



# County of Yolo

## PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

*John Bencomo*  
DIRECTOR

292 West Beamer Street  
Woodland, CA 95695-2598  
(530) 666-8775 FAX (530) 666-8156  
[www.yolocounty.org](http://www.yolocounty.org)

---

---

## YOLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

CHAIR: Jeb Burton  
VICE-CHAIR: Richard Reed  
MEMBERS: Leroy Bertolero; Jeff Merwin; Richard Reed; Keith Williams; Don Winters

---

---

### MINUTES

August 12, 2010

#### ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

1. Chair Burton called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Bertolero.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bertolero, Burton, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters  
MEMBERS ABSENT: Kimball  
STAFF PRESENT: David Morrison, Assistant Director of Planning  
Donald Rust, Principal Planner  
Jeff Anderson, Assistant Planner  
Aundrea Tyler, Office Support Specialist

\*\*\*

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE **JUNE 10, 2010** MEETING.

#### Commission Action

The Minutes of the **June 10, 2010** meeting were approved with no corrections.

MOTION: Bertolero SECOND: Reed  
AYES: Bertolero, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: Burton  
ABSENT: Kimball

\*\*\*

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

None

\*\*\*

5. CORRESPONDENCE

5.1 Publication on Rural Smart Growth

5.2 Dairy Cares progress report

5.3 Climate Action Plan staff report, Attachments 1 and 2.

5.4 Hand written letter from Donna Bayliss Wallace provided during public comment

Chair Burton acknowledged receipt of all correspondence received prior to the meeting and distributed at the beginning of the meeting.

\*\*\*

TIME SET AGENDA

6.1 **2010-016:** Tentative Parcel Map to divide an existing 388-acre parcel (APNs: 055-150-01, -02, and -03; 055-190-01 and -02) into two parcels of approximately 371± and 17± acres each, for the purpose of separating farming operations from future agricultural commercial uses. The project site is located on the east and west sides of County Road 99W, immediately south of County Road 13, near the town of Zamora. The parcel is zoned A-P (Agricultural Preserve) and A-1 (Agricultural General). Approximately 361 acres of the parcel is under Williamson Act contract. A Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project. Owner/Applicant: Jack Wallace Family, LLC (J. Anderson)

Jeff Anderson, Assistant Planner, presented the project, and answered questions from the commission.

Chair Burton opened the public hearing.

Dick Hopman, on behalf of the applicant, stated that there is agreement on all of the requirements, and they would like the commission to approve the request to carry out the terms of a marital agreement. He also requested that he be able to reserve further comment until after Ms. Bayliss speaks.

Donna Bayliss Wallace thanked the commission and said she looks forward to working with them in the future in developing the property discussed. She requested some clarification regarding the boundaries of Parcel 2 in the graphic displayed in the PowerPoint presentation. She explained that they were working on promoting a new type of marketing of agricultural products in distillations, which are from herbs and flowers. She displayed an example and provided written material to the

commission.

Chair Burton closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bertolero said he is familiar with the location as he used to stop at a fruit stand there, and that it is not a practical location to be farmed due to its shape, pesticide restrictions, and dust from the freeway. However, it is a great location for an agricultural commercial use and the site is identified in the 2030 General Plan as future agricultural commercial, so he thinks it should stay in the A-1 (agricultural general) zoning now, and he looks forward to the time when the General Plan is updated to include the new agricultural commercial use.

Vice-Chair Reed concurred with Commissioner Bertolero and asked about Parcel Two, which was questioned by Ms. Bayliss on the graphic in the PowerPoint.

Mr. Anderson explained that the information in the PowerPoint was based on the information in the request of the applicant.

David Morrison further clarified that staff evaluated the request based on the application submitted by the Jack Wallace, LLC, and if they would like to change it, staff would need to reevaluate the application based on the updated information.

Commissioner Winters stated that he did not have much to add to previous comments, but the proposal appears to be a positive project for all parties. With the thorough staff report, he has all the information he needs, and he is in support of the project.

Commissioner Merwin was in agreement with his fellow commissioner's comments, but had concerns about the confusion over the parcel that was questioned by Ms. Bayliss. He felt those questions had not yet been adequately resolved. However, if the Parcel Map reflects the applicant's intentions, then that is what the commission will consider.

