

MINUTES OF THE SOLANO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Special Meeting of July 31, 2008

The special meeting of the Solano County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, Fairfield, California.

PRESENT: Commissioners Moore, Barnes, McAndrew and Chairperson Barton

EXCUSED: Commissioner Mahoney

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Yankovich, Planning Program Manager; Ken Solomon, Contract Planner; Jim Laughlin, Deputy County Counsel; Diane Buschman, Office Assistant III

Items from the floor - none

1. **PUBLIC HEARING** to accept comments on the **Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR)** for the **Rockville Trails Estates** project consisting of approximately 1,580 acres located northeast of the intersection of Green Valley and Rockville Roads. (Project Planner: Mike Yankovich)

Mike Yankovich stated that the purpose of the public meeting was to provide an overview of the modified project and to accept public testimony on the RDEIR for the Rockville Trails Estates project. The RDEIR was being circulated for the mandatory 45-day public review period which will close on August 7, 2008. He also stated that there would be no action taken by the Solano County Planning Commission at this meeting. The Revised Final EIR (RFEIR) will then be brought before the Planning Commission for consideration along with the proposed amendments to the project application in late August or early September 2008.

Geoff Reilly of Christopher Joseph & Associates (CAJA) described the background of the original EIR, the purpose of the Revised EIR (REIR), the RDEIR environmental determination and the modified project alternatives. He also reviewed significant impacts after mitigation (significant and unavoidable). They included transportation/traffic and noise. Less than significant impacts with mitigation included: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation and traffic, utilities and services.

Specific details are as follows:

Geoff Reilly provided a brief history of the original EIR. Planning Commission recommended certification of original EIR on August 9th. Board of Supervisors on Oct. 9th

requested evaluation the following: consolidating effluent storage ponds, additional information on emergency water supply, information on noise from fire station, and rock wall historical analysis. Modified Project changes were noted. The RDEIR includes additional studies, including: technical reports and simulations, Air Quality report on GHG, biology, geotechnical, noise, and traffic update. The RDEIR comment period ends close of business on August 7th. The RDEIR looked at all issues. Significant impacts identified that cannot be mitigated (i.e., Significant and Unavoidable), included: (1) TRANS-9 (Rockville Road between Suisun and Abernathy), which will have temporary but significant and unavoidable impacts until interchange is completed; (2) NOISE-4 (Cumulative noise on Green Valley Rd. south of Rockville Road), which cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Significant impacts that can be mitigated in the RDEIR include: (1) Aesthetics: scenic vistas, resources, visual character, light & glare; (2) Air Quality: all impacts less than significant with mitigation; (3) Biology: special status plants that will be avoided, wildlife species (VELHB & CRF) for which negative survey results have been documented, birds (potential for nesting), loss of vernal pool on Road G, 1.52 acres of impacted wetlands, wildlife movement & cover, and habitat disturbance; (4) Cultural Resources: 2 archaeological sites (project redesigned to avoid sites), paleontological resources; (5) Geology/Soils: Cordelia Fault (performance standards included in project), all impacts fully mitigated, GEO-9 benefit of consolidated pond and elimination of berms; (6) Hydrology & Water Quality: channel impacts and erosion, need details on outlets and dissipaters (to be provided with Final Maps), NPDES compliance, groundwater degradation (all can be mitigated); (7) Noise: during construction; (8) Traffic: most Near-Term impacts on intersections (mitigated by restriping, adding signals, fair-share payments), cumulative impacts at Rockville/Abernathy (added travel lane), access alignment (western entrance to be aligned into 4-way intersection), acceleration lane added at east entry; (9) Water: off-site wells (no expected impacts, but mitigation includes monitoring, dig wells deeper; (10) Wastewater: grinder pump failure (back-up power), off street sewer lines to be identified, long-term maintenance and operation (operating plan is mitigation).

Several original EIR impacts fell out by project redesign (i.e., fire station, park), TRANS-8 resolved by completed improvements, TRANS-10 (now mitigated through fair share contribution, UTIL-1 is less than significant because water is more than adequate, UTIL-6 is no longer applicable as no ponds are remaining.

