



## COUNTY OF SOLANO GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

County Administrative Center  
First Floor Multi-Purpose Room  
675 Texas Street, Fairfield

### MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF The Solano County General Plan Update Citizen's Advisory Committee January 14, 2008

The regular meeting of the Solano County General Plan Update Citizen's Advisory Committee was held Monday, January 14, 2008, in the Solano County Administration Center, Multi-Purpose Room, 675 Texas St., Fairfield, CA 94533.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Terry Curtola, Ian Anderson, Nicole Byrd, Larry Clement, Randy Dawson, Michael Fortney, Scott Greenwood-Meinert, Carol Landry, Jerry LeMasters, Sandy Person, Norman Repanich, Anthony Russo, Brian West

MEMBERS ABSENT: Patricia Gatz and Jose McNeill

OTHERS PRESENT: Birgitta Corsello, Director, Resource Management; Mike Yankovich, Planning Manager, Resource Management; Jim Louie, Senior Planner; Resource Management; Harry Englebright, Englebright and Associates, Jeff Henderson, EDAW; Paul Tuttle, EDAW; Elizabeth Boyd, EDAW; and Diane Buschman, Office Assistant III, Resource Management

Chairman Curtola announced that in addition to the Citizen's Advisory Committee meetings scheduled for tonight and January 28<sup>th</sup>, an additional CAC meeting has been scheduled for Monday, February 4, 2008.

#### Public Comments for Items on the Agenda

(Limited to 15 Minutes, limited to 3 minutes per speaker)

Robert Hansen, Suisun Valley, expressed concern that the Uniform Rules and Procedures for the Williamson Act could restrict incidental operations to agriculture such as small value added processing of their own products on their property. He also stated that farmers wanted to be able to process agricultural products from non-adjacent parcels and from their neighbors' parcels.

Charles Dawes, Vacaville, stated that the CAC decision not to downsize minimum parcel sizes in his area was based on faulty information. Harry Englebright responded that steep slopes and fire hazards were some of the

considerations that led to the decision not to reduce the minimum parcel size for that area.

June Guidotti, Suisun, stated that her concerns were still that her parcel was not included in the process. She asked what “opportunity sites” were. (Staff indicated that it would be covered in the presentation tonight) She was also concerned about conservation overlays degrading her property.

1. Review/Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of December 10, 2007 were approved.

2. Review of Preliminary Draft General Plan Part I

Chairman Curtola referred to a letter from Moira Burke to the CAC and confirmed that the members had received a copy of the letter.

Jeff Henderson began by giving a brief review of the status of the Update since the December CAC meeting. The Board of Supervisors met on December 11, 2007 to review the Land Use Diagram and Land Use Policies and Programs and made several recommendations. The Land Use Diagram was published as part of the Notice of Preparation for the EIR that was distributed on December 21, 2007. The policies and programs for the land use chapter were currently being incorporated into a draft for the CAC’s review at the February 4, 2008 meeting. The Solano County Planning Commission reviewed the Agricultural policies and programs on January 3, 2008. The Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) reviewed them on January 9<sup>th</sup>. The Agricultural policies and programs with comments from the Planning Commission and the AAC will go to the Solano County Board of Supervisors for their review on January 15<sup>th</sup>. The comments will be incorporated into the Draft Agriculture chapter which the CAC will review at the January 28, 2008 meeting. The Circulation policies and programs were reviewed at the Planning Commission on January 3, 2008 and the Board of Supervisors is scheduled to review them on January 15, 2008. The CAC will review a Draft Circulation chapter on February 4, 2008. With regard to the EIR the Notice of Preparation with a project description was distributed on December 21, 2007. The public comment period is open until 5:00 p.m. on February 4, 2008. A public scoping session with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will be held on January 23, 2008 at 3:00 p.m. in the Board chambers. The Preliminary Draft General Plan will be formulated as a series of 10 chapters in one document.

