



County of Yolo

John Bencomo
DIRECTOR

PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695-2598
(530) 666-8775 FAX (530) 666-8156
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

JANUARY 13, 2011

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

1. Chair Burton called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Merwin.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Burton, Bertolero, Kimball, Merwin, Reed, Williams, and Winters
MEMBERS ABSENT: None
STAFF PRESENT: David Morrison, Assistant Director of Planning
Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner
Philip Pogledich, Senior Deputy County Counsel
Aundrea Tyler, Office Support Specialist

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF THE **DECEMBER 09, 2010** MEETING.

Commission Action

The Minutes of the **December 09, 2011** meeting were approved with the following corrections.

- A. Page 5, paragraph four, correct Commissioner Bertolero's comment as follows:

Commissioner Bertolero asked who determines what is normal ~~is determined~~ in the local CEQA Guidelines.

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

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

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 Letter from Frank Sieferman Sr. regarding the Climate Action Plan

5.2 Memo from John Swann regarding the Climate Action Plan

5.3 Memorandum in packet from Eric Parfrey regarding Planning Division applications

5.4 Letter from Francis Knight regarding the Solar Ordinance

5.5 Article from Stanford University News titled "High Yield agriculture slows pace of global warming, say Stanford researchers", shared by Commissioner Merwin.

5.6 Packet from Erich Linse regarding the Climate Action Plan.

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 **ZF #2009-043:** Recommendation for the proposed Climate Action Plan and amendment to the 2030 Yolo Countywide General Plan. The hearing will provide an overview of the Draft Climate Action Plan, as well as those proposed changes to General Plan policies and actions needed to reflect the Climate Action Plan. An opportunity for comments from the general public and other interested parties will be provided. 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. Morrison)

David Morrison, Assistant Director of Planning Services, provided a brief introduction and explained that the Climate Action Plan (CAP) was started by the county last March. The reasons for the CAP are numerous. There are several pieces of State legislation that require the preparation of the CAP, including, Assembly Bill 32, Climate Change Scoping Plan, Governor's Executive Order S-3-05, Senate Bill 375, and Senate Bill 97. Yolo County has also been very active in this arena, going back to

to 1982 with the adoption of the Energy Element. In recent years, Yolo County adopted the Cool Counties initiative, making it one of the founding thirteen counties across the nation to voluntarily pledge to reduce their greenhouse gasses to 80% below 1990 levels by the year 2050. In addition, in the 2030 General Plan there are 300 policies and/or actions that deal directly or indirectly with climate change.

There have been ongoing discussions regarding the CAP with the State Attorney General's Office, which has been involved in several actions against counties and cities for not preparing climate action plans, including Riverside, Stockton, and Fremont. Yolo County wanted to ensure that in developing its General Plan, they were not going to be penalized by the Attorney General's Office for not including a Climate Action Plan as part of its General Plan. To address the expectations of the Attorney General's office, the county had pledged to ensure that the Climate Action Plan was prepared as soon as the General Plan was completed. If the need for a CAP were based solely on the science, the issues raised by opponents would be addressed in more detail. However, the county has a clear mandate from the state to move forward with the CAP.

Heidi Tschudin, Project Planner, from Tschudin Consulting Group, provided background information, went over each emission sector, explained how data was collected, defined the target goals and measurements used, and answered questions from the commission.

Commissioner Kimball asked about how and if they were accounting for wetlands.

Mr. Morrison explained the process for the accounting of wetlands. They are generally considered a net contributor to greenhouse gas, because of the methane gas they release. While there are some studies of the greenhouse gas emissions created by wetlands, most research has been done in the wet eastern United States. Little is known about freshwater wetlands in the arid western US. There is not an accepted methodology at the state level concerning wetlands; therefore the CAP has identified them, as an issue where more work needs to be done it will be included in future revisions to the CAP when incorporated into accepted state models.

Ms. Tschudin added that it has not been accounted for in the statewide emissions numbers or Yolo County's emissions numbers.

Commissioner Reed asked what the penalty would be from the State if the 2020 target is not met.

Mr. Morrison replied that possible legal action could be taken against the County because of noncompliance with the General Plan or the Environmental Impact Report.

Ms. Tschudin added that no penalties have been established at this time.

Commissioner Merwin stated we are proactive in what we are doing, including the agricultural sector to the effect that what is being attempted is literally groundbreaking. He asked if they had CO₂ equivalent data on a per acre basis comparing agricultural or open space land to urbanized areas on an acre per acre basis.