Alternatives included in the REIR consist of the No project, 5-acre minimum (258 DU), 10-acre minimum (136 DU); the Modified Project eliminates need for modified project site plan alternative.

Richard Loewke, environmental consultant for Rockville Trails Estates, briefly described the modified Rockville Trails Estates project design. A summary of community amenities included: the water storage pond, a 7.2 acre park, a fire station, permanent open space, expanded wildlife corridors and habitat protection, a membrane bioreactor (UV disinfected

tertiary treatment for landscape and vineyard use), multiple water wells and conservation program, energy conservation and enhanced storm protection (provided PowerPoint presentation and APA Journal handout to commissioners).

Chairperson Barton asked if the Commission had any questions. Commissioner McAndrew asked if the possibility of rockslides at the recycled water storage pond had been mitigated. Mr. Loewke answered that the recycled water storage pond is proposed to be located on a site at the northeast corner of the property that has a less than 10% slope and is not at risk from landslides or rockslides. Commissioner McAndrew also asked if there would be measures to inform the residents not to interact with wild animals migrating through the project site proposed wildlife corridors. Mr. Loewke answered that he believes that an education program was one of the included mitigation measures in the RDEIR. Chairperson Barton asked how adjacent residents whose wells go dry as a result of increased water usage from the development will be accommodated. Mr. Loewke responded that there are mitigation measures included in the RDEIR to address potential impacts to off-site surrounding wells, including digging new and/or deeper wells, or alternatively providing water from the project's on-site wells which would have more than sufficient capacity for this purpose.

Chairperson Barton opened the public hearing.

Richard Diamond, 369 Via Palo Linda, Fairfield, stated that the Rockville Trails Estates project will be a disaster for Green Valley and the taxpayers of Solano County. The RDEIR does not adequately address the impacts on the local water supply, increased traffic congestion, fire fighting resources, the school system and the impact of a privately managed sewage treatment facility on the environment. States that the current General Plan would not allow this project, because of the large size; he stated that the maximum number of homes allowed under the current General Plan is 120. Who will solve the water deficiency?

Bryant Washburne, 1934 Vintage Lane, Fairfield, stated that he did not believe that there was enough water in the Green Valley aquifer to support the Rockville Trails Estates project. He states that there was not adequate testing done on the aquifers, and more testing is needed. He believes it has never been proven that the two aquifers are connected. He challenged the RDEIR's position that its proposed mitigation would reduce the impact of loss of well waters to neighboring homes to less than significant. He stated that there is no adequate mitigation to a homeowner when they run out of water. The permitting requirements to obtain County approval for a new well are complicated and time consuming. He has a 400 foot deep well and has already drilled a second well on his property that is a half mile from the project site and does not believe the project will serve him.

Trish Coveney-Rees, 1 Chilmark Place, Suisun Valley, stated that she was against the Rockville Trails Estates project because it posed the threat of neighboring wells going dry.

She is concerned with water quality and water supply. Asked why private land owners should be required to dig deeper wells and wants to know who will pay if the wells go dry? She explained her experience with the water in her swimming pool turning green in color, and the explanation she received that the cause of this discoloration was associated with a concentration of manganese. She expressed concern that this concentration of manganese could adversely affect the quality of water in the aquifer. She stated her opinion that the project is result of greed, and suggested that more testing is needed.

Maurice Koch, 5055 Business Center Drive, Suite 108, PMB 396, Fairfield, states he is pleased that the four individual recycled water storage ponds were eliminated. He also stated that he was concerned that his domestic well water supply would be affected by the project. He was concerned that the Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) road easement that runs across his property and over an existing cement bridge over a creek bed does not meet the width standards for EVA road use. He was concerned that any replacement or modification of the bridge would not blend in with other structures on his property. He also stated that he believes the utility easement called out on the EVA road is no longer valid as SID and the Rockville Trails developer agreed to abandon the use of SID water. The RDEIR also did not address the issue of surface drainage down the hillside onto his property from the project site. He believes swales will need to be replaced, because the proposed project roadway will not provide for drainage control. Finally he expressed concern that the RDEIR did not adequately address the effects of the proposed Road N on his continued use of water from an on-site natural spring from which he currently obtains water via two 2" pipes leading down to a pond on his own property.

