MINUTES OF THE SOLANO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of September 19, 2013

The regular meeting of the Solano County Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, Fairfield, California.

PRESENT: Commissioners Rhoads-Poston, Cayler, Walker,

Tubbs and Chairman Boschee

EXCUSED:

STAFF PRESENT: Bill Emlen, Director; Mike Yankovich, Planning

Program Manager; Jim Leland, Principal Planner; Karen Avery, Senior Planner; Nedzlene Ferrario, Senior Planner; Jim Laughlin, Deputy County Counsel; Terry Schmidtbauer, Environmental Health Program Manager; Marcy Hannum, Environmental Health Specialist; and Kristine Letterman, Planning

Commission Clerk

Items from the floor:

June Guidotti, 3703 Scally Road, Suisun, spoke of vandalism that has taken place on her property due to someone removing her No Trespassing signs. She also spoke of her disapproval with PG&E having agreements with area landowners. Ms. Guidotti spoke to the negative impacts to her property from the Potrero Hills Landfill.

1. **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING** to consider **Zone Text Amendment No. ZT-12-04** to adopt an ordinance amending Chapter 28 (Zoning Regulations) to incorporate permitting procedures and land use regulations for commercial solar energy facilities in the Exclusive Agricultural Zone Districts within the unincorporated territory of the County of Solano. This project is determined to be categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act. (Project Planner: Nedzlene Ferrario) **Staff Recommendation:** No recommendation as of September 12, 2013.

Bill Emlen explained for the commission that this draft ordinance attempts to address the siting of commercial solar facilities in the county and has been under development for some time. He said that there has been a lot of good work done on the ordinance and staff believes significant progress has been made. He noted that correspondence was received recently from the Ag Advisory Committee, Farm Bureau, and several solar facility developers voicing their interest in providing further input on this ordinance. Mr. Emlen stated that staff is recommending this item be continued until January 2014 to allow for further study and refinement of the ordinance.

Since there were no questions of staff, Chairman Boschee opened the public hearing.

Barry Sgarrella, 2650 W. Twitchell Island Road, Rio Vista, spoke to the proposed development of a utility scale solar project which could encumber several thousand acres on Ryer Island. He

stated that their approach to solar is quite unique which is to marry solar and agriculture and have them work together cooperatively. He provided an overview of this concept along with the particulars of the project and the benefits to Solano County.

Tom Hester, 3554 St. Hwy. 84, Walnut Grove, gave the commission the farmer's perspective on what this project could and should mean to the farming operations on Ryer Island. Mr. Hester stated that this project could have dual benefits for supplying green energy and generating financial help to preserve the agriculture on the land.

Dennis McQuaid, 80 E. Sir Francis Drake, Larkspur, stated that the Trust which owns the corporation which farms the island is very supportive of this project. They have a lease which will allow the development of a major commercial solar project and allow it to continue for 40 years as described, and hopefully longer. He stated that they support the adoption of interim regulations with regard to large solar projects. Mr. McQuaid stated that they are also sensitive to the concerns with regard to flight safety and possible impacts to Travis Air Force Base.

Dan Calamuci, Carpenters Local 180, Vallejo, spoke on behalf of local carpenters and stated that they are opposed to the language in the proposed ordinance that would prohibit the development of commercial solar facilities on land in the "A-40" and "A-80" zoning districts. He stated that they are always looking to expand work opportunities for their members and encouraged the commission to reject the proposed language and not recommend the ordinance.

John Belperio, 380 Aaron Circle, Vacaville, stated that he was very supportive of green energy. He stated that he has worked on both a solar panel project and a wind turbine project and noted that the solar project produced the lowest carbon footprint.

Fidel Chavez, 1233 Grant Street, Fairfield, stated that he lives in the community and has worked on many local projects as a carpenter. He said that a large scale solar project would be great for local employment and would bring money into the community.

Agustine Diaz, 785 Overture Lane, Fairfield, stated that he is a carpenter and commutes to work in the Bay Area. He said that it is hard to work far from home and from his family. He stated that this is an opportunity to bring good jobs close to home.

Paul Boykin, 330 Grand Canyon, Vacaville, stated that he believed solar projects would be very good for Solano County.

Michael Queen, 676 Central Avenue, Vallejo, stated that he did not agree with the ordinance and the restriction of green energy development on agricultural land. He said that he could see the advantage of utilizing agricultural land for duel purposes. He commented on how the impact would be lessened by placing the ancillary equipment underground. Mr. Queen stated that this project would create much needed jobs and would benefit Solano County.