Ms. Tschudin responded with examples used that were comparable to the comparison made by Commissioner Merwin.

Commissioner Merwin specified that he was looking for a generic number for agricultural land compared to a generic number for urbanized land. He explained that he attended a presentation given by Dr. Louise Jackson, who is doing innovative case studies and is in the process of preparing surveys

surveys for farmers to help determine more specifically, what the baselines were in 1990 for agriculture versus what is being done now. The consensus in the room was that agriculture has already done significant things that aren't noted anywhere because there isn't any data to support its benefits.

Ms. Tschudin said that some of that information was presented to the commission in earlier workshops. The reason that public outreach focused on the agricultural sector was that the existing methods for calculating agricultural emissions did not account for many of the actual practices that have been in effect in Yolo County for a long time. As a result, the Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) presented in the CAP are much lower than those estimated in the General Plan, particularly in the agricultural sector. That is because they modified the analysis to account for Yolo County's specific conditions.

Commissioner Merwin said that where he is heading with this, is that using the available data, it can be successfully argued that Yolo County has in fact, been focused on reducing GHG emissions since 1990 by preserving and enhancing agriculture.

Commissioner Merwin pointed out the pie chart on page four of the executive summary that displayed agriculture as being 48% of the total, and stated that a similar chart needs to be placed right beside it for perspective. The new chart would show the countywide percentages found in Table A-6, on page A-15. The chart is not intended to relieve agriculture's responsibility, but rather illustrate a different perspective. County lines are not drawn vertically; we all breathe air that comes and goes from elsewhere. As such, he would like to see greenhouse gas emissions compared regionally. Including the major cities that are adjacent to Yolo County would show agriculture's relative contribution compared to urban uses. It is all a matter of perspective, and because Yolo County is already doing groundbreaking research for agriculture, and trying to be reasonable and rational about farming, even though it isn't mandated, a broader perspective needs to be included. Without this information, people in the future that read the document will look at that pie chart and get the misimpression that agriculture is the major cause of greenhouse gasses. If other entities take a similar approach, without the regional perspective, it may result in the farm industry being regulated out of existence.

Mr. Morrison responded that the CAP documents how the agricultural sector has already responded, not as a result of any political or environmental intentions, but because it makes economic sense. There is a goal in the CAP to reduce fertilization by twenty-five percent, but since 1990, the industry has already achieved 19 percent of the reduction already. Similarly, there has already been some movement to replace low horsepower irrigation pumps with solar, especially those located far away from existing electrical lines. All of that has been acknowledged and incorporated into the document. All they can do is plan for the unincorporated area of Yolo County, but due to the sheer geographic size of agriculture, compared to urban areas; it appears that farming has a much greater impact.

Commissioner Merwin explained the importance of including an agricultural perspective in the document and making it clear, so that the information in the CAP isn't misperceived by others.

Ms. Tschudin said that his points were good. This issue was made well in the General Plan, but wasn't carried over as succinctly into the CAO because it is an implementation document. Staff will make the recommended changes.

Commissioner Kimball said that the introduction that Mr. Morrison provided today was exactly what she would like to see included in the executive summary. Many people will just read the executive summary and will not see the more layered discussion in the main document. It's not that the agricultural

agricultural perspective hasn't been incorporated into the thinking behind the CAP; it just wasn't written into the text. Since the CAP is being held up as a model, we want to make sure that it accurately represents the county's attitude towards farming.

Mr. Morrison replied that they would do that.

Commissioner Merwin shared an article from Stanford University News about the benefits to climate change from intensive agriculture. In addition, when he attended the California Farm Bureau Federation Annual Meeting, President Paul Wanger cited an aggregate number for California Agriculture that was inclusive of dairy and open field crops and tree crops. Commissioner Merwin will obtain that information and provide it to Ms. Tschudin, and Mr. Morrison.

Ms. Tschudin turned the presentation over to Mr. Henderson.

Jeff Henderson, Project Manager for the consulting team from AECOM, walked through the 15 primary measures in the Climate Action Plan.

Commissioner Kimball requested that she be allowed to assist in regards to the hedgerow and riparian numbers, as they are currently working on several projects. She also wanted to see the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service included as the agency that pays for the majority of the projects through the Farm Bill and other programs.

