

Unapproved Minutes
Dunnigan Advisory Committee
Wednesday, February 17, 2010

Dunnigan Fire Hall
29145 Main St.
Dunnigan, Ca 95937

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Weber called the meeting to order at 7:20 pm

ATTENDANCE

- 12 Members in attendance, quorum present
- 3 Members absent, Bob Langfield, Greg Bickford, Erich Linse
- 3 County representative were present at this meeting
- 12 residents and guests
- Total in attendance, 27 members, guests and county representatives

MINUTES

Chairman Weber called for the approval of the minutes of January 27 he asked if there were any corrections or additions to the minutes.

Chairman Weber suggested the approval of the January minutes be postponed until the March meeting in order for the minute tape to be reviewed referencing the Questions/Concern section of the presentation by David Morrison. M. Smith asked that the questions and responses by David Morrison referencing the Level of Service E for all roads in the Dunnigan Specific Plan be recorded verbatim. Secretary Kirkland was asked to review the minute tape.

The transcript from the minute tape of January 27 on this subject is as follows, **bold type** indicates the corrections:

Presentation: David Morrison, Question/Concerns

M. Smith questioned the level service policy under the Circulation Element 3.2 **as the general level of service for roadways** within the Dunnigan Specific Plan. He asked Don Rust when **that policy** was introduced into the draft General Plan or draft EIR. **Response:** Mr. Morrison indicated it was in 2006 **when we drafted the General Plan, the first draft. M. Smith, then questioned, so that policy was in the EIR that was circulated? Response:** David Morrison stated, **there are two different things there, let me expand this out a little bit.** The level of service in all communities is set to E, parts of Woodland and Davis operating at a Level of Service F. They look at level of service by making a greater and efficient use of existing roadway system, this is a very key and central issue of this General Plan, and it's been in there since we first started drafting. The EIR is just an analysis document, if the General Plan is adopted these are the **likely environmental consequences that would occur.**

M. Smith asked does the policy CI 3.1 that was in the draft General Plan and the draft EIR report, state that all roadways and intersections within the unincorporated county maintain a level of service C or better **except** for, and there is a list of **special** roadways that are not required to maintain that level. Unless the road is on that list, all other roads in the county would be required if this policy followed through and was incorporated in the General Plan. **This is the policy that** was included in the **draft** EIR that was circulated for public comment, then after the General Plan is finalized this policy 3.2, which should be behind 3.1, sets Level of Service E as a general level service of roadway operation within the Dunnigan Specific Plan, so all of the roads in Dunnigan would have to be called in this exception in order for this not to be a total contradiction to the other policy that was in the circulated version of the draft EIR. We had many comments in writing submitted on this issue.

Response: D. Morrison stated it goes back to narrow streets and smart growth again. Woodland does not have Level of Service C. If you want to be a city or town, you can't do a level of service C without having eight lane roads.

M. Smith responded you can't do an EIR discussing only this list of roads will be allowed to be developed at less than a level of C, then after you study that issue you come up with a policy that allows all of Dunnigan roads to be developed at a level of service E. That is quite substantial, that's a big difference in the evaluation of an impact that is supposed to be identified and studied in the EIR. **Response:** D. Morrison stated he appreciated that prospective, we feel the EIR is sound **technically** and any general plan is looked at in the context as a whole, not in the context of a specific policy. I feel comfortable with both the environmental analysis and the consistency of the General Plan. He went on to state he hears the concern, he understands it, but he does not necessarily agree with it. If we were to require Dunnigan to be the only urban area within Yolo County that has a level of service C on its roads and none of the other do, then we would be creating a town that would not get support from SACOG or the Attorney General.

M. Smith indicated he was not asking for special consideration. I am just referring to the policy in the EIR and every draft version of the General Plan that he has seen does not contain this 3.2. They only contain a 3.1 which is in direct contradiction to 3.2, I wanted to know when 3.2 was inserted into the General Plan as a policy and if it was inserted in the General Plan prior to this EIR being released how come 3.2 isn't included in this draft EIR and how come 3.2 wasn't studied. **Response:** D. Morrison indicated he would check. He assured us that the concept of level of service E **in Dunnigan** was looked at from the beginning. He would follow up and respond.