Rick Russell, 2070 Bailey Circle, El Dorado Hills, stated that he owns property in the Montezuma Hills. He said that he has spoken to landowners in the area and they are in

agreement that any policy that would restrict the opportunity for solar would be detrimental not only to the land, but also the intent. He said the idea of agriculture and solar can work together.

Russ Lester, Chairman, Ag. Advisory Committee, 5430 Putah Creek Road, Winters, stated that there have been concerns expressed that the current ordinance may need some changes. He said that they are working with county staff in looking at those changes. Mr. Lester stated that the concerns expressed are in regard to making solar more compatible with agriculture and to encompass all agricultural regions. Mr. Lester stated that he supports green energy and is probably the first business in Solano County that is 100% powered by renewables. He noted that their solar is located on their rooftops and over their yard areas. Mr. Lester commented that garages and parking lots are ideal locations for siting solar. He said placing solar over an orchard would lessen crop production and asserted that agriculture needs to be protected because it is our food and food is our life.

Mr. Lester noted that industrial solar is not compatible with agriculture and the General Plan does not allow for it in agricultural zones. He said industrial solar is not a local energy source that is kept locally. He said the tax base is reduced because solar is not a taxable evaluation of property taxes. Mr. Lester commented that this ordinance does not take jobs away it just directs them to a different kind of industry. He said he supports the staff recommendation to put this ordinance on hold and asked that a moratorium be put into place until the ordinance is complete.

Commissioner Tubbs said if there is acreage available in the county that is not producing and the owner decides to install an industrial solar facility, would that satisfy the ag committee's concerns about making sure the county has land for producing food and making room for solar.

Mr. Lester said that he believed this would open the door to allow for a landowner to remove his land from production by leaving it fallow for a few years. He pointed out that there are a lot of areas in the county such as Lambie Industrial Park or the many building rooftops and parking lots that would be suitable for solar panels.

Moira Burke, 5794 Silveyville Road, Dixon, stated that Solano County has a very unique and precious asset which is farmland, and it has been identified for decades by UC Davis experts as being unique to the planet. She stated that the largest employer in the county is agriculture. She stated that there are thousands of jobs in agriculture and there is nothing more important than producing food. Producing food is critical to Solano County's economy, and more importantly it is critical to our existence. Ms. Burke stated that her farm produces grass fed beef and lamb and organic hay. She stated that she is the vice-chair of the ag. advisory committee and is passionately interested in protecting the county's farmland for the future and for future generations. Ms. Burke stated that she strongly endorses the efforts to rewrite the ordinance with careful attention to protecting agricultural land. She supported the continuance of this item and asked that the commission put a moratorium on any solar development until that time.

Ian Anderson, 6269 Birds Landing Road, Birds Landing, stated that it is important to find skilled people in the field of agriculture as agriculture is increasing in productivity and higher skilled people are needed. He stated that Solano County agriculture is on the upturn and he strongly supports the decisions that relate to helping the county keep agricultural lands in production. Mr.

Anderson stated that farmers are not against having solar in areas that are the most appropriate for that use. It is known that there are many acres properly zoned or on available rooftops that could meet Solano County's mandated needs. He referred to a study done by Sonoma County where they believed that 7% of the commercial properties within that county would be sufficient for renewable energies, and he believed that it would be similar to that for Solano County. He stated that it is the policy of this county to conserve and protect both intensive and extensive agricultural land, and to encourage agricultural operations within the county and to specifically protect those lands for exclusive agricultural use or uses which do not interfere with agricultural operations.

Jeanne McCormack, 8192 Montezuma Hills Road, Rio Vista, stated that they own and farm land in the Montezuma Hills. She commented that the population of the State of California will double by the year 2030. She remembered driving from Rio Vista to Los Angeles in the late 1940's and seeing nothing but agricultural land in between which is gone now, and once it is gone it is always gone. Ms. McCormack noted that many kinds of agricultural lands are not suitable for growing certain crops but they are very productive in other kinds of crops. She said that it is important to think about feeding future generations. She urged the commission to impose a moratorium until a good ordinance is in place.

June Guidotti, 3703 Scally Road, Suisun, stated that she lives in the Potrero Hills and supports the commission in not making a decision tonight. She stated that there is a place for solar but it needs to be put in the appropriate places.