Commissioner Williams said it was appropriate to have agricultural commercial at the project location, as it would be very difficult to farm. He also knows of a fruit stand just down the road, so perhaps if the property is zoned agricultural commercial they will have a real agricultural market there.

Chair Burton explained that he is always concerned when he sees nonconforming issues pushed right before things are corrected, but in this situation, it is not an issue he has a problem with, and he is in support of approving the request. The county has wanted the Yolo Store and has pushed for it, and he feels that even after the corrected zoning they would have approved the request. In addition, he apologized for stepping out for a moment as someone had a Brown Act question regarding a document that will be made available to the public

### **Commission Action**

The Planning Commission:

1. **HELD** a public hearing and received comments;
2. **ADOPTED** the Initial Study/Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines (**Attachment C**);
3. **ADOPTED** the proposed Findings (**Attachment D**); and

4. **APPROVED** the tentative Parcel Map (TPM #4982) (**Attachment B**) in accordance with the Conditions of Approval (**Attachment E**).

MOTION: Bertolero      SECOND: Reed  
AYES: Burton, Bertolero, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: Kimball

### **Findings**

Upon due consideration of the facts presented in the staff report and at the public hearing for Zone File #2010-016, the Planning Commission approves the proposed Tentative Parcel Map #4982. In support of this decision, the Planning Commission makes the following findings (*A summary of the evidence to support each FINDING is shown in italics*):

#### **California Environmental Quality Act**

That the proposed Negative Declaration and Initial Study prepared for the project is the appropriate environmental documentation in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines.

*The Initial Study shows that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment.*

*Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines, an environmental evaluation (Initial Study) has been circulated for 30 days for public review and to Responsible Agencies having jurisdiction over the project, with no significant comments noted. The proposed Negative Declaration is the appropriate level of environmental review pursuant to Article 6, Section 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines (**Attachment C**).*

#### **Yolo County General Plan**

That the design of the land division and the development proposed for construction on the parcels to be created by the land division is consistent with the 2030 Yolo Countywide General Plan.

*The subject property is designated as Agriculture in the 2030 Yolo Countywide General Plan. As conditioned, the Tentative Parcel Map is consistent with the policies, goals and objectives of the General Plan. Residential development is not proposed as part of this application.*

#### **Zoning Code**

That the proposed Tentative Parcel Map is consistent with the applicable zoning standards.

*The proposed project will result in two parcels of approximately 371 and 17 acres, respectively. The property is currently one legal parcel; however, five Assessor Parcel Numbers (APN) are associated with the property. The property is separated by County Road 99W. The subject property is currently zoned Agricultural Preserve (A-P) and Agricultural General (A-1). Parcel 1, which is identified in the General Plan as a future agricultural commercial site, will retain the A-1 zoning until the zoning code is amended to include an agricultural commercial zoning classification. The 17-acre parcel (Parcel 1)*

*does not meet the minimum parcel size requirements of 20 acres for A-1 parcels. This is a unique circumstance that has occurred because the zoning code has not yet been updated to reflect the recently adopted General Plan. Staff is currently in the process of updating the zoning code and bringing it into conformance with the General Plan, which will include the creation of an agricultural commercial zoning designation. It is anticipated that this future agricultural commercial zoning designation will have no minimum parcel size (similar to existing Agricultural Industrial [AGI] zone), or a minimum parcel size that is well below the 17-acre size of Parcel 1.*

*Parcel 2 (371 acres) will continue to be split zoned, with approximately 361 acres zoned A-P and 10 acres zoned A-1. The 10-acre A-1 portion of the property is separated from the remainder of the parcel by County Road 99W. The remaining 361 acres of Parcel 2 is enrolled in the Williamson Act. The contract boundary will not be affected by this Parcel Map. Parcel 2 meets the minimum 80-acre size requirement for the A-P zone. The 10-acre A-1 portion of Parcel 2 will remain unchanged and since it is not a separate stand alone parcel, it is not required to meet the minimum size requirement of 20 acres for the A-1 zone.*

### **Subdivision Map Act**

Pursuant to Section 66474 of the Subdivision Map Act, a legislative body of a city or county shall deny approval of a tentative map, or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not required, if it makes any of the following findings:

- a) That the proposed map is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans as specified in Section 65451.