Mr. Henderson stated that the three chapters of the Preliminary General Plan to be reviewed tonight were the Introduction, the Health and Safety Chapter and the Economic Development Chapter. At the January 28<sup>th</sup> meeting the CAC will review the Agriculture Chapter, Resources Chapter, and the Public Facilities and Services Chapter. At the February 4<sup>th</sup> meeting the Land Use Chapter and the Transportation and Circulation Chapter will be reviewed. The Housing and Parks and Recreation Chapters are not within the scope of the current General Plan update because they both had been recently adopted and were not as out of

date as the other chapters. The Housing Chapter will be revised within the next two or three years.

Mr. Henderson recommended that the CAC discussion of the chapters focus on identifying any item that may have been missed and to review the hi-lighted additions and changes that were recommended by the CAC, TAC, Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors. He also encouraged the CAC to focus on the direction of the policies and to submit comments in writing to staff that involved rephrasing or were editorial in nature.

The Introduction Chapter provided a general overview and setting for the General Plan update as well as the Vision Statement that was drafted by the CAC. The chapter also described the Plan's format, outlined the planning process and the implementation strategy and finally described the General Plan in relation to other planning efforts by federal, state, regional and local entities.

The Committee began by discussing the Vision Statement. Anthony Russo suggested eliminating that portion of the Environment section that read as follows: *Although we live between the San Francisco Bay region (with a projected population of over 8 million in 20 Years) and the Sacramento region (with a projected population of nearly 3 million in 20 years)*. He also proposed that the word "preserve" in the third paragraph of the Environment section be replaced with the word "enhance". Ian Anderson stated that he supported preserving agricultural lands because he didn't want to lose the value of agricultural land as a finite resource. Sandy Person thought that agriculture should be perceived as a business. Nicole Byrd suggested using the word "resources" in the sentence. Mr. Russo and Ms. Person thought it was important to include wording that conveyed the value of creating jobs closer to where people live. Scott Greenwood-Meinert suggested deleting the second sentence of the first paragraph of the Preamble. Mr. Anderson was not comfortable with the phrase in the Environment section that stated that farmlands should be "accessible to all our residents". After further discussion the Vision Statement was amended to read as shown on Attachment 1 of the minutes.

**Larry Clement made a motion to accept the Introduction Chapter which included the Vision Statement with amendments. Ms. Person seconded the motion.** Chairman Curtola asked for all those CAC members in favor of accepting the Vision Statement as amended to signify their approval by saying "aye". Then he asked if any members were opposed. All members of the CAC were in favor of the motion.

The Health and Safety Chapter (Chapter 5) was reviewed next. Mr. Henderson stated that the chapter consists of Flood Control, Seismic Safety and Land Stability, Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials, Disaster Preparedness, and Public Health as well as the Air Quality and Noise sections. Three new proposed goal statements (Goals HS-5, HS-6 and HS-7) derived from comments from the CAC, TAC, Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors were briefly summarized.

Under the Flood Control section Mr. Henderson reviewed Policy HS-9 which was the one modified policy. Randy Dawson asked if there were maps that indicated where “floodways” were located. Mr. Henderson answered that floodways were the center most portion of a 100 year floodplain and was the portion of the floodway that carried the 100 year flood flow. The floodways are shown on FEMA 100 year floodplain maps. Under implementation programs for Flood Control Mr. Russo asked if Pgm HS-10 would require an engineered report on dam integrity for all new development within the inundation area of Monticello Dam. Mr. Yankovich stated that the developer would have to declare that they met the requirements based on the flood zone in which the site lies. It was decided that the language of Pgm HS-10 would be revised for clarity. The intent of the policy was to ensure that a developer was performing due diligence to verify the development was in a safe area or at least to address any risks. Mr. Henderson stated that all the other policies and programs in this section were previously discussed in depth by the CAC.

Mr. Henderson stated that the sections of Seismic Safety and Land Stability, Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials and Disaster Preparedness had no new or revised policies or programs in the workbook. He noted that mapping information referenced in the workbook on seismic safety and land stability will be transferred onto a GIS based program so that they can be updated as needed. Chairman Curtola asked if the County had an Oil Spill Contingency Plan. Birgitta Corsello answered that County does have an Oil Spill Contingency Plan which is under the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard.