John Murphy, 7112 Batavia Road, Dixon, voiced his concern with removal of agricultural land from production. He spoke with regard to the Veteran's Cemetery in the City of Dixon where agricultural land is being removed. He said the land is being removed in phases and so there is no estimate on the amount of farmland that will be lost.

Commissioner Tubbs asked Mr. Sgarrella about the revenue source for the Ryer Island project. Mr. Sgarrella stated that they are proposing to enter into a development agreement where there would be user fees paid to the county for the electricity that is generated, and there would also be significant development impact fees.

Commissioner Tubbs wanted to know if there are any large scale solar farms in the area where the progress could be seen. Mr. Sgarrella stated that this idea is in the early developmental stages and this theory is not in practice currently. He said that perhaps the only negative aspect is that it reduces the amount of direct sunlight the plants would enjoy under normal circumstances. He said that he could bring in agricultural experts who are in the process of developing cropping plans that would be able to explain in detail the particulars of this type of operation.

In response to Commissioner Tubbs' inquiry, Mr. Sgarrella explained in some detail the differences between individual vs. industrial scale solar projects and their relation to the power grid. Mr. Sgarrella stated that he would provide the commission with some additional written information on the subject.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston wanted to know what the ratio will be for the amount of acreage used for the product and the space used for the storage of equipment. Mr. Sgarrella stated that the size of the building that will contain all of the compressor equipment is 40 feet wide by 50 feet tall by 200 feet long. He stated that they do not have any other facilities planned for the site itself except for a control building and one area for grounding matts. He estimated that the coverage for the ancillary equipment would be less than 1% of the total area.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston noted that one of the concerns that have been expressed is the amount of land that will be taken out of agriculture, and she commented that 1% is low.

Commissioner Cayler inquired if this type of project is being used in our countries. She commented that Spain has a lot of solar industry and sadly a lot of it is located on prime agricultural land. Mr. Sgarrella stated that he was not aware of this type of project happening in any other country.

Commissioner Cayler commented that another consideration to be looked at is the amount of room that is needed for farming equipment to able to maneuver throughout the project area for farming activities. Mr. Sgarrella stated that it is very sparse as far as the support of the system is concerned. He briefly detailed the size and diameter of each pipe and column and noted that they have shown a John Deer 690 Harvester with a tandem dump truck can move freely in between those columns.

A motion was made by Commissioner Rhoads-Poston and seconded by Commissioner Tubbs to continue the public hearing to January 16, 2014, and direct staff to continue more outreach on the draft solar amendments to the zoning regulations, including consideration to broaden the scope of the ordinance to include additional provisions pertaining to parcels located within the "A-20" and "A-160" Zoning Districts. The motion passed unanimously.

2. PUBLIC HEARING to consider an appeal of the Zoning Administrator's approval of Extension No. 6 to Use Permit No. U-82-42/Marsh Development Permit No. MD-82-12 of Lois Tonnesen for the continued operation of a pet cemetery located at 3700 Scally Road, 2 miles southeast of the City of Suisun in an "A-SM-160" Suisun Marsh Agricultural Zoning District, APN: 0046-120-410. This consideration has been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act. (Project Planner Karen Avery) Staff Recommendation: Deny appeal and approve extension of the project.

Karen Avery gave a brief overview of the written staff report. She stated that the site is 20 acres in size and was approved in 1983 as a cemetery and includes the burial of small animals including ashes. The applicant is permitted to operate in phases and is intended for disposal of animal remains from shelters and veterinary clinics. Ms. Avery stated that the applicant has applied for and been granted administrative extensions of the use permit every 5 years from 1983 to 2008, with no known issues, public controversy or appeals.

In 2008 the Planning Commission approved the fifth extension of the use permit and the decision was appealed to the Board of Supervisors. On August 5, 2008, the Board of Supervisors upheld the Planning Commission's approval and the use permit extension was granted.

The applicant has requested the sixth extension of the use permit by filing an application. The application was circulated to in-house staff as well as outside agencies for review. Staff determined that the pet cemetery is being operated in full compliance and the extension was approved administratively by the Zoning Administrator on July 18, 2013. That approval has since been appealed. The staff report provided a breakdown of the reasons for the appeal as well as staff responses.

Chairman Boschee opened the public hearing.

The appellant, June Guidotti, 3703 Scally Road, Suisun, requested a refund of the money she paid for the appeal because of a conflict of interest due to an abuse of discretion by some county officials and outside individuals. Ms. Guidotti referred to page two of staff's report and stated that the adjacent zoning listed as agriculture is incorrect. She stated that to the south of Tonnesen's property is a commercial industrial landfill; north is Solano Garbage Company; east is UTC Aerospace; and to the west is her property. She stated that her property is not in the Williamson Act. She stated that her property was zoned solid waste and requested that it be rezoned back to solid waste.

