said that some of that information is available now.

Mr. Huff, a property owner by Cache Creek, commented on the settling basin and described changes that have occurred near his property.

Mr. Siefertman asked if there's a law that says he can't protect his property against flood waters. He feels he has an option to buy flood insurance or build a levee.

Steven Basha, County Counsel, stated that it depends on if you build a berm and it contributes to increased runoff on somebody else's property then there may be some liability exposure that you would have irrespective of FEMA's concerns. He said that he hasn't looked at that law, so he doesn't know the answer.

John Bencomo said that if this notion is being entertained, it should be discussed with Planning and Public Works to make sure vulnerability to liability is limited, and also to get some discussion with FEMA.

John Bencomo expressed that the intent of this meeting was to get the word out and to give an overview. He said that staff will be happy to meet individually with property owners to talk about the specifics of their property and how potential development is affected. He stated that this will be revisited at the next Planning Commission Meeting.

The public hearing was closed.

Commission Action

DIRECTED staff to continue this item at the March 1999 Planning Commission Meeting.



The Commission recessed for lunch at 12:50 p.m. and will reconvene at 1:20 p.m. with the continuation of Item 6.2.

7. ASSISTANT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A report by the Assistant Director on the recent Board of Supervisor's meetings on items relevant to the Planning Commission. An update of the Planning and Public Works Department 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.

Assistant Director Bencomo brought the Commission up to date on the following:

- (1) Introduction of Dave Daly, new Senior Planner.
- (2) Planning Commission Meeting Dates.
- (3) Planning Commission Stipend.
- (4) Workshop at UCD on Role of the Planning Commissioner.
- (5) Esparto Subdivision.
- (6) Conservation Easements.
- (7) Beau Chevaux Winery Appeal



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 Rodegerdts made a presentation at the Davis Campus Law School last Saturday on conservation preservation. About two weeks ago, he attended the Smart Growth Summit Meeting in Sacramento sponsored by an Urban League.
- (2) Commissioner Walker suggested that Chairman Lang send a thank you to the Knights Landing General Plan people for their long-term devotion and determination, and what he believes is a successful outcome to a community project.
- (3) Commissioner Gerber said he had been contacted by Tom Lumbrazo about the Turn of the Century project two days ago, before he determined

he had a conflict.

- (4) Commissioner Lang said he met with the Yolo County Farm Bureau with John Bencomo and Brett Hale on the Heidrick's buildings.



9. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission was adjourned at 2:30 p.m. The next Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission will be held on Thursday, March 3, 1999, at 8:30 a.m., in the Planning Commission Chamber.

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** from the date of the action. A written notice of appeal specifying the grounds and an appeal fee **immediately** payable to the Clerk of the Board must be submitted **at the time of filing**. The Board of Supervisors may sustain, modify or overrule this decision.

Respectfully submitted by,

John Bencomo, Assistant Director
Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

clk

MYFILES\CAROLE\PCMins021199.wpd