Dunnigan Specific Plan: Correction

- Mr. Morrison responded by saying, **Ms. Tschudin** and I were busily reading on the sidelines going through your letter.

Planning Commissioners Update, Correction

- Commissioner Williams and I were the only two that voted to support staff and require full house foundations, the other **5** voted to allow garage foundations only.

CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Williams called for correspondence. No correspondence has been received. He referenced the folder given to committee members this evening which includes a copy of our Standing Rules and the Yolo County by Laws for Advisory Committees for their personal use. He also referenced the information request sheet that needs to be completed and returned to Secretary Kirkland to update our files.

ACTION ITEMS

Request for Comments: Sky High Ranch lot line adjustment.

Chairman Weber referenced the request for comments on a lot line adjustment on a piece of property located south west of Dunnigan. He turned the meeting over to D. Rust.

- D. Rust referenced the map indicating the requested change.
- 7 parcel consisting of 1214 acres, part of a 2500 acre ranch
- Want to separate two parcels, all land under contract in the Williamson Act
- Reason is for estate planning only, not adding or subtracting any property
- Taking a lot and turning 90 degrees in opposite direction
- B. Stucker questioned why this would come to our board for comments if it complies with all the county and Williamson act requirements.
- D. Rust indicated they are requesting a lot line adjustment and the property is close to our area.

Discussion:

- B. Stucker indicated he knew the people, old farming family, just want to move a lot line, no impact
- M. Smith stated there are 2 parcels right now and will be 2 parcels when they are done, the same owners, no impact.

Chairman Weber called for a motion,

Motion by B. Stucker to support the lot line adjustment, Seconded by Vice Chairman Busch. Vote: Yes 12; No 0; Abstain 0; Motion passed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairman Weber opened Public Comments.

Commissioner Williams introduced Barbara Cotter who is on the committee along with some members of our advisory who work to preserve our local historic church.

B. Cotter, Dunnigan Historical Church

- The goal is to preserve the church. Funding comes from our flea markets and donations. Now that there is a congregation in the church we are getting some rent. She indicated the \$3500 per year they get barely covers expenses. There are no extra funds to fix, repair or add to the building. In the past the Dunnigan

Developers Group paid the insurance for 2 years, we also received a grant from the Historical Society back in 2002 of \$2500 as well as private donations. We have been aggressively seeking donations by contacting several organizations that make charitable contributions, I finally contacted David Flores at the Historical Society who referred me to Nate Palmer. I informed Mr. Palmer of our goal to seek funding to sustain the church and asked for assistance.

- B. Cotter went on to say the congregation is moving to Zamora. B. Stucker asked if they plan to remain in Zamora or return and will they continue to pay rent? B. Cotter indicated she was not sure, main reason for the move is there is no restrooms, running water, no place for Sunday school children. She did indicate they have done a lot of work to improve the church.
- B. Stucker clarified the goal is to obtaining funding to improve the church. B. Cotter answered yes, if we could add a building to house Sunday school and provide restrooms this would help.
- Chairman Weber asked when the fund raisers are held. B. Cotter indicated spring and fall. Chairman Weber asked if donation of articles from residents would be helpful for the flea markets. B. Cotter indicated all donations are helpful.
- S. Gooch stated the big problem is there is no water or sewer system. Use of the building is pretty limited because of these issues. Hopefully these services will come with development.
- B. Cotter indicated the park across the street has water, questionable if we could tap in.

Abandoned animals/roosters

- Community resident V. Lovell voiced concern about animals being abandoned, animal services notified, they refused to interact and pick up the animal. Animal services indicated they don't want residents to interfere with abandoned animals. Resident was told not to feed or water the animal.
- Secretary Kirkland questioned D. Rust about the rooster situation; do we have a code enforcement officer? D. Rust stated no. Do we have the Ag Ordinance? D. Rust responded it has not come back from the Sheriff's Dept. What is going to be done about the Rooster situation coming back in the Hardwoods? D. Rust referenced the lack of funding for these issues.
- Secretary Kirkland referenced the letters sent out to specific properties, did you follow up on those letters. D. Rust indicated some problem residents left; there are a couple of homes that animal control will have to handle. We can again survey the Hardwoods to identify the properties with the rooster population and notify those residents. We can only notify and take action on rural residential properties, not ag.