Ms. Guidotti stated that the Tonnesen's pet cemetery is full of radiation and toxic chemicals because of the dumping of experimental animals from Livermore Laboratory and UC Davis. She stated that these chemicals are leaking onto her land. She stated that spraying for mosquito abatement on the Tonnesen property has taken place in the past. Ms. Guidotti asked the commission to deny the permit extension.

George Guynn, Suisun, stated that he hoped the commission would support Ms. Guidotti and grant her appeal.

Brian West, president, West & Associates, spoke on behalf of the applicant. He stated that his company has been retained by the Tonnesen family since 2009 to perform compliance inspections and groundwater monitoring at their facility. He said that he has personally been out to the property on inspections many times and on none of those occasions has he ever witnessed anything out of compliance with the permit conditions. He commented that the applicant has a long standing permit with the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board and that the site has always been in compliance with that permit. Mr. West stated that they have been testing the groundwater on a semi-annual basis and on no occasion has there been any detection of any contamination in the groundwater from their activities.

Mr. West stated that he has never seen any standing water on the property either in the summer or winter, and so it would not make sense to perform any mosquito abatement. He commented that the property is not in the marsh and there are no recognized wetlands or other type of biological resource like that on the property. Mr. West commented that there are very few animal carcasses that are disposed of in the facility, and that 99% of it is cremated ashes. He said that he is not aware of any animal carcasses that have ever been disposed of from any institutional source. Mr. West stated that the Tonnesens have a well-run operation and have always been in compliance with their permit conditions. He stated that they provide a service to the community and should be allowed to continue to operate.

In response to Chairman Boschee, Mr. West stated that his firm prepares a semi-annual report which is submitted to the regional water board and to the County's Resource Management Department. He noted that all of those reports are public documents which can be reviewed by the public.

Commissioner Tubbs asked staff about their findings when conducting their site visit. Ms. Avery stated that she found the operation to be in compliance with the conditions of the use permit. She noted that she did not observe any standing water on the property. She said that both Phases 1 and 2 were covered in grasses except for the portion where the current burial pit was located.

In response to Commissioner Tubbs, Mr. West stated that this site is not open to the public. He stated that the applicant has contracts with veterinarians and other animal shelters in the Northern California area, and the remains that are brought in are solely from those sources in which they have contracts.

Since there were no further speakers, Chairman Boschee closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Commissioner Rhoads-Poston and seconded by Commissioner Walker to deny the appeal and approve the requested extension of Use Permit No. U-82-42/Marsh Development Permit No. MD-82-12, subject to the recommended conditions of approval. The motion passed unanimously. (Resolution No. 4600)

3. **PUBLIC HEARING** to consider revocation of Minor Use Permit No. MU-12-07 of **Dave and Shashi Sharma** for the storage of trucks, trailers, automobiles and equipment, auto repair shop, SMOG station, hobby shop, and small car sales lot for surrounding neighborhoods. The property is located at 400 Benicia Road, .1 mile west of the City of Vallejo in an "R-TC-MU" Residential Traditional Community Mixed Use Zoning District, APN: 0059-113-330. This project is determined to be categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act. (Project Planner: Jim Leland) **Staff Recommendation:** Modify permit conditions.

Jim Leland gave a brief overview of the written staff report which provided the project description, permit history, and compliance review. Staff recommended that the commission determine the existing truck storage and recycling use operated on the property does not comply with the terms and conditions of the use permit, and that the commission modify the permit to remove that use from the list of permitted uses.

Commissioner Tubbs asked if the owner of the property was informed that the permit was going to be modified and was given a chance to fix the problem.

Mr. Leland stated that staff has had multiple meetings with the owner over the past 12 months and have also discussed the situation with the site operator. He stated that a variety of suggestions on possible ways to comply were made by staff.

Commissioner Tubbs wanted to know if it was a lack of willingness or lack of ability to comply that has brought this matter to the commission. Mr. Leland stated that after a number of attempts to deal with the situation, nothing has changed. He noted that the property owner's

obligations have all been met under the use permit. He said the current operator is the one who controls whether or not the material is visible from the site and whether it is stored in trucks or in an enclosed structure, and so far that has not happened.

