

**SOUTH DAVIS GENERAL PLAN CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SDCAC)
MINUTES OF MEETING ON JANUARY 15, 2013**

Approved April 30, 2013

Committee Present: John Cooluris, Stan Dean, Maureen Guerrieri, Matt Williams, Olin Woods.

Committee Absent: Jim Bernardy.

Others Present: Leroy Bertolero – Yolo County At-Large Planning Commissioner, Rich Reed – Yolo County Planning Commissioner, Landon Scarlett – Recording Secretary.

Citizens Signed In: Michael Dahmus, Marcia Kreith, Mike ?, Mary Corliss, Bill Corliss, John Eisele, David Hills, Judith Hills, Lyn Taylor, Joanne Roy, Mont Hubbard, Gary Matteson, Don Erman, Nancy Erman, Pam Neiberg, Eileen Gueffroy, Don Gueffroy, Tom Glaser, Jonathan Clay, Clare and Bob King, Phyllis Brock, Nadean Brown, Greg Link, Max Simmons.

1) Call to Order –Matt Williams, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:35 PM at The El Macero Country Club, and asked that everyone sign the sign-in sheet at the back of the room, and to please utilize the comment sheets if you plan to speak.

2) Introductions – The members of the Committee introduced themselves.

3) Approval of Agenda:

As introduction, Mr. Williams noted that item 8.1 of the agenda is modified because Proposal ZF#2012-0036 under the County Ag Cluster Housing Ordinance has been placed on hold and that since there were no actions items on the proposal on the agenda, Mr. Ruff (applicant) and Mr. Morrison (Assistant Director, Yolo Co. Planning and Public Works) would not be attending. Mr. Williams stated that Mr. Ruff intends to wait to submit his completed proposal until the end of the [pre]Environmental Impact Review (pre-EIR) comment period. It was also noted that SDCAC's review of the proposed Zoning Changes requested by the County was on hold for the present.

The Agenda was approved as written

MOVED BY: Cooluris/SECONDED BY: Dean

AYES: Cooluris, Dean, Guerrieri, Williams, Woods

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bernardy

4) Approval of Minutes of November 13, 2012

MOVED BY: Woods / SECONDED BY: Dean

AYES: Cooluris, Dean, Guerrieri, Williams, Woods

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bernardy

Mr. Williams mentioned again that draft minutes and meeting agendas are posted on the County website, and in the glass case on Montgomery after having been reviewed by the SDCAC.

5) Correspondence and Announcements:

Mr. Williams noted that there were no announcements, but that there had been correspondence (e-mails) submitted to SDCAC from David Hills, Judith Hills, Marcia Kreith and Gary Matteson commenting on the proposal and the County Ag Cluster Ordinance. He said that many of the comments related to the past, present and future of the Ordinance, which had been approved by a vote of 4 to 1 by the Yolo County Supervisors on November 9, 2010. He encouraged all interested citizens to watch the video of that 11/9/2010 Supervisors meeting (available on the County website) in order to see and hear the discussion, comments and vote that resulted in the Ordinance's approval.

Mr. Williams noted that SDCAC is not the proper venue for discussing the appropriateness of the Ordinance but that the Supervisors, County Staff and the Planning Commission are the correct audience. He encouraged interested citizens to contact these groups with their questions/comments and to copy SDCAC on those communications. He explained that the Supervisors stated purpose for SDCAC is to gather the will of the community on land-use proposals submitted to the County relating to the designated South Davis area, and pass that information on to the County (Planning Commission) for their consideration.

Mr. Williams noted that SDCAC has been asked to concentrate on the County Ag Cluster Ordinance proposal at the moment as a priority, acting as an informational conduit for the community. He encouraged citizens to tell the Supervisors if they have additional meaningful things they want SDCAC to talk about at future meetings.

Mr. Cooluris agreed that SDCAC was intended to review whole, complete applications under existing ordinances. He noted that the CC&Rs related to the partial application were supposed to be on tonight's agenda but would not be considered since the application is on hold. He said it was hard to know what the opinion is of the entire Willowbank community on the proposal at this time.