Barbara Lane, 1879 Rockville Road, Fairfield, was concerned that the Rockville Trails Estates project would cause mudslides and adversely affect the water table in the area. She lives near an unstable area where a mudslide has occurred previously and cost her \$100,000 in repairs. She wants the proposed homes moved to the north of her because there is better drainage. Her well is between 100-600 feet deep. She stated that a high capacity well operation would cause a cone of depression in the aquifer that would severely affect the shallower neighboring wells and cause them to possibly run dry. She also questioned why the water level tests were only done in February and April of 2008 rather than also during the dry months of August and September. She suggested that water level measurements be taken throughout the year to accommodate readings when the water table is at its lowest as well as its highest in order to achieve a true average for a year. Ms. Lane also was concerned that the issue of drainage had not been adequately addressed. Numerous homes are proposed to be built close to a severe grade which increases the possibility of landslides caused by excessive water runoff. She wants the developer to be responsible for replacement well cost and temporary water supply if the wells dry up. The maximum day demand falls off in the summer.

Herbert Hughes, 4317 Green Valley Rd. Fairfield, stated that he was against the Rockville Trails Estates project because Solano County does not have the resources to guarantee compliance for a private waste water system without a countywide sewer district in place.

Stated that without oversight by a sewer district contractors and private managers can cut corners and fail to meet regulatory requirements and the County and its taxpayers will inherit the problem. He is pleased that the previously proposed 4 treated effluent storage ponds were removed. Believes that the problems remaining include: (a) the wastewater system would be operated by a CSD - the County does not have the resources to enforce standards, and suggests a County-wide sewer district is better because the developer's operator who would run a CSD cannot be trusted; (b) a budget for the CSD must be established now in order to evaluate public risk and circulated as part of the REIR before its adoption; (c) the pipe system carrying the untreated waste water must be evaluated – where does effluent go in a power failure? Mr. Hughes suggests the use of alternative septic systems on 2.5 acre minimum lots and to reduce the project size.

Larry Birch, 6 Spring Lane, Fairfield, stated that the RDEIR was full of misrepresentations and partial analyses, and on many points it provided insufficient information for sound decision making. Areas of specific concern included (1) the economic viability of the project related to questions of its fiscal survival as it attempts to meet numerous environmental mitigation requirements, (2) environmental impacts of water extraction from large capacity wells causing a decline of the water table and (3) percolation of the wastewater into the groundwater tapped by surrounding domestic wells. He believes that the alternatives are misleading in the RDEIR. He also believed that the visual impacts from Rockville Park will not be less than significant, as the site will look different than it does today from that perspective. He suggested that the County consider a different alternative with 120-150 homes. A very large number of drip emitters are needed for this system; who maintains these? He stated that septic tanks would use less energy. He expressed concerns that the pond will be a “deer catcher” and that this impact has not been evaluated.

Larry Zinkin, 4330 Dynasty Lane, Green Valley, stated that the Rockville Trails Estates project is too large and too dense a development for the county setting of Green Valley. The proposed residences will be too dense and too close to existing country property and he asked that proposed homes near his property be pushed back 300 feet to preserve his views. He was also concerned with houses being placed on prominent ridgelines. He states the project is not consistent with Rural Residential standards and that the subdivision ordinance was ignored by RDEIR. The project has a “city-type” density. Mr. Zinkin was also concerned that the western access road would become the primary access route to and from the project as it is closest to I-80, I-680 and nearby shopping areas. This would overburden the Rockville Rd./Green Valley Rd. intersection and Green Valley Rd. leading to the freeway interchange. The RDEIR and the project description were not consistent with the Solano County General Plan and the Subdivision Ordinance. He stated he has seen several Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetles (VELB) and believes they are on the project site. Mr. Zinkin explained that he had also seen many California Red-Legged Frogs (CLF) and one California Tiger Salamander. He also mentioned that within an old off-site quarry pond he believed he saw five very large turtles that could have been Western Pond Turtles. Mr. Zinkin asked whether permits have been taken out on the old SID wells. He stated that the SID well is still a mess, and that the contractors did a lot of damage. He was also

concerned about water supply issues posed by the development of the project.