Chairman Weber thanked Don for his work; he feels the community is asking for a follow up on the problem. D. Rust suggested we schedule a time to survey the Hardwoods again and referenced the list that had been previously submitted.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Sub Committees, 2010

Chairman Weber open the discussion on sub committees needed for 2010. He read the list of committee topics that had been in place for 2009, which are drainage, water, community maintenance, roads, safety, incorporation and landscape, Per Commissioner Williams the landscape sub committee was put on hold due to Cal Trans bureaucracy. He was unable to obtain permission to plant trees along the freeway. Chairman Weber asked Commissioner Williams if he had any additional information on the landscape issue. Commissioner Williams indicated he would again contact Cal Trans and attempt to get the necessary permission. Incorporation committee was disbanded at last meeting.

Chairman Weber went through the list of existing sub committees and enlisted discussion from the members on which sub committees to retain.

- Drainage, need to continue to concentrate on this issue.
- Water, comments pros and cons. Keep as informal; question whether this should be incorporated within the Specific Plan sub committee. B. Stucker indicated he could keep the committee informed on the water. M. Smith indicated this committee was started when the ground water ordinance was being developed so we could stay on top of what was going on. Has not seen this ordinance going anywhere. Still a very important issue.
- Safety important; should retain. Gang graffiti an issue.
- Roads should be maintained, roads are an issue and patches did not work, potholes back again, just patched last year.
- Specific Plan committee, Chairman Weber indicated this committee could encompass water, drainage and roads, do we need the individual committee's as listed. Secretary Kirkland indicated the Specific Plan is on the west side of the freeway it does not deal with the east side or the Hardwoods, suggest we leave the existing committees in tact.
- Chairman Weber suggested we keep all of the existing sub committee's and add a new one. He questioned the need for a sub committee to deal with specific plan issues. Secretary Kirkland referenced the comments from the previous meeting to continue to carry this issue until the application has been received.
- B. Stucker confirmed to hold off until official applications has been received.
- Secretary Kirkland referenced the booklet that was put together at the beginning of this plan and suggested the committee revisit the booklet.
- Vice Chairman Busch questioned what the specific plan is going to cover, what are we going to see.
- D. Rust responded by indicating it was not project specific, it is an overview, the analogy they tell me is that is a 40,000 ft view. When you get into details them it becomes project specific. His take on this issue is what we would like to see, versus what the applicant did, versus what actually ends up on the ground. He referenced the information David Morrison presented at the last meeting. He felt setting up a sub committee to work with the county on general concepts it would work is a good idea. Details won't take place until project build out.
- D. Rust referenced the information on the land use plan presented by Keith Fichtner in the newspaper; that is a 40,000 ft view. That does not get down into every detail, but the overall concepts of land use activity where everything will be; he hopes that's what we are looking at. He went on to reference information he looked at today with regards to a light rail station, the General Plan states to designate a piece of property for this station, it doesn't say purchase or build, just set aside a piece of land for this project.

- B. Stucker questioned the presentation of the application the first week in April. Then we provide our comments and views on the specific plan; then will the county reconcile those two.
- D. Rust indicated the county has 30 days to accept or deny the application. Application will depend on the project itself and how it relates to the requirements of the General Plan. Once application received it will be sent to the Dunnigan Advisory committee for review. Time line is minimum 18 months if not longer.

Chairman Weber put out sign up forms for the sub committees, he indicated there was no problem with community members serving on the sub committees; however, the chairman must be an advisory committee member. Forms were placed on the table for signatures.

DUNNIGAN SPECIFIC PLAN

Chairman Weber recognized Don Rust.