Mr. Morrison clarified that Commissioner Kimball wanted to see slough restoration among others included as part of a progress indicator for that measure.

Commissioner Kimball confirmed that it was her request, and she will send suggested language to be integrated into the document where feasible.

Mr. Henderson continued his presentation of the different measures.

Chair Burton opened the public hearing.

John Swann, Owner of Swann Electric Bicycles, read from the statement he submitted to the Planning Commission regarding long-term transportation and the restriction of electric bicycles in bike lanes.

Erich Linse provided a packet from a variety of sources regarding climate change and global warming, which he referenced to the commission.

Frank Siefertman Sr, representative of the Yolo County Landowners Association, read the group's mission statement, and read from the letter he provided to the commission regarding the Climate Action Plan. He also complimented Commissioner Merwin on his explanations and representation of agriculture.

Chair Burton closed the public hearing.

Chair Burton called a five-minute recess.

Ms. Tschudin continued the presentation of the Climate Action Plan, and spoke of implementation and monitoring procedures. Staff will keep track of the reductions on a project-by-project basis, using the carbon calculator. That information will be reported back to the Planning Commission and the Board of

the Board of Supervisors every two years, which will provide an indicator as to the success of the CAP implementation. The data will also indicate whether the 2020 target and later goals are being met. Every five years, the greenhouse gas inventories will be recalculated to make sure that both they and the projections are accurate. The updated inventories can also take into account any changed conditions or advances in science and/or methodology.

Ms. Tschudin further discussed assumptions regarding the CEQA compliance of the CAP. The 2030 Yolo County General Plan fully anticipated both preparation of the CAP and all items within it. The General Plan also directed that the interim CEQA thresholds be revisited when the CAP was approved. Those CEQA thresholds state that projects could move forward in the interim period if they could prove that there would be no net increase in Greenhouse Gas Emissions. What the CAP now proposes, in alignment with state law and policies within the General Plan, is that the actual targets and goals each project is required to achieve would be lower than its existing conditions. CEQA measures impacts based on existing conditions, so that the thresholds in the CAP are actually lower by design and by definition. That reinforced the county's ability to rely on the 2030 Yolo County General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for adoption of the CAP.

Additionally, future projects will be able to continue to rely on the cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions analysis that is in the General Plan EIR, so long as the projects are consistent with the General Plan and the Climate Action Plan. This will make CEQA much less expensive for applicants and will streamline the process for projects. Therefore, staff's recommendation to the Planning Commission is that they rely on the General Plan EIR, which was certified and adopted on November 10, 2009, for the purposes of showing compliance for the adoption of the CAP. This includes whatever modifications the commission feels are appropriate. She explained that none of the actions taken today are final actions, but rather recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. The CAP is tentatively scheduled to be heard by the Board of Supervisors on February 1, 2011.

Mr. Morrison followed up on Commissioner Merwin's comments from earlier regarding comparison of agriculture and urban areas and indicated that Table A-4, on page A-9 of the Appendix in the Climate Action Plan shows a range of crop emissions. The highest emissions are rice at 1.4 metric tons per acre. It only looks at the crop itself, not the emissions for harvesting and commute of the farm workers. A preliminary estimate of the emissions for an acre of developed urban land is about 30 tons per acre, perhaps a bit higher. Therefore, as a comparison, urban uses are probably about 30 times higher than farming, on an acre for acre basis.

Chair Burton asked the commission if they had any further questions for staff.

Commissioner Kimball made a recommendation to include the percentage of the total in parenthesis in the boxes that show the total metric tons of emissions under the 2020 and 2030 GHG Reduction Potential. It would reinforce the perspective of agriculture's relative contributions and would help the reader to more easily compare numbers.

Chair Burton reopened public comment.

Chair Burton acknowledged the letter submitted by Vicki Murphy regarding the Climate Action Plan, as she had to depart prior to providing her testimony.

Chair Burton closed public comment.

Chair Burton asked other commissioners for comments and recommendations regarding the Climate Action Plan

Commissioner Bertolero said we have to do something to comply with all the regulations and laws. On that basis, he thinks the document today is good and that the Commission has recommended several improvements. He thinks that overall, the document is pretty well done, given what is known at this time. The future is speculative and more studies are needed. We don't know what is going to happen, but there is a mechanism in the Climate Action Plan to make those adjustments as we go.