Elizabeth Boyd stated that staff had received several comments from the TAC on the Public Health section. Stating that water will become increasingly valuable, Norm Repanich asked if the County or other local agency had investigated desalinization programs and riparian rights to the Sacramento River for drinking water. Ms. Byrd asked if the Update should give any direction to new landfill sites in the event the existing landfills reach their capacity. Mr. Englebright answered that the Integrated Waste Management Plan will address that issue when it is updated. Ms. Landry asked why HS-47 called for a report on public health implementation policies to the Board of Supervisors every 3 to 4 years when an annual report was required to the Board of Supervisors on the General Plan. Mr. Henderson stated that the Land Use chapter of the General Plan was likely to have a program that describes an annual report to the Board of Supervisors and the need to report back on public health can be discussed as a sub-bullet of that report. He suggested that HS-47 be rewritten to indicate that public health implementation policies will be a part of the annual report to the Board of Supervisors.

Air Quality, Noise and Climate Change were the next sections reviewed. Mr. Henderson indicated that there were modifications to Air Quality Policies HS-42 thru HS-46. Mr. Anderson asked what the “incentives to agricultural producers” were in HS-45. Examples of incentives included providing retrofit funds for equipment and replacement of certain types of motors. Staff stated they would expand on the description of incentives for that policy. There were no further

comments on the Air Quality Policies. Noise Policies HS-47 thru HS-51 were considered next. There were no Committee member comments on the Noise Policies.

The final section reviewed in the Public Health and Safety chapter was Climate Change. Mr. Henderson stated that climate change was being addressed in the General Plan because of the need to comply with state law (AB 32) which sets benchmarks levels for greenhouse gas emissions. Rather than write climate change policies and programs and place them in a section of the General Plan, the Update will look at the body of policies and programs that are found throughout the General Plan and point them out in the Climate Change section of the Health and Safety chapter and show how certain aspects of climate change will affect different sections such as flooding thru sea level rises or wildfire risk thru drought. In this way climate change will be addressed throughout the General Plan. The EIR for the General Plan also have a climate change section that will describe how the General Plan update will meet the requirements of AB 32 and the reduction strategies for greenhouse gases.

**Mr. Clement made a motion to accept Chapter 5 (Health and Safety) with amendments. Mr. Repanich seconded the motion.** Chairman Curtola asked the CAC if there were any questions on the motion. There were no questions. He then asked for all those CAC members in favor of accepting Chapter 5 as amended to signify their approval by saying "aye". Then he asked if any members were opposed. All members of the CAC were in favor of the motion.

The next chapter to be discussed was Economic Development (Chapter 6). Mr. Henderson stated that the key issue of the chapter was economic development with sub-issues of employment, labor force, opportunity sites, commercial and industrial land use planning and infrastructure planning. Goal statements ED-1 thru ED-7 were discussed first. Goal ED-1 was modified to read "*Maintain and improve the County's strong and diversified economic base and provide for a wide range of employment opportunities*". Mr. Clement suggested that Goal ED-6 should have a reference to the Agricultural chapter.

Policies ED-1 thru ED-14 were discussed next. Policies ED-11 thru ED-14 had been added to reflect comments from the Solano County Planning Commission. Chairman Curtola asked what ED-11 referred to. Ms. Boyd stated that it addressed the need for consistent industrial development standards. Randy Dawson suggested an implementation program be added to replace the industrial land that will be lost with the implementation of the Fairfield Vanden/Peabody Road Specific Plan.

Ms. Person stated that she didn't support some of the numbers in the economic chapter because they were based on ABAG numbers which are different than the sources Solano County Economic Development Corp. (SCEDC) uses. She stated that the difference in the figures was profound and affected the data the CAC was working with. Mr. Englebright stated that staff could use figures that would be the most supportive of the primary agency that would be implementing

the programs and they could utilize SCEDC's numbers. Chairman Curtola asked if there would be any problems such as losing grants if the ABAG numbers were not used. Mr. Yankovich stated that funding amounts were based on ABAG's figures. Ms. Person will submit written comments to staff on figures regarding the discrepancies in the numbers.