*The proposed Tentative Parcel Map is consistent with the 2030 Yolo Countywide General Plan. The current agricultural use and any future agricultural commercial use are consistent with the Agriculture designation in the General Plan.*

- b) That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans.

*The site has been determined to be suitable for agricultural use based on designations in the 2030 Yolo Countywide General Plan. There are no permanent structures on either of the properties. Parcel 1 is proposed to be used for agricultural commercial purposes in the near future. Parcel 2 will continue to be farmed in seasonal row crops as part of a larger farming operation. The Tentative Parcel Map is consistent with the requirements of the General Plan.*

- c) That the site is not physically suitable for the type of development.

*No new development is proposed as part of this application. Parcel 1 does not have a well and was not considered feasible to farm as part of the larger farming operation. Parcel 1 has been identified in the 2030 Yolo Countywide General Plan as a site suitable for agricultural commercial uses. A new zoning designation will likely be established for Parcel 1 to reflect future agricultural commercial uses. Parcel 2 will remain in agricultural production.*

- d) That the site is not physically suitable for the proposed density or development.

*The proposed Tentative Parcel Map is in an agricultural area of the County and the parcels will retain their agricultural use. Residential development is not proposed as part of the application. The division of the parcel into two parcels of approximately 371 and 17 acres is suitable for the continued use of seasonal row crop production and future agricultural*

*commercial uses.*

- e) That the design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

*An Initial Study has been prepared, and staff has determined that a Negative Declaration is the appropriate level of environmental review pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines. Prior to the recording of the Final Parcel Map, the applicant shall pay or mitigate for the loss of Swainson's hawk habitat according to the Department of Fish and Game Swainson's hawk Guidelines. The proposed creation of one new parcel (and one remaining parcel) will not cause environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish and wildlife or their habitat. The project's Conditions of Approval address Swainson's hawk fees for creation of one additional parcel.*

- f) That the design of the subdivision or type of improvements is likely to cause serious public health problems.

*The proposed design of the requested Tentative Parcel Map will not cause serious health problems. All issues regarding health, safety, and the general welfare of future residents and adjoining landowners will be addressed as described in the Conditions of Approval, by the appropriate regulatory agency prior to recordation of the Final Map, issuance of Building Permit, and/or issuance of Final Occupancy Permit.*

- g) That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of, property within the proposed subdivision. In this connection, the governing body may approve a map if it finds that alternate easements, for access or for use, will be provided, and that these will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by the public. This subsection shall apply only to easements of record or to easements established by judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction and no authority is hereby granted to a legislative body to determine that the public at large has acquired easements for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision.

*Access to the 17-acre parcel (Parcel 1) will continue to be from County Road 99W. Per Caltrans requirements, access to this parcel from County Road 13 shall not be allowed. Access to the 371-acre parcel (Parcel 2) will continue from County Road 13 and County Road 95.*

*The design of the Tentative Parcel Map or the type of improvements required will not conflict with easements acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of, property within the proposed subdivision.*

- h) The design of the subdivision does not provide for, to the extent feasible, future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities.

*The proposed parcels are 17 and 371 acres respectively, providing significant opportunities for future development to incorporate passive or natural heating and cooling feature*

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

### **ON-GOING OR OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

PLANNING DIVISION—PPW (530) 666-8808

1. The project shall be developed in compliance with all adopted Conditions of Approval for Zone File #2010-016. The applicant shall be responsible for all costs associated with implementing the Conditions of Approval as approved by the Yolo County Planning Commission.
2. The Final Parcel Map for the project shall be filed and recorded, at the applicant's expense, with the Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department. The Final Parcel Map shall be recorded within two years from the date of approval by the Yolo County Planning Commission, or the Tentative Parcel Map shall become null and void, without any further action in accordance with the State Subdivision Map Act.
3. The applicant shall pay fees in the amount of \$2,060.25 (\$2,010.25 for state filing fee, plus \$50 Clerk-Recorder processing fee), under Public Resources Code Section 21089, and as defined by Fish and Game Code Section 711.4, at the time of the filing of the Notice of Determination, to cover the cost of review of the environmental document by the California Department of Fish and Game.