Vice-Chair Reed said that they have received many comments from people that question the basis of climate change and the science; however, we are not here to debate the underlying issue, we are focusing on the plan as we should. He recommended making the point more prominently in the Introduction Chapter, that Yolo County is paying a price for its past success in preserving agriculture and thwarting sprawl, which makes it more difficult for us to achieve the State mandated targets. Additionally, he would like to see the Introduction include the reworking, rephrasing, or context setting that Commissioner Merwin spoke of earlier. He also read that the Climate Action Plan will be updated as the science changes in the years ahead and it is important to point that out and make it clear.

Further recommendations from the commission are as follows:

1. Page iv -- (Commissioner Merwin) Add a pie chart showing the information in Table A-6 on p. A-15 and insert it into the Executive Summary on p. iv. This needs to be part of an overall rewrite for the Intro Chapter that provides perspective on the relative contribution of agriculture to GHG within the region. Because the CAP only shows the unincorporated area, it implies a disproportionate responsibility for agriculture's contributions to GHG emissions.

Include a direct comparison between the average GHG emissions from an acre of farmland and from an acre of developed land. This is an important point to illustrate the significant contributions made by Yolo County to GHG reduction by not developing. Farming cleans more air than it pollutes by a 3:1 or 4:1 ratio. The message needs to be that Yolo County is not the problem, but the solution to regional climate change.

2. Page 35 -- (Commissioner Kimball) Include sloughs and other types of restoration in Measure A-6. The measure shouldn't be limited to just hedgerows and riparian forests, but should be expanded to include other types of re-vegetation projects.
3. Page 37 -- (Commissioner Bertolero) Mention in the Supporting Measures that large retail buyers and large buyers of produce that serve the retail buyers are already requiring growers to carry out sustainable farm practices, such as conservation tillage, so that it can be a part of their advertising and marketing.
4. Page 30 -- (Commissioner Kimball) Modify the inset boxes throughout this chapter (such as the one on this page) for each measure to show the proportional contribution of the measure to achieving the 2020 target and 2030 goal.
5. Page i -- (Vice-Chair Reed) Add language from staff report (wherever appropriate in Executive Summary) that describes why Yolo County is at a disadvantage in making reductions as compared to other jurisdictions for precisely the reason that we have always restricted and controlled growth. Also add language (where appropriate) that emphasizes that document is intended to be modified as necessary to reflect new information, better accounting for reductions, and new technologies._

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

January 13, 2011

Page 8 of 13

6. After Page 124 -- (Commissioner Williams) Add a glossary and acronyms page to assist lay readers through the extensive technical jargon in the document.
7. Page 39 -- (Commissioner Bertolero) Modify the discussion of drip irrigation. It does not save water, it actually uses the same amount, but it does result in increased yield, which allows you to use fewer acres for same crop thus lowering need for all other inputs (land, fertilizer, fuel, water, etc.)
8. Page 16-18 -- (Commissioner Bertolero) The CAP needs to discuss the implications if the State doesn't fulfill its anticipated reductions as shown on Tables 2-2 and 2-3.
9. Page 2 -- (Commissioner Merwin) The discussion to be inserted in the Executive Summary regarding the larger context for agriculture in the region should also be pulled into the Introduction chapter.
10. Page 28 -- (Commissioner Merwin) The discussion to be inserted in the Executive Summary regarding the larger context for agriculture in the region should also be pulled into the Agriculture Measures chapter.
11. Page 38 -- (Commissioner Kimball) Discuss the benefits of pulling more local processing into Yolo County, which would reduce long truck trips to move raw product to the processing plant and then back to Yolo County for distribution.
12. Page 44 -- (Chair Burton) Change the bus icon used in the Transportation section. Given Yolo County's focus on bicycles and its lack of busses, a bicycle logo would be more appropriate for the Transportation Chapter than the bus logo.
13. Page 61 -- (Chair Burton) Expand measure E-4 to describe other types of alternative energy, such as heat capture and anaerobic organic waste digesters. The latter technology is being developed here in Yolo County and should be highlighted.
14. Page 85 -- (Commissioner Bertolero) Clarify the discussion of Adaptation on page 85. How can there be an increased risk of wildfires during drought? If there is no rainfall, then the vegetation fuel doesn't grow that creates the wildfire potential.
15. Page 80 -- (Commissioner Kimball) Add a reference to the County Design Guidelines, which support low-impact development methods, such as passive drainage.
16. Page 74 -- (Chair Burton) Add a caption to this picture to explain what it is.
17. Page D-2 -- (Commissioner Winters) Clarify/verify page D-2 of the appendices. Several of the numbers referenced appear to refer to thousands of dollars and are not shown as such.
18. Page 27 -- (Commissioner Merwin) Clarify that agricultural measures are intended to be voluntary.