D. Rust indicated:

- No formal application has been received; a couple of meetings have been held between applicant and staff, indication is that application should be received by April 2.
- June 2009 applicant asked the Board for permission to work with planning staff on land use concept plans, request was approved. A conceptual culinary plan was developed to work with the staff to see that the plan being proposed is consistent with the General Plan. This was done; we now feel we have it to a point to where hopefully we will see this as part of the application.
- Referenced map presented last year in Sept./Oct., most important is the plan must be consistent with the General Plan.
- The time line; if application is received in April, it's anticipated a 15-18 months time frame if all goes smoothly, could be longer.
- When the first home or business will go in is not known, it really depends on the economy, applicants are looking to get the entitlements and ride the economy out.
- Could take 30 or more years to fully develop.
- Concerns heard by the Planning Commission: biggest concern is water, next was job/housing balance. General Plan is very specific in this area; jobs must be in place in order for the house to continue to be built. Ratio of 1.2 jobs to houses is in the General Plan.
- Another issue is the ag mitigation, applicant is going to take out 2300 acres of land capable of producing ag, they must mitigate for that one to one.
- Other areas of concern are traffic impacts, waste water treatment, drainage; it all has to be worked out.
- D. Rust indicated they had anticipated an application last June when the board gave staff direction to work with the applicant, the applicant indicated they would have an application in Sept./Oct., we are now in February 2010, no application as yet, we are 6 months out, it has slowed the process.

Chairman Weber referenced a previous meeting that led us to believe the details of the application would come down to the color of house and where they were going to put them, now it sounds as if this requirement has relaxed some and the application is a concept about the density of housing somewhere within the Specific Plan area and would be required to do that along with water, drainage and all that other stuff within their application.

D. Rust responded there is a number out there of 7500 new homes, in the 9000 number you have the new homes, existing homes, density bonuses and second dwellings than can be built on some homes, all representing the projected number of 9000 dwellings at build out. The colors symbolize the land use proposals, General Plan states 8 units per acre for low density, 10-20 units for medium and 20+ for high, colors represent the proposed densities for each area on the map. Water, sewer, roads are not all depicted at this time, with regards to schools, he will be attending a meeting in March with Pierce Unified to see if they are okay with the proposed locations of the schools. Still a work in process, he indicated we are still looking at this from a 40,000 ft level, stressed the importance of getting involved, work on the details. If you want to be part of the process, you have to get involved, he referenced our comments to the General Plan, they heard you, you need to participate.

Chairman Weber thanked Don for his comments.

SUBCOMMITTEE ITEMS

No meetings have been held.

PLANNING COMMISSIONER UPDATE

Commissioner Bertolero: no meeting in February; referenced the combined meeting held in January for January/February. Next Planning Commission meeting will be held on March 11. He referenced the following:

- Action Item on road abandonment through tribal housing was continued. Land owner in the area indicated the road accessed his property and objected to the abandonment. Point of reference was a map sent in by the land owner showing his property connected to this road, county map did not indicate this. Six week continuance will allow time for a new survey to determine if resident is blocked from entering his property by this road abandonment.
- Workshop held with Granite Aggregate
- Had election of officers for coming year, Jeff Burton is Chairman for this year.

Commissioner Williams indicated the board would meet as needed.

D. Rust referenced at the meeting on March 11 the staff will bring forward a county wide protocol for any Specific Plans through out the County of Yolo, not the Dunnigan Specific Plan but any specific plan, there are four, Dunnigan, Madison, Elk Horn and Knight Landing. This protocol will depict what the county expects from the applicant.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Approve January 20 meeting minutes
- Finalize formation of Sub Committees for 2010
- Are concepts for Dunnigan Specific Plan

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- Contact D. Rust to survey the Rooster situation in the area along with representative from the Advisory.
- Chairman Weber suggested we come to next meeting with some concepts of what we want to see in the Specific Plan.
- Secretary Kirkland suggested we bring the Dunnigan Specific Plan booklets that were completed by the developers based on our input. We could review the information to be sure we had taken into consideration all the necessary services that we had originally spoke about for Dunnigan.
- Commissioner Bertolero indicated if we don't have action items or business we don't have to hold a meeting, we are only required to hold 4 meetings per year.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

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

Motion by: A. Backhaus, **Seconded by:** S. Mumma; **all in favor.**

Meeting Adjourned: 8:39 pm

Respectfully Submitted
Deanna Kirkland, Secretary
Dunnigan Advisory Committee