Diana Browning, 6 Spring Lane, Fairfield, spoke about trail development in the Rockville Trails Estates project. She stated that the development of the trail system has only been partially planned out. The necessary detailed planning should be done in Phase 1 of the project and not be deferred to a later phase. The trail planning should include professional trail planners and hiking/biking associations to develop trails to meet the needs of the users. When will the trails be built? The County should require that the trails and parking for public access be developed at the same time as the initial roads. Because the project area is prone to wildfire danger the trails should be required to accommodate the width and grades that fire trucks can use as an emergency access route. Ms Browning thought that CDF originally called for fire engine access to be provided to the perimeter of all homes in the project. A fire 15 years ago burned 300 acres and Ms. Browning wanted to see cattle grazing added as fire protection measure. Ms. Browning believed that the proposed parking lot was not adequate to provide access to the west side trail. Parking along Rockville Road would be unsightly and dangerous.

Jeff Zinkin, 4330 Dynasty Lane, Fairfield, stated that the Rockville Trails Estates project was too close to his home and creates too much density in the area, which will ruin the rural character of the Green Valley area. He also stated that the project was inconsistent with the intent of the Solano County General Plan. He requested that the project be modified to include 5 acre lots, and suggested that a 300 foot buffer be included (with cattle grazing to keep the grasses down) between the project and the existing residences. Mr. Zinkin was also concerned about the impact of high capacity wells on the shallower neighboring wells especially during times of drought. Conservation is needed. Does not believe the project has enough water. He wanted fines to be imposed if his water was affected. He cited new mitigation measure regarding off-site channel from watershed A. He stated that the RDEIR is misleading on this drainage, as it doesn't mention or describe flows going under Rockville Rd or other pipes and just one culvert. He also believed the storm runoff modeling was inaccurate, because of areas where there is rapid runoff and that the County needs to look carefully at this.

Nancy Nelson, 1800 Cravea Lane, Fairfield, stated that she was concerned about the project's impact on storm drainage and rapid runoff in the area. The RDEIR presented an overly simplified and deceptive description of the off-site drainage path from the central portion of the site in Watershed A. Stated that a portion of this existing drainage path has already proven to be incapable of handling water flow generated by major storm events. The size of the culvert is small, and it has not been well maintained. Better maintenance is required. The water runs overland then enters a 16 inch pipe. The pipe discharge has been deteriorated. Described how the channel carries a lot of water and fills with water in a storm (utilized PowerPoint slideshow). The December 2005 storm event completely overwhelmed the culverts in the area. Stated that she believes additional run-off generated by the project would only add to the flooding problems. She urged the County to look closely at the analysis of storm drainage and rapid runoff presented in the RDEIR. She requested that the

applicant's commitment to improve the off-site channel be clarified. She stated that the RDEIR claims that runoff from the developed project will be reduced to less than current conditions, but she believes that the modeling is defective. Commissioner Fred Barnes noted inadequate maintenance of the culverts. Ms. Nelson said that the channel is both inadequately maintained and undersized, and she believes it needs to be dredged.

Ronald Fissolo, 1890 Rockville Rd., Fairfield, also agreed that the issue of storm drainage and rapid runoff was not adequately addressed in the RDEIR. He was concerned that the Rockville Trails Estates project would further strain a water run-off system that was already overwhelmed by major storm events.