Vice-Chair Reed made a motion to approve the recommended actions and recommendations from the Planning Commission

Commission Action

The Planning Commission recommends the Board of Supervisors:

1. **HOLD** a public hearing to receive public testimony and take final action on the Yolo County Climate Action Plan (CAP) (see Attachment 1);
2. **RECOMMEND** adoption of a resolution adopting the CAP (Public Review Draft dated December 17, 2010) to the Board of Supervisors (see Attachment 2);
3. **RECOMMEND** reliance upon the General Plan EIR (SCH#2008102034) certified November 10, 2009, Resolution No. 09-189 for compliance with the CEQA for these actions; and
4. **DIRECT** staff to transmit the Planning Commission's actions to the Board of Supervisors.

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

WORKSHOP (no action)

- 6.2 **ZF# 2010-005:** Workshop (no formal action) on the proposed Small and Large Solar Facilities Ordinance, an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, adding Section 8-2.2419 to Chapter 2, of Title 8 of the County Code. Owner/Applicant: Yolo County (E. Parfrey)

Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner, presented the ordinance and answered questions from the commission.

Commissioner Bertolero had questions about the different sizes of solar projects. He suggested that they should include a new category that would provide additional review between 0.5 MW and 1.5 MW.

There was some discussion regarding the compatibility of solar facilities on Williamson Act land.

Commissioner Merwin recommended that the term "solar farms" be replaced with "solar development."

Commissioner Merwin encouraged them to continue using the term "prime farmland," because prime farmland can also apply to Class II and Class III soil, and if they remove the prime farmland designation, then all of a sudden you have opened up all of the Clarksburg area to solar development.

Mr. Morrison explained that the location of most solar facilities would be constrained through the need to locate in close proximity to existing substations that connect to transmission lines with the capacity to transmit new power.

Chair Burton opened the public hearing.

Charles Hoes commented on the setback on agricultural applications. As an example, having enough panels to run a pump would require around one hundred panels, which could be run on a fence line so that they are off the productive ag land. However, if there are setbacks, then they have to place the panels right in the farmland. Therefore, the setback requirements need to be changed. Also, with regards to the need for new transmission lines and substations, there are currently systems permitted in California that are Giga Watt size, and they have no problems putting in the improvements for those. He thinks there should be an emphasis on facilities matched to local uses, as opposed to big facilities that sell or move power to distant places.

Jason Steinberg on behalf of Dean Newberry, made a comment that Mr. Newberry is studying using ag hay barn rooftops in West Sacramento and throughout Yolo County as locations for solar panels that aren't being used for anything rather, than using actual ag land. Such an arrangement could be a benefit for all parties.

Mitch Sears, City of Davis, Manager of the City Sustainability Program, said that he is looking at the issues from different standpoints. He wanted to let the commission know that the City held a workshop where they invited the County Ag Commissioner as well as experts from the solar industry because the City is looking at the possibility of developing community scale solar farms on some City owned property within the vicinity. He thinks it is worthwhile to look at the very distributed application of renewable energy (housetop), but what they are looking at is the need for a whole scale shift in how they produce energy and consume it. City of Davis is looking in terms of rooftop, but also the potential need for doing larger scale renewable energy projects within the County. They are supportive of the County taking a proactive approach and want to make sure that the City goes into it with their eyes wide open for the full range of installations, so they are there to work with County staff, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Chair Burton closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bertolero addressed shading concerns that may erupt between neighbors and the need for second meters for those installing solar panels if they were going to sell power back to the utility.

Mr. Morrison clarified that issues between neighbors regarding shading would be a civil matter between the landowners.

Commissioner Bertolero said he sees problems with developing huge solar fields if a large percentage of the property remains in agriculture, but that productive farmland must be put into grass. When it comes down to the staff recommendation, it says "incorporate much of the language" and he feels it should say, "incorporate all of the language" in these specific recommendations from the DOC report.

Commissioner Bertolero reiterated his desire to see the three designations for solar project size to be increased to include another classification. Additionally, he would like to see the definition of prime ag lands tightened up, and the setback requirements reviewed. His recommendation is that if they are going to allow the panels, they should be installed as tight together as possible, use up the smallest amount of land as possible, and then concentrate farming on the best soils in the remainder of the parcel.

Commissioner Kimball agreed with Commissioner Bertolero that they should go with high-density solar development rather than dispersed solar farms. She thanked Commissioner Bertolero and others, who have given a lot of time and thought into the ordinance. She added that there would always be

always be someone unhappy in any regulatory dispute, and there will always be complaints and problems, so she feels very strongly about putting a sunset clause on the ordinance.

Vice-Chair Reed acknowledged the letter from Ms. Knight from Solar Power, and he hopes that staff will consider the setback issue. Ms. Knight's letter also pointed out the per megawatt fee, and it is an interesting philosophical point. Additionally he concurred with Commissioner Bertolero's points on the high-density solar development. He believes that we can't solve the problem of renewable energy by taking out prime farmland.

Commissioner Williams said his thoughts are in connection with Commissioner Kimball's about just looking at acreage. Perhaps solar panels are already at the maximum efficiency of what can be produced, but if there was a possibility of a significant improvement in their efficiency then perhaps they should look at acreage rather than the amount of power they generate.

Commissioner Merwin said Mr. Parfrey did a good job of initiating the process and obviously, put a lot of hard thinking into it. He hoped that the commission comments would be helpful.

Commissioner Winters said the draft is a good solid starting point and he thinks it is worth discussing potential mitigation for habitat loss and loss of farmland. As Vice-Chair Reed pointed out, they should not discourage the development of solar energy because it is one of the waves of the future, but it needs to be balanced with the potential loss of good farmland.

Commissioner Bertolero asked about dealing with some language in the portion of the County for the flood plain.

Mr. Morrison said that they would be required to comply with all FEMA and building code requirements.

Chair Burton said the draft ordinance is well written and a good start. He thanked Mr. Parfrey for all of his hard work.

Commission Action

That the Planning Commission:

1. Hold a public workshop hearing, consider public comments, and give further direction to staff regarding the concepts proposed for the Small, Medium, and Large Solar Facilities Ordinance; and
2. Return the item to the Commission at a future hearing for recommendations on the revised ordinance.

REGULAR AGENDA

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

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.

8.1 Staffing changes

- A. The Senior Building Inspector position was filled by Robert Flores.
- B. Within the Planning Services Division, Stephanie Cormier was promoted from Associate Planner to Senior Planner, and Jeff Anderson was promoted from Assistant Planner to Associate Planner.

8.2 Community

- A. Updated the 2010 housing statistics.

8.3 Board of Supervisors

- A. Approved a revision/correction to the Ag Cluster Housing Ordinance.
- B. Reappointed Mary Kimball to the Planning Commission for another 4-year term
- C. Reached an agreement with the Tsakopoulos Tri-City group about Conaway Ranch

8.4 General Plan

- A. SACOG awarded Yolo County the Local Vision Award for the 2030 General Plan.
- B. The Sacramento Chapter of the American Planning Association awarded the 2030 General Plan with the award for comprehensive planning in small jurisdictions.

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 Bertolero explained that there were not any advisory committee meetings; therefore, he did not attend any. He is currently working with the CCPCA to host the spring conference in April or May and he is leaning towards working something out at the Sugar Mill with a tour at Bogle Winery and Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area with a theme of the Climate Action Plan.
- B. Commissioner Kimball had nothing to report.

- C. Vice-Chair Reed had nothing to report.
- D. Chair Burton had nothing to report.
- E. Commissioner Williams had nothing to report.
- F. Commissioner Merwin reported his attendance at the Yolo County Farm Bureau, and a conference held at the Yolo County Farm Bureau office hosted by Dr. Louise Jackson from UC Davis, regarding the climate survey for agriculture.
- G. Commissioner Winters congratulated Commissioner Kimball on her reappointment to the Planning Commission, and explained that he will not be reappointed to the District 2 seat. With the open availability of the At-Large position, however, he may still have an opportunity to continue to serve.

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 Draft chapters to the Zoning Code

10.2 General Plan Amendments regarding the CAP and flooding.

10.3 Park Winters Use Permit

11. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission was adjourned at 1:29 p.m. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Yolo County Planning Commission is February 10, 2011, 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