Opportunity sites were explained by Mr. Henderson. He stated that opportunity sites were certain locations in the county that had economic development potential based on site characteristics and the location of the areas relative to certain provisions of the Orderly Growth Initiative. Site characteristics included sites with easy access to freeways, sites adjacent to existing urbanized areas and sites that were isolated from other potentially incompatible uses. Other sites were linked to existing amenities and economic assets such as the Delta, Travis AFB, and U.C. Davis. Some opportunity sites lie in unincorporated areas that potentially can or currently do support job generating uses without requiring a redesignation from agricultural or open space use. Other areas such as North Vacaville, Dixon and Neighborhood Agricultural Centers are subject to the Orderly Growth initiative and require voter approval before their uses can be changed to accommodate increased commercial and/or industrial development. Areas that have been identified as potential opportunity sites include Old Town Cordelia, the Lambie Road Area, Collinsville, the Dixon area, North Vacaville and the Interior Valleys of Suisun Valley, Lagoon Valley, Pleasants Valley and Vaca Valley.

Ms. Person commented that the Lambie Road area had constraints to economic development such as being a 9 to 1 mitigation area. Mr. Henderson stated that a specific plan was being recommended for the Lambie Road area based on comments from the Board of Supervisors. The plan would provide a comprehensive approach to the infrastructure, environmental mitigation and the mix of industrial land uses.

Regarding the North Vacaville area Ms. Person didn't think that office use was compatible with industrial manufacturing. It was decided to delete "office use" from the North Vacaville area description. Regarding the last sentence describing the Dixon area, Ms. Person suggested that the word "processing" be replaced with "service".

In the paragraph entitled *Commercial and Industrial Land Use Planning*, Ms. Person thought that the first sentence that stated in part "...the largest gains in manufacturing jobs will be located in the unincorporated areas of the county" should be reworded to make it clear that it was only describing manufacturing job gains in the unincorporated area rather than including the cities. Ms. Person also suggested that toll roads be considered for inclusion in the paragraph entitled *Infrastructure Planning*. In the paragraph entitled *Solano EDC* she suggested adding a bullet that addressed supporting regional coordination or partnerships between counties and regional areas to help leverage each others assets.

**Mr. Russo made a motion to accept Chapter 6 (Economic Development) with amendments. Jerry LeMasters seconded the motion.** Chairman Curtola asked if there were any questions on the motion. There were no questions. He then asked for all those CAC members in favor of accepting Chapter 6 as amended to signify their approval by saying “aye”. Then he asked if any members were opposed. All members of the CAC were in favor of the motion.

3. Chair/Committee Member Comments

Chairman Curtola asked members to e-mail staff with any grammatical or editorial comments on the material covered. Mr. Russo stated that he thought the chapters covered were clear, concise and read very well. He also asked if Kurt Richter and Al Sokolow would be coming back to speak on the final version of the Solano Agricultural Futures Project.

Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

June Guidotti, Suisun, asked when she would receive a copy of the Integrated Waste Management report that she requested. Mr. Englebright answered that he did provide her with a copy of the Integrated Waste Management plan. He stated that the plan was scheduled to be updated sometime this year and the update will be a public process.

John Murphy, Dixon, stated that he wanted to request that his property near “Batavia Road and the railroad tracks” be redesignated for commercial and industrial uses. Chairman Curtola advised Mr. Murphy to bring his request forward to the Solano County Planning Commission and the Solano County Board of Supervisors as the Citizen’s Advisory Committee was nearly done with their recommendations.

Jon Fadhl, Dixon, thanked staff for all their hard work.

Michael Garabedian, Critical Mass Agriculture, commented on the Vision Statement by saying that preserving agricultural lands was critical and discussing agriculture as a business was not substantive but was an additional thing because “if you don’t have the land, you don’t have the business”. The focus should be on the land not the operators. He also disagreed with removing the phrase “maintaining the viability of agriculture” and changing it to “enhance the viability of agriculture”.

Since there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

The next regular meeting of the Solano County General Plan Update Citizen’s Advisory Committee will be held on Monday, January 28, 2008 in the Solano County Administration Center, Multi-Purpose Room, 675 Texas Street, Fairfield, CA 94533

## **A Vision for Solano County in 2030**

### **Preamble**

The vision for Solano County is founded on the principles of “The Environment,” “The Economy,” and “Social Equity.” The vision is for the County as a whole, recognizing that Solano County must work collaboratively with the cities and other public agencies to achieve this vision.

The vision uses words and phrases that may be subject to differing interpretations. These words and phrases are defined in more concrete terms as policies in the various chapters of the General Plan.

### **The Environment**

The people of Solano County will act wisely as stewards of our natural resources. We will maintain and enhance much of our County’s environmental resources for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations. We will focus on creative and innovative solutions to meet both human needs and the needs of the natural environment.

Our respect for human and environmental needs will guide our land use decisions, such as where development takes place. We will continue to guide most growth into our cities and collaborate with officials in those cities to promote sustainable development. By continuing this practice, we can sustain the unique character and identity of our communities while simultaneously valuing our agricultural identity in rural areas. We will use our natural habitat, farmlands, and water resources to maintain separation among our cities and unincorporated communities. These features will continue to contribute to our identity and economy and help to protect our people from flooding and other natural hazards.

Because we value the quality of our air, soil, water, and other finite natural resources, we will continue to enhance agricultural business and preserve agricultural lands and resources. We will support practices that use renewable and recycled resources and reduce energy consumption and pollution as much as possible. Because the agricultural industry is a major contributor to the overall economic health of the County, it is our desire to contribute to its prosperity.

We support creating jobs closer to where people live to reduce our reliance on automobiles to meet our daily travel needs. We will provide abundant and diverse recreation opportunities that are compatible with the natural environment and provide

**ATTACHMENT ONE**

our residents and visitors with an opportunity to enjoy nature.

By considering human and environmental needs equally, we can create a place where people may choose to live, work, and play within close proximity; a place where nature, farmlands, and water are valued; and a place where people have choices for housing, employment, transportation, and recreation.

### **The Economy**

We support diversification of our local economy so that many activities contribute to our prosperity. This diversity will provide opportunities for small and large businesses to thrive in a variety of industries. We will nurture businesses that employ our residents and offer opportunities for local ownership. We will encourage businesses that support our communities and provide our people with sufficient incomes to meet their basic needs. While we protect our current economic assets, we will prepare for economic change as we compete in an increasingly global marketplace.

We will use our natural and agricultural resources as economic opportunities while also recognizing their environmental value. We will strive to enhance the quality of our natural and agricultural resources as visitor attractions and contributors to our economy while giving equal weight to their environmental value. We will support small family farms and large agricultural businesses alike in a committed effort to enhance the viability of agriculture for future generations in this county. We will encourage Solano County residents to visit and learn about our local farms and encourage them to buy from local farmers. By doing so, we may also encourage farmers to provide sustainable goods and services for our community.

### **Social Equity**

People are our greatest assets and should be treated equitably. To achieve an equitable society, we will support access to opportunities so that individuals may thrive. We will support housing opportunities for all residents at all income levels. We will provide our citizens with an opportunity to succeed through quality education, skills training, and lifelong learning. We will also promote public health, safety and security, and environmental justice as part of an equitable society.

Access to open government is vital to our society. We will ensure that all our residents have access to their local governments and vital information affecting their lives. We will nurture civic participation through informed citizens and seek collaboration to identify common goals and solutions. We will give equal consideration to public and private

interests in our government decisions. We will promote access to civic culture and the arts as part of a healthy community. We will also seek fiscal responsibility in our government while supporting a wide range of public services that make Solano County a desirable place to live.

DRAFT