John Nelson, 1800 Cravea Lane, Fairfield, stated that the issue of noise generated by increased traffic on the western access road was not adequately addressed in the RDEIR. Believes the RDEIR's portrayal of use of the western access road is grossly underestimated. It states that the western access road was not intended to provide primary access to the site; recommends that the westerly project entry be downgraded to an EVA. She also stated that motorists traveling to and from I-80, I-680, Hwy 12 and nearby shopping areas will use the western access road because it is the shortest and most direct route. Concludes that the more cars there are the more noise there will be. He thinks that the steep access will cause cars to accelerate, generating more noise.

Cathy Ritch, 504 Via Vaquero, Fairfield, stated that development in Green Valley over the past five years has already adversely impacted traffic. The Rockville Trails Estates project would make a bad situation worse. A transportation impact analysis concluded that with or without the project eight intersections surrounding the I-80/I-680/SR12 interchange would operate at unacceptable levels. The RDEIR traffic analysis says that 8 intersections will operate at "F" LOS without the project under cumulative conditions. County and Vallejo have approved 24 projects. TRANS-1 through 8 was also not accurate. Mitigation of the traffic impacts through interchange improvements, construction of the North Connector and other road improvements would not be completed by the time the Rockville Trails Estates project is constructed. She thought that the I-80 improvements did not have secured funding. In light of the current economic situation funding for transportation projects is uncertain. Ms. Ritch urged the County to call a moratorium on further housing construction in the area of the I-80/I-680/SR12 interchange until recommended road and intersection improvements were completed.

Jerry W. Gerald, 1911 Vintage Lane, Fairfield, stated that the Rockville Trails Estates Transportation Impact Analysis is flawed and does not address risk to life with LOS "F". Thinks the project violates transportation planning goals of County (i.e. maintain LOS "C"). Believes the County would thus be creating safety impacts to response times. Access in and out of Green Valley is already restricted by traffic congestion caused by housing development in the area over the past few years. He believes all cars from project will use Suisun Valley Road. Green Valley, Mason Road, and Eastridge Road are not mentioned in a traffic analysis. He stated that the traffic flow patterns are illogical, and the numbers of

peak hour trips are under-estimated. He stated that the project will add traffic with secondary units and that the RDEIR does not estimate this. Believes that there is no determination as to how fair share contribution from project was calculated. Alternative transportation modes not identified.

Jorg Fleige, 1401 Rockville Rd., Fairfield, stated that the Rockville Trails Estates project will make traffic worse than it already is as Green Valley Road is used to access I-80 westbound and I-680 southbound. He disagreed with the Rockville Trails Estates traffic study, which indicated that little subdivision traffic would use Green Valley Road. He believes that the majority of drivers will take Green Valley Road because they will be commuting to jobs in the Bay Area. The alternative to Green Valley Road would be to back track several miles to Abernathy Road. He wanted to know how a governmental agency could approve a development knowing that it will overburden already challenged infrastructure. He believed that tax payers will need to pay for road improvements. Mr. Fleige concluded that congestion affects productivity, and that the project should be denied. He believed the mitigation measures would not fix the problems.

Mimi Fleige, 1401 Rockville Rd., Fairfield, stated that the RDEIR still has several unresolved issues. She also stated that the Public Resources Code (PRC) has been violated in the RDEIR. There were several mitigation standards that were inadequate in reducing oak woodland impacts to less than significant. The PRC requires 7 years of maintenance for planted oaks that may become diseased or die during this time frame which must be replaced – not the 5 years as suggested in the RDEIR. The PRC also requires that an appropriate number of trees be replaced for any removed oak that is less than 18 inches in diameter. She believes that the RDEIR proposal is to use a 1 to 1 ratio for oak replacement, and that this is not adequate in compensating for the loss of the original trees. The RDEIR states that 740 oak trees will be removed. Of those 137 trees are estimated to have trunks more than 18 inches. If that number of oaks is removed the Rockville Trails Estates project will be in violation of CEQA. Ms. Fleige stated that mature oak trees such as the ones at the proposed Rockville Trails Estates project site are instrumental in the reduction of CO2. One large oak will absorb all the emissions of an average car over its lifetime. When mature oak trees such as those at the project site are cut down, it will take up to 100 years for any planted trees to make up for the loss. She also stated that animal species will be lost as oak trees are removed and that placing buildings near roots of trees, as well as the lowering water table, will cause additional death of oaks.