CALTRANS DISTRICT 3—(916) 274-0635

4. Access to Parcel 1 shall be from County Road 99W.

COUNTY COUNSEL—(530) 666-8172

5. In accordance with Yolo County Code Section 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 attach, 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 cooperates 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.

6. Failure to comply with the Conditions of Approval as approved by the Yolo County Planning Commission may result in the following actions:
  - non-issuance of future building permits;
  - legal action.

**PRIOR TO FINAL PARCEL MAP APPROVAL:**

PLANNING DIVISION—PPW (530) 666-8808

7. The Parcel Map submitted for recordation shall have the Parcel Map Number (PM #4982) indelibly printed on it. Said PM #4982 shall be prepared with the basis of bearings being the

**Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department**

August 12, 2010

Page 8 of 1

State Plane Coordinate System, North American Datum (NAD 83) pursuant to Article 9, Section 8-1.902(f) of the Yolo County Code.

8. The applicant shall be required to address the potential loss of Swainson's hawk habitat through participation in the Draft Yolo County Habitat Conservation Plan (Yolo County Natural Heritage Program). The applicant shall pay a Swainson's hawk in-lieu mitigation fee for the newly created parcel, for a total of 2.5 acres. The fee is currently set at \$8,660 per acre, and shall be collected for 2.5 acres (\$21,650 total) prior to the recording of the Final Parcel Map.

PUBLIC WORKS—PPW (530) 666-8811

9. To provide adequate right-of-way for a standard rural road width for County Road 95, applicant shall dedicate to the county a five foot wide easement for road and utility purposes on the west side of the existing right-of-way for County Road 95, where necessary to create a total half-street easement of thirty feet along all County Road 95 frontage.
10. To provide adequate right-of-way for a standard rural road width for County Road 13, applicant shall dedicate to the county an additional easement for road and utility purposes on the south side of the existing right-of-way for County Road 13, where necessary to create a total half-street easement of thirty feet along all County Road 13 frontage.

**PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF ANY BUILDING PERMITS:**

BUILDING DIVISION—PPW (530) 666-8775

11. All building plans shall be submitted to the Planning and Public Works Department for review and approval in accordance with County Building Standards prior to the commencement of any construction.
12. The applicant shall pay all appropriate fees prior to the issuance of Building Permits, including but not limited to the Winters Joint Unified School District, Winters Fire District, and County facility fees.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT (530) 666-8646

13. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, well and septic system designs shall be approved by the Environmental Health Department.

\*\*\*

- 6.2 **2009-043:** Review of the proposed Climate Action Plan. The workshop will provide an overview of the progress of the Climate Action Plan project and allow for comments from the general public and other interested parties. The Climate Action Plan is a requirement of the 2030 General Plan, and will ensure compliance with Assembly Bill 32, Senate Bill 375, and other state/federal requirements that are being developed to regulate greenhouse gas emissions throughout the unincorporated areas of Yolo County. Applicant: Yolo County (H. Tschudin/D. Rust)

Donald Rust, Principal Planner, provided a brief overview of the presentation, and introduced the project team.



Heidi Tschudin, Project Planner, from Tschudin Consulting Group, pointed out some of the key points of the Climate Action Plan, along with a brief history of the process.

Honey Walters, Ascent Environmental, walked the commission through the emission's inventory and projections for the Climate Action Plan.

Jeff Henderson, Project Manager for the consulting team from AECOM, reviewed measures and reduction mechanisms that described how the county would work with the overall community to reduce emissions within the individual sectors.

Cully Thomas, AECOM, presented the preliminary performance indicators being considered for agriculture, how measures were determined, and some of the reduction mechanisms.

Mr. Henderson reviewed the energy sector, which included new performance indicators for several sectors, including construction, energy, waste water, transportation, solid waste, water conservation, and adaptation to future climate change.

Mr. Rust concluded the presentation and outlined the procedures that will be taken for adoption of the Climate Action Plan.