Mr. Woods noted that the comment period for the pre-EIR had been extended to January 31.

RECORDING SECRETARY'S NOTE: after the meeting, the information about the extension of the pre-EIR comment period on this proposal to January 31, 2013 was found to have been stated in error. The pre-EIR comment period actually ends January 24, 2013.

Mr. Dean and Ms. Guerrieri indicated their agreement with the committee comments above.

After the Committee members had completed their discussion of the correspondence, Mr. Williams opened public comment on this Correspondence item.

Mr. Erman asked for clarification of what the word "postponed" means regarding the proposal. Mr. Williams replied that the applicant stated that the application has been put on hold to gather pre-EIR commentary in order to make the completed proposal as responsive as possible to the submitted commentary. Mr. Erman noted frustration that a deadline for community comment has been set when a completed proposal does not yet exist for review. There was general agreement that this point is hard to argue and it was requested that it be conveyed to the County that if there is a new or completed proposal received, a new community comment period should be initiated.

Ms. Hills asked whether the Planning Department had stated their reservations about the proposal. Mr. Williams replied that he had asked this question specifically and had been told only that "the application is incomplete and they [The County] cannot proceed with processing until it is complete". Ms. Kreith asked if Mr. Morrison had said what "incomplete" means. Mr. Williams replied "no".

Mr. Hills asked why there is a "new deadline" of January 31st for EIR comment given that information on the proposal's intended management of storm-water, sanitary sewers, and water supplies are not currently available to the community.

There was a lengthy discussion about the importance and difficulties involved in uniformly getting information about this proposal in a timely fashion to interested members of the community that it affects. Ms. Corliss, Ms. Kreith, Ms. Erman, Mr. Erman and Ms. Hills, weighed in on this issue. Mr. Link offered to be on an e-mail committee to establish a broader community list of those who wish to be informed on the proposal. He also suggested that people write letters to "The Enterprise" about the proposal as a good way to inform a broader audience. Mr. Dean observed that communication protocol is not an action item on the agenda for this SDCAC meeting, but that the topic of communication should be formally added to the agenda of the next SDCAC meeting. Mr. Cooluris concurred.

On the matter of City of Davis involvement raised by Ms. Hills, Mr. Williams noted that Davis City Council member Lucas Frerichs had attended 2 prior meetings on this proposal, that Council member Dan Wolk was also aware of it, and that Mitch Sears, the City of Davis Open Space Manager, has been assigned to handle this project, and encouraged members of the community to contact Mr. Sears if they have questions.

Ms. Hills noted her concern that the proposal and Ordinance may not be in sync with the Yolo County General Plan, as required by law. Ms. Kreith noted her concern about how the Ordinance was affected by state law changes. Mr. Cooluris and Mr. Williams reiterated that ordinance issues were not a part of the mandate of SDCAC but are handled by the Yolo County Supervisors and Staff who should be contacted directly regarding ordinance matters.

Mr. Dean left the meeting at 6:30 pm

PUBLIC FORUM

6) Public Comment: Mr. Eisele brought up two issues that Mr. Williams noted pertain to item 8.1 (see below).

7) County Report - Mr. Williams recognized Planning Commissioners Bertolero and Reed. Commissioner Bertolero mentioned that he and Commissioner Reed had recently been reappointed to additional 4-year terms. He explained that Commissioners attend many meetings such as this throughout the year in order to learn. Some planning commission decisions are final [but can be appealed to the Board of Supervisors for a fee]. Other planning commission decisions are recommendations to the Board of Supervisors [for example, the Nishikawa project]. He promised to give due consideration in the decisions they do make.

8) DISCUSSION ITEMS

8.1 Abbreviated Discussion of Proposal ZF#2021-0036:

Ms. Guerreri brought up the issue of CC&R's and the difficulties involved in their enforcement. Discussion followed. Mr. Clay, Mr. Dahmus, Mr. Erman, Ms. Kreith, Ms. Coorlis, Mr. Williams and Mr. Cooluris commented on the CC&R matter. Ms. Erman questioned why the County required CC&Rs to be submitted as part of the application. No one knew the answer to this question. Mr. Cooluris suggested that due to the many unknowns and the fact that the application is incomplete it would be sensible to wait until the revised CC&Rs are available to further comment and that perhaps then they can be dealt with on a larger scale.