Jan Hewitt, former District 3 Solano County Supervisor and City of Vacaville Planning Commissioner, stated that she had some questions to ask about the Rockville Trails Estates project. (1) She asked if it was a conflict of interest that the engineers report and the EIR were both authored by Creegan & D'Angelo. Who was the third party? (2) Why is the sewer plant sited on or near the Cordelia Fault line, which is now twice as wide on Rockville Road as it was in 1976? (3) Why is the County considering a sewer plant not presently allowed in Solano County? (4) Who will be responsible for the sewer district and pay for it when it fails as a public district? (5) Will there be a public review of all the

monitoring and mitigation needed for Rockville Trails Estates project fixes? (6) Who will pay for bonds to be posted to pay for replacement pumps for the sewage? (7) What happens to the salmon when the sewage drains into Green Valley and Suisun Valley creeks? (8) Who pays for the neighbors cracked septic tanks from the excavation blasting? (9) Clay lining of ponds did not contain the hazardous waste in the Benicia hills. (10) What is to prevent landslides into your storage pond? (11) The traffic impact on Green Valley Road is vastly underestimated. The road bed is not adequate to handle all the heavy trucks necessary for construction. Also the new interchange is not scheduled to be built until 2035. Are you planning a round-about for the corners of Rockville and Green Valley roads and Rockville and Suisun Valley roads? She concluded by saying the RDEIR is still inadequate and should not be certified. It is not in the County's best interest.

Roberto Valdez, Plantation Way, Vacaville, stated he opposes the Rockville Trails Estates project, because it would have an adverse impact on the Rockville corridor: (1) native grassland, including needlegrass, would be affected; (2) oak trees would be lost; (3) special-status wildlife species would be affected, including Golden Eagle, VELB, burrowing owl, CRF, western pond turtle, and vernal pool crustaceans (22 special-status species). He stated that he is currently associated with the preparation of the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for County.

Jim Dekloe, 655 Oakbrook Dr., Fairfield and member of the Sierra Club, stated that the public had pointed out where the consultants had skewed impacts on the area. Impacts on local schools also had not been studied adequately. The high school is already full and the project would put an additional burden on them. The Rockville Trails Estates project is wrong for the area. The RDEIR doesn't cover all the adverse impacts on the Green Valley area. Believes that this project will have a significant effect on aesthetics, because even a child can see the difference in the before and after perspectives. He believed that aesthetics should therefore be considered a significant impact. Regarding traffic, he stated that the RDEIR authors had to admit to the impacts, even though the traffic is assumed to be routed incorrectly. Stated that there is no soil on this site, and it is therefore hard to build here. He believes that clustering is the wrong design, spreads development throughout the entire site. He stated that although the former wildlife "cul-de-sacs" have "opened up" in this revised design, that the project is still inappropriate and the corridors are still inadequate. He concluded that the design maximizes impacts. Questioned whether the RDEIR outlines impacts accurately, wonders if it hides facts.

Since there were no further speakers, Chairperson Barton closed the public hearing.

Commissioner McAndrew asked that the applicant and the County's EIR Consultant to reconsider the noise mitigation for the fire engines by allowing fire trucks to use their sirens for the sake of safety. She also commented that Mitigation UTIL-2 (regarding water supply connection) sounds like the creation of a water district outside the boundaries of the project. She then asked the applicant's environmental consultant who would pay if the water supply for the surrounding wells fail. Mr. Loewke answered that the information in the

RDEIR shows that it is very unlikely that any off-site wells would be affected; however, if any such wells were affected by operation of the project then the applicant would pay for implementation of the mitigation measures. Commissioner McAndrew asked if the treated wastewater storage pond could be fenced off to protect deer and people from falling in. Geoff Reilly from CAