

ESPARTO CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
09/18/12

Attending: Colleen Fescenmeyer, Melissa Jordan, Pat Harrison, John Hulsman Jr,
Giacomo Moris, Patrick Scribner.

Absent:

MEETING ADMINISTRATION

- 1) Call to order at 07:12 pm by Chair Fescenmeyer.
- 2) Agenda:
 - a) **Motion** to approve agenda by M. Jordan, Second by P. Harrison. Vote: all in favor, none opposed.
- 3) Minutes:
 - a) Minutes for August sent out yesterday. Need time to review.
 - b) **Motion** by G. Moris to postpone approval until October, Second by P. Scribner. Vote: All in favor, none opposed.
- 4) Correspondence & Announcements:
 - a) G. Moris introduced Nancy Pennebaker, the new Executive Director of Capay Valley Vision.
 - b) C. Fescenmeyer announced an event to help pay for Magnum's surgery (police dog injured in an arson case). Saturday at 7:00pm at Free Heart Farm – tickets at the feed store.
 - c) P. Harrison – Lions club: German Shepard rescue of N. Cal (celebrated first year anniversary). Program starts after dinner 7:30 PM at the VFW this Thursday. Three pups will be there.
 - d) P. Scribner - Tomorrow night is the EHS FFA ag booster meeting at the Ag dept. at 6:30 PM.
 - e) M. Jordan - Water Board meeting is tomorrow night at 7:30pm. In 1968-9 well #4 was drilled but produces sand so it has not been productive. Introducing a stainless steel strainer may be a solution. Could add 300 GPM for Esparto at the cost of only a test well.

PUBLIC FORUM

- 5) Public Requests

- a) Keith Williams (Planning Commissioner) – Yolo County DA presented “Fraudline” targeted at seniors. Clever frauds are out there and there have been a number of robberies in Dunnigan.

6) County Update

- a) Jeff Anderson apologized to C. Fescenmeyer that he was unable to be here tonight. Send him an e-mail with any questions.

7) Action Items

a) Finalize Crosswalk Letter

- i) Funds not transferred yet to County Administrators Office so we should hold off on the letter. How much longer should we wait? G. Moris to consult Sue and Nancy at CVV for expediting.
- ii) Get exact dates for accidents (3 including Gabe). Barry Burns?
- iii) School back in session should be a driver for expediting.

b) Park Development Fees

- i) C. Fescenmeyer read from her e-mail correspondence with David Morrison. (see appendix).
- ii) G. Moris recognized and thanked C. Fescenmeyers efforts to get the data, something the ECAC has tried to get for years.

c) Zoning Code Update

- i) M. Jordan – why no chickens unless you have half an acre?
- ii) M. Jordan – large number of pages is costly and difficult to print for some.
- iii) C. Fescenmeyer – no code enforcement.
- iv) G. Moris – maps? – those are coming later.
- v) Planning Commission’s next meeting is 10/11/12.
- vi) G. Moris – event facilities seem too impactful to neighborhoods in residential zoning. For example, something like the fireworks at the Stephens – it would be nice to be noticed for that kind of event.
- vii) G. Moris – is there an inconsistency/error on second unit size – no limit per table 8-2.506 or 2500 sf per table 8-2.505?

viii) J. Hulsman comments:

- (1) Farm labor camp is allowed in all zones except R-L – why not R-L?
- (2) Page 2 encourages mixed uses, but that is not reflected in the tables.
- (3) Page 6 – Ag processing is limited – Not allowed anywhere but RR-5.
- (4) Kennels and animal boarding in RR-5 only, but it seems that they could work in smaller parcels.
- (5) Outdoor kitchen – why not in R-M? Excessive requirements around the use of it – why is this even controlled?
- (6) Solar arrays left out of the table 8-2.504, but are in table 8-2.506.
- (7) Should clarify that setbacks apply to buildings. The context is confusing and might be interpreted as a setback for yard features (like front lawn).
- (8) Barn office can have a toilet and shower, but a barn without an office can only have a toilet - you might want or need a shower for safety purposes.

- ix) G. Moris – Page 15 specifies fencing to keep all animals in except domestic dogs and cats. His experience is that loose dogs are the most trouble, especially for livestock like sheep.
- x) P. Scribner – overall it's OK, but seems to be much inconsistency in the write up.
- xi) G. Moris suggested we draft a letter collecting comments with some opinions expressed:
 - (1) General sense of controlling more than needs to be controlled.
 - (2) Cite errors and inconsistencies.
- xii) J. Hulsman – Local commercial – max allowable 40,000 sf. seems very big. Table 8-604 uses “large” for retail larger than 10,000 sf.
- xiii) P. Scribner – have two sections: opinions and inconsistencies and have examples for both.
- xiv) J. Hulsman noted that Commercial can become multifamily apartments – Page 6 Table 8-604, with a minor use permit.
- xv) J. Hulsman – “other personal services” allowed in C-H, but not a barber.
- xvi) P. Scribner – The codes for Industrial are backwards compared to the convention used for Residential and Commercial. For example the L-I and H-I should be I-L and I-H for consistency; otherwise this will be confusing as we use these terms often in the future.
- xvii) J. Hulsman – Commercial and Industrial sections talk about max heights of 4-5 stories. Barry's ladder truck could be limiting.
- xviii) **Motion** by J. Hulsman that we draft a letter, second by M. Jordan. Vote: All in favor, none opposed.