Mr. Eisele's first concern (postponed from item 6, above) was water safety. He questioned the effect that eleven built-out parcels would have on water pressure in the community (for fire protection etc.) should the project tie in with the City of Davis water supply. Mr. Cooluris mentioned that Supervisor Provenza had asked him through the Willowbank County Service Area Advisory Committee (WCSAAC) to deal with Mr. Ruff on water issues. Mr. Cooluris thinks there may be opportunities down the line to share costs if this proposal does in fact go forward. Mr. Cooluris thinks there may be opportunities for the existing and proposed lots to use city water for domestic use and community well water for all other uses. To do this, the proposed eleven new lots would have to be annexed to the WCSAAC. He noted that accomplishing such an annexation would necessitate the approval of both Yolo LAFCO and the County Supervisors.

Mr. Williams, speaking as a citizen not as SDCAC chair, mentioned his observation that 2.5 acre lots were originally recommended to accommodate separate well and sewer systems on each proposed lot, plus the required ag buffer, and that with city water and sewer, the lot sizes could be substantially reduced thereby leaving more prime ag land in production. He noted the option here for preserving more than 250 acres under permanent ag easement. He also noted that the connection fees required by the City of Davis for North Davis Meadows residents was so high that those residents chose to stick with their existing well and water distribution system.

Mr. Eisele (also postponed from item 6, above) stated that because of the inherent land costs of the proposed new 2.5 acre homesites, he takes issue with the applicant's opinion that dwellings compatible with the existing Willowbank environment would result. Mr. Williams suggested this was an issue for the County Supervisors and Planning Staff as it applies to the Ordinance.

Mr. Erman made projections about the impact of the proposed eleven 2.5 acre homesites on water usage, which he stated would be equivalent to the usage by 180 homes in Davis. Mr. Williams pointed out that landscaping decisions could have a huge effect on projected water use, and that Mr. Erman's extrapolation from El Macero's current water use levels might not be meaningful. Discussion followed about average acre

feet of water per year used by Willowbank , El Macero and Davis. It was noted that that averages may be misleading.

Ms. Roy asked what factors SDCAC was considering when deciding to report on this proposal. Mr. Williams said that the purpose of the committee was to report to the County Planning Commissioners the will of the community involved. Ms. Hills asked if the community could participate in the final meeting to decide on the report and Mr. Williams responded "yes".

Mr. Woods suggested it might be appropriate to circulate a straw poll or questionnaire to the affected community to determine its will on the proposal.

Note: Mr. Cooluris left the meeting at 7:10.

Ms. Erman questioned how "permanent" the ag conservation easement really would be. Mr. Clay stated he had access to Private Land Trust information and volunteered to investigate the longevity of pertinent existing easements particularly as they relate to this project, which would abut an existing city.

Mr. Erman had a question about whether the residential parcels currently located in Solano County will be annexed into Yolo County.

Mr. Woods recommended that the e-mail addresses listed on the sign-in sheet from this meeting be combined with those on the WCSAAC roster and sent to the County for purposes of notifying interested community members of matters relating to the application. Ms. Erman noted that it is preferable to get notices of meetings and agendas a week in advance.

9) ACTION ITEMS: none

10) FUTURE MEETING:

10.1 Next Meeting of SDCAC: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 at 5:30 location to be determined (NOTE: After the meeting it was found that the El Macero Country Club is not available on that date and time).

10.2 Possible Agenda Items:

- Ruff/Nishikawa proposal
- Communications and notifications with the community
- Straw poll
- Review of Proposed Zoning Changes

11) Adjourn: the meeting adjourned at 7:25 pm

MOVED BY: Woods/SECONDED BY: Guerrieri

AYES: Guerrieri, Williams, Woods

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bernardy, Cooluris, Dean

Respectfully submitted by:



Landon Scarlett
Recording Secretary