In response to Commissioner Walker, Mr. Leland stated that the property owner has provided to staff information that he has served notice to the tenant to vacate the premises.

Chairman Boschee opened the public hearing.

The applicant, Dave Sharma, stated that he has given the tenant a 30-day notice which will be up on October 7, 2013. Mr. Sharma stated that he would like to be able to keep his permit.

Chairman Boschee asked the applicant if he agrees with the recommendation for the removal of the storage of trucks and the recycling from his use permit.

Mr. Sharma stated that he is in agreement with staff's recommendation.

Norma Welch, 319 Thomas Avenue, Vallejo, stated that the property is a nuisance and an eyesore. She commented that there are many residences on that corner that are in the same disarray and the one directly across the street is almost a carbon copy of the subject property.

Martha Crockett, 425 Wallace Avenue, Vallejo, wanted to know if other uses will be allowed to replace the recycling and truck storage uses that are removed. She also inquired as to how the county will monitor the situation and what will happen if the same eyesore becomes prevalent.

Mr. Leland stated that the uses listed in the use permit were typical for the building that exists, which was an old service station. He stated that the recycling and truck storage already existed when the permit was processed so staff tried to make that use work, but to no avail.

Mr. Leland explained that what staff is recommending leaves the permit in place minus the storage of trucks and the recycling. If the property owner finds a tenant that operates one of the allowed uses, they are free to lease the property to that tenant with no further action by the county. The control mechanism would be whether to have another expedited compliance review as was the case in the first review of this permit. He also stated that any business that operates at that site will need to apply for a business license which would result in a field inspection by county staff to verify compliance with both zoning and building codes.

Earl Trumbull, 1256 Bush Avenue, Vallejo, stated that he owns the residence immediately to the north of the subject property. He stated that he was always in favor of a smug shop or neighborhood type business that operates within the enclosed building. He voiced his concern with the debris that has been stacking up, and the possible dangerous chemicals mixed in with that debris. He said that he supported the uses as allowed in the use permit.

Since there were no further speakers, Chairman Boschee closed the public hearing. Commissioner Walker referred to the minutes of the August 15, 2013 Zoning Administrator meeting with respect to an assertion made by a Martha Crockett stating that there are

containers of hazardous materials stored on the property. He wanted to know what evidence was presented and if that had been investigated.

Mr. Leland stated that Ms. Crockett submitted photos at the zoning administrator meeting of the containers she believed to contain hazardous materials.

Ms. Crockett submitted those same photos to the planning commission for their viewing.

Commissioner Walker stated that he recently drove by the site and commented that there is a lot of material piled everywhere and definitely had a salvage yard type of a feel. He also voiced his concern with the possible storage of hazardous materials on the property.

A motion was made by Commissioner Walker and seconded by Commissioner Rhoads-Poston to determine that the existing truck storage and recycling use operated on the property does not comply with the terms and conditions of the use permit, and modify the permit to remove the truck storage and recycling use from the list of uses permitted on the property. The motion passed unanimously. (Resolution No. 4601)

4. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING to consider Zone Text Amendment No. ZT-12-01 to consider adopting an ordinance amending Chapter 28 (Zoning Regulations) to include the following sections: Section 28.01 Definitions; Section 28.21 Exclusive Agricultural (A) Districts; Section 28.70.10 General Development Standards Applicable to All Uses in Every Zoning District; Section 28.73.30 Public Assembly Uses; Section 28.75.10 Agritourism; Section 28.75.20 Temporary Agritourism; Section 28.76.20 Commercial Services; Section 28.77.10 Industrial, Manufacturing and Processing Uses; Section 28.96 Sign Regulations; Section 28.101 Administrative Permit; Section 28.106 Use Permit. Staff Recommendation: Approval

Jim Leland reviewed staff's written report. He stated that staff has been developing amendments to the Chapter 28 of the County Code (Zoning Regulations) which would make changes in the following areas of the zoning regulations: 1) Exclusive Agricultural (A) District Revisions; 2) Revisions to the Sign Regulations and; 3) Procedural Revisions. He stated that these changes are a part of the ongoing effort to modernize the County's Zoning Regulations to be consistent with the 2008 General Plan, to provide more clarity with respect to land use standards and requirements and to reduce unnecessary permit requirements. Previous versions of these zoning text amendments included revisions to the commercial and industrial districts, which are no longer a part of the proposed amendments being considered in this proposal.