8) Discussion Items

a) Wind Energy Forum

- i) M. Jordan concerned that none of her questions were answered until she asked at the end. Why weren't wind farms being considered for south of Davis, explain the unrealistic photo for the CEMEX, etc.
- ii) Payback for these generators? Federal tax credits, but apparently cost effective even without.
- iii) Viewshed? G. Moris relayed conversation with Greg Buis of Pioneer Green Energy and P. Harrison on the bus. G. Moris feels some weight should be placed on the value of the viewshed (heritage, pastoral setting, etc.) – more than just property value. Other topics get the attention – bird strikes, green energy, etc.
- iv) M. Jordan – Travis is concerned about the wind turbines and don't feel an acceptable solution has been reached. Travis has 2000 square miles of jurisdiction.
- v) J. Hulsman – Approvers will have to decide if land should look like an industrial area. Not as much farmers as there was when he was young in that area.
- vi) M. Jordan - 607 wind turbines in Rio Vista area and adding about 90/yr.
- vii) Sandra Montero comments:

- (1) She heard that we should not expect the CEMEX wind turbine to pay for all their energy needs. G. Moris – is Pioneer looking at the CEMEX data?
 - (2) Pioneer was originally talking 150 turbines – now 400.
 - (3) Leroy Bertolero said we are 3rd level (first level is Solano).
 - (4) Sac Bee article noted that “Mrs. Anderson says she hates them, but appreciates the money”. Anderson is the family presented as an example of a landowner that accepted the turbines on their property.
 - (5) Concerned they are not looking at the other forms of energy like solar.
- viii) Transmission lines will be a concern again.
- ix) M. Jordan – why not look at hydro on the canals?
- x) M. Jordan – Solano County has a 60 page document that should be reviewed carefully. We cannot go backwards if it gets approved.
- xi) Overall, the forum seemed well done.
- xii) Keith Williams – one comment surprised him: infrasound. The scare tactics had been brought out with that years ago. Mental development of unborn babies, interfering with sleep, etc. Point is that much is unknown still.
- xiii) M. Jordan – subsidence in the area. Appreciates that ordinance has that they get taken down if not running any more.
- xiv) Drop this topic from the next meetings agenda, but revisit when Pioneer’s (or other) application is complete.

9) Future Agenda Items

- a) Crosswalk - M. Jordan. If funds don’t transfer, we need to write a letter.

10) Meeting Adjourned at 9:00 pm. **Motion** by M. Jordan, second by P. Harrison. All in favor, none opposed.

GLM
09/19/12

Appendix: Correspondence on Park Fees:

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: David Morrison <David.Morrison@yolocounty.org>
To: "fescenmeyer@yahoo.com" <fescenmeyer@yahoo.com>
Cc: Howard Newens <Howard.Newens@yolocounty.org>; Mark Krummenacker <Mark.Krummenacker@yolocounty.org>; Belinda Chee <Belinda.Chee@yolocounty.org>; Regina Espinoza <Regina.Espinoza@yolocounty.org>; Jeff Anderson <Jeff.Anderson@yolocounty.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2012 12:19 AM
Subject: FW: Esparto Park Development Fees - transactions details

Colleen,

This question has come up several times in the past from the Esparto Advisory Committee. I hope that this helps to clear

The fees were collected for the specific purpose of funding capital improvements for parks in Esparto. As such, they cannot be transferred to the General Fund, but must be spent for projects consistent with the purpose for which they were collected.

Some of the fees have been used for costs related to development of the new pool project, such as the preparation of a CEQA document. Planning, engineering, permitting, and management are considered to be part of any capital improvement project.

We agree. The funds should and will be used to benefit parks in Esparto. Certainly the ECAC can recommend specific projects, but which projects would be carried out would be reviewed and recommended by either the General Services Department and/or the Special Districts Manager. The final decision on all capital improvement projects rests solely with the Board of Supervisors.

Please see the attached spreadsheet for a list of deposits, withdrawals, and current balance.

If you need any further information or assistance, please let us know.

David Morrison, Asst. Director

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

From: Colleen Fescenmeyer [<mailto:fescenmeyer@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2012 10:53 AM
To: Howard Newens
Subject: Esparto Park Development Fees

To whom this may concern:

I am the current chair for the Esparto Community Advisory Committee. There have been some inquires from directors and community members as to the Esparto Park Development Fees that have been collected. I would like to get the facts straight and disspell the rumors floating around. Some think the Fees will be put back into the general fund for Yolo county. Others think they will be used to off-

set administrative costs for the new pool project. Another version says they can't be touched because it is designated for capitol improvements only.

We would really like to utilize them as they were intended to benefit our community by creating or improving parks in Esparto. We also need to know how to go about doing so. Would an improvement project be run through the ECAC or the Planning Dept. or the county? Additionally can you give us a statement for our account showing when money was deposited or withdrawn and the current balance remaining.

Thank you very much for all your help!

Sincerely,

Colleen Fescenmeyer

Chair, Esparto Community Advisory Committee

[707-580-6650](tel:707-580-6650) / [530-787-3655](tel:530-787-3655)

fescenmeyer@yahoo.com

2 attachments — [Download all attachments](#)

 **121 Esp Parks Imp CPF - Transactions 8-16-12 - from MK.xlsx**
48K [View](#) [Open as a Google spreadsheet](#) [Download](#)

 **2012 09 18 ECAC Agenda.pdf**
25K [View](#) [Download](#)