Commissioner Merwin commended the Climate Action Plan team on their work and offered some recommendation to consider. He stated he was a little surprised by the high percent of emissions that were attributed to agriculture, but he also understands that many of the things done in agriculture contributes to green house gasses. One concern he shared was that through the process they might be inadvertently throwing the baby out with the bath water. He did not hear any onerous implementations, like restrictions on the types of crops that can be grown, or whether livestock can be kept, but the reality is that a significant portion of agriculture in Yolo County is irrigated agriculture. The project team has taken into account the consumption of energy to pump water, but didn't factor in the fact that if the ground wasn't irrigated, it would grow weeds, and or native plants that would likely be dead during the summer, which is the most critical period of time from a local perspective, because of smog generation. In fact, what is happening now, by growing plants during that period of time, CO<sup>2</sup> is being scrubbed from the atmosphere. Therefore, they aren't actually factoring in that there is a net benefit gained by encouraging the production of irrigated crops, which should be factored in, reducing total net emissions.

Chair Burton opened the public hearing.

Erich Linse, Dunnigan Resident, said that he thinks they need to look at a balance between the General Plan idea of large growth in Dunnigan and putting it where it should be in West Sacramento. The problem raised for West Sacramento was flooding; but anything that is flat in Yolo County generally floods. If they want to look at technology from five hundred years ago, Venice dealt with low elevation by putting piles in the ground and it has lasted them for a thousand years. Instead, the county has chosen to put urban residential development twenty to thirty miles away from where the jobs are concentrated.

Chair Burton closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bertolero commended the work done so far by staff and consultants, and said that there is a big task in front of them. His expertise would be more on the agricultural side, being a farmer for twenty-five years and in consulting for the last twelve years. He spoke about fertilizers, and how they handled irrigation and fertilizing issues from last year, and explained that he came up with an idea on one change in the way they were irrigating, which his growers had been testing for

the last two weeks. Agriculture is looking at new technologies, not only to reduce emissions, but also to survive and make a profit. As for winter crops and rotation, farmers aren't going to grow wheat unless the price goes up, as that is a rotation crop to dry out the ground. As for organic growing, the emissions are increased ten times from the truck hauling all of the manure fertilizer it takes to grow organic tomatoes. In addition, the nitrate level in the soil with the organic fertilizer manure is much more than with commercial, so they need to be very careful that they don't over apply it. Another problem is pesticides. For example, with aphid sprays, organic insecticide does not work as well as conventional insecticide, so there are more applications of the organic insecticide to get the same results. He shared his thoughts on drip systems, and rotation of crops, and offered to assist the team by sharing his experience and ideas.

Vice-Chair Reed thanked the team for their work and explained that the area he is interested in is change management. Staff should be collectively mindful of how they can make it easier for people to adapt to change, through incentives, information sharing, etc. As a result, they can turn this into a benefit for development and make it attractive for people to do business in Yolo County.

Commissioner Williams stated that he was looking forward to further reports in the future.

In addition to his previous comments, Commissioner Merwin said he wanted the group to keep the term CAP Nazis in mind as they are developing the plan. He said one of the biggest sources of stress in a farmer's life right now, is the Nazis, in particular, air Nazis, water Nazis, etc. His point is that incentive based programs are tremendous, and they will be participated in because it makes economic sense. Punitive measures should always be a last resort. Unfortunately, our government has decided that it has to protect us from everything, all the time, and they jump to the punitive because they can charge fees and fines, to fund their programs. Therefore, the county needs to be more creative in how they develop these programs, so that they will embrace and participate in them. Staff should also be wary of the illusion that electric power is the be all and end all. Some electric power is provided by hydroelectric, solar or wind, but a lot of it is generated by natural gas and coal. It is important to be careful of embracing electric technology, because what it does in many cases is pass the environmental problems off to someone else.

Commissioner Winters said it was an interesting presentation and he heard many thoughtful comments from his fellow commissioners. He is excited about Mr. Morrison's comment about Yolo County taking a leadership role.

Chair Burton conveyed his appreciation for the huge project staff was undertaking, and said he realizes that they are set by state and federal mandates, but one thought he had while he was reading it, was that the county is going to produce less emissions because of the type of crops being grown, and he knows that reference is to grapes. It is great because Yolo County has fewer emissions, but food has to be produced somewhere, because people are not eating less. Because we operate in a global context, emission reductions that we realize here may instead just be shifted somewhere else. However, he is glad that Yolo County is leading the way on what is going to be a major issue.

### **Commission Action**

The Planning Commission:

1. **HELD** a public workshop to receive public comments; and
2. **PROVIDED** comments and direction to staff.