Mr. Leland noted that a letter was submitted to staff by Mr. Doug Novotny with a series of suggestions, many of which would apply to the Suisun Valley Agricultural Zoning District which he noted is not before the commission at this time. Mr. Leland reviewed Mr. Novotny's letter and addressed each comment. He suggested that the commission decide whether or not they would like staff to continue to work with Mr. Novotny on the proposed changes to the Suisun Valley District and report back to the commission at a later date.

Commissioner Tubbs spoke with regard to noise and suggested that the starting point be the average decibel limit of 45 dba with 65 dba as the maximum. That way the focus would most likely fall on the 45 dba first rather than the 65 dba.

Mr. Leland noted that the information Commissioner Tubbs is referencing is not part of staff's proposal, but is part of Mr. Novotny's letter and his proposal for amendments to the Suisun Valley District. Mr. Leland stated staff's proposal references 65 dba which is the current standard for the county.

Commissioner Tubbs commented that he liked the 45 dba vs. the 65 dba and asked if it is something that could be discussed and perhaps put into the proposed amendments.

Mr. Leland stated that staff would need time to analyze how to do that because some of the standards are listed in the General Plan which is what the ordinance was based on. He said that staff would need to look at how that could be accomplished and suggested the commission defer this item to allow staff that opportunity.

Chairman Boschee opened the public hearing.

Doug Novotny, 5404 Williams Road, Fairfield, referred to his letter and stated that the recommendations come as a group effort among interested landowners in the Valley. He stated that what they are trying to do is look at the bigger picture and to think ahead about what is happening and try to prevent some of the problems and disagreements and discord that can arise. He stated that he is trying to anticipate what would become the amendments for the Suisun Valley out of the work staff is doing now in the exclusive agriculture district. He stated that a lot of things that have been learned and the point staff is trying to make about sound will apply anywhere. Mr. Novotny stated that the 65 decibel LDN is not acceptable. He said that it needs to be decided what reasonable controls are. He said that there is not a one size fits all solution that is extremely restrictive everywhere and it has to be recognized that in some places like the upper valley there need to be more restrictions.

Chairman Boschee stated that the sound issue is very difficult because it is not just the noise, it is also the type of sound and some things are not as annoying as other things so it is very difficult to manage and control that. He asked Mr. Novotny about his opinion regarding daytime noise vs. night time noise.

Mr. Novotny stated that the type of sound and the time and duration of the sound over the course of the day and the frequency certainly makes a lot of difference. He believed that there could be more flexibility at different times than others. He said daylight hours seem to have a different quality even if it were the same level of sound it is much less intrusive. He said that when the sun begins to set something changes, especially in the valley where he lives. Mr. Novotny stated that in talking with some experts he was told that the 65 LDN has nothing to do with the kind of uses that are currently being discussed, and that historically it was designed entirely for transportation noise.

Bruce Dorrough, 5225 Williams Road, Fairfield, asked the commission to take to heart the recommendations that the group for the Suisun Valley area has worked together to prepare. He said that they are asking for events to be smaller, shorter in duration, and with consideration to the infrastructure. He referred to neighboring counties and their dealings with complaints due to noise, inadequate infrastructure, traffic, and negative impacts to residents. For this

consideration he asked the commission to look at what has been put together by this group who has done a lot of work to help address these concerns. Mr. Dorrough stated that he is not opposed to agritourism in the community but is hoping that it can fit the areas appropriately.

Since there were no further speakers, Chairman Boschee closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Walker inquired if the commission can move forward with the proposed amendments and address the "A-SV" district separately.

Mr. Leland stated that the commission could treat this as independent from the "A-SV" district and move forward with a recommendation to the Board and then direct staff to take to heart the letter and the testimony and report back to the commission at a later date. Mr. Leland stated that staff would suggest the commission defer this item to allow staff the opportunity to think through what might be proposed for the "A-SV" district and whether or not that would inform other changes to the exclusive ag district, especially if noise standards are going to be introduced. He stated that this would avoid ending up with radically different rules for the exclusive ag district from the Suisun Valley ag district.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston stated that she likes the idea of taking into consideration neighbor concerns, but stated that this needs to be a general rule that applies to all areas and not be applied on a street-by-street basis. Ms. Rhoads-Poston also noted that this should not in any way limit or change the intent of the permit that the Glashoff family just received from the county.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tubbs and seconded by Commissioner Walker to continue this matter to January 16, 2014, taking into consideration the testimony received with special attention on trying to address the sound limitations in a proper way in a one size fits all for the county. The motion passed unanimously.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS and REPORTS

There were no announcements and reports.

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