\*\*\*

REGULAR AGENDA

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 None

\*\*\*

8. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

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

David Morrison brought the commission up to date on the following:

8.1 Board of Supervisors:

Since the last Planning Commission meeting, the Board of Supervisors has taken the following actions:

- a. Approval of the recommendation of the Planning Commission to amend the housing agreement on the River's Edge subdivision in Knights Landing to recharacterize the affordable housing requirements
- b. Staff was given direction to make two General Plan amendments. The first was to change the Cache Creek Area Plan to indicate that the Technical Advisory Committee is not a permanent standing committee appointed by the Board of Supervisors. The second was to change the General Plan to include information that is required by state law regarding flooding, but was inadvertently left out of the General Plan
- c. Approval of the final map for the Patwin Terrace Subdivision west of Davis;
- d. Approval for a grant to move forward on an infrastructure study done by the Wes Ervin, Economic Development Manager;
- e. Approved the submittal of comments on the rerelease of the Tribal Environmental Impact Report for the proposed expansion of the Cache Creek Casino; and
- f. Continuation of the Results Radio project at the landfill until mid-September to allow evaluation of issues regarding potential bird strikes

8.2 Budget and Personnel

- a. The Planning and Public Works Department lost two employees to layoffs, including the assistant chief building official and the chief assistant director. Both of those employees have found positions in other government agencies.

8.3 In the Community

- a. There has been no further word on the Dunnigan Specific Plan in regards to whether or not they will be moving forward;
- b. In Capay Valley, the main issue is road abandonments. In the last year five road abandonment applications were received, all of which were located in the Capay Valley. Most requests are related to the cessation of road maintenance on those roads;
- c. In Clarksburg, the Delta Stewardship Council has released their draft procedures, which will significantly change how the county does planning in the Delta. One of the biggest changes would be that the Delta Stewardship Council's authority will extend to the secondary zone. Previously, the Delta Protection Commission's authority only extended to the primary zone;
- d. In Knights Landing the proposal for the cell tower is being moved to take it further away from the existing residential neighborhoods; and
- e. In Esparto, the two biggest issues are (1) the proposal for the Madison Esparto County Service Area (MERCOSA) to start studying the idea of taking over the local parks system; and (2) a nail and hair salon that was received a lot of controversy due to the abundant use of red neon in its signage. It is an ongoing enforcement issue, which will be resolved within the next two or three weeks, as the owner has been working diligently to bring her business into compliance.

\*\*\*

9. 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.

- A. Commissioner Winters had nothing to report.
- B. Commissioner Merwin reported his attendance at the Yolo County Farm Bureau meeting and a town hall forum in Clarksburg put on by Mike Thomson. He has also been watching the Bogle Winery project as it proceeds.
- C. Commissioner Williams reported his attendance at a meeting, along with Erich Linse of the Dunnigan Citizens' Advisory Committee regarding Sacramento Valley History, which included information on an Ark Flood, and he isn't sure if FEMA has covered a flood of that extent. He also attended citizens' advisory committee meetings in Knights Landing, Capay Valley.
- D. Vice-Chair Reed had no report as he was on vacation.
- E. Commissioner Bertolero reported his attendance at citizens' advisory committee meetings in Madison and Dunnigan. Unfortunately, many of the advisory committee meetings were cancelled due to a lack of projects. He had a tenth grandchild added to

his family.

- F. Chair Burton reported that he had been involved in some West Sacramento related functions, but spent the majority of the last two months on vacation.

\*\*\*

## 10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

The opportunity for commission members to request that an item be placed on a future agenda for discussion. No discussion by other commission members will occur except for clarifying questions.

- 10.1 Proposed Mining and Reclamation Plan
- 10.2 Annual Mining Report
- 10.3 Cell Tower Use Permit in Knights Landing
- 10.4 Recommendations on several chapters of the Zoning Code, including the Administrative Chapter and CEQA Guidelines.
- 10.5 Final Climate Action Plan
- 10.6 Expansion of the Unitarian Church in Davis
- 10.7 Possible Appeal for the Spence Trucking project
- 10.8 Discussion by Regina Espinosa, County Service Area Manager, regarding water systems in North Davis Meadows

\*\*\*

## 11. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission was adjourned at 10:47 a.m. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is September 09, 2010, in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers.

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 the 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,

David Morrison, Assistant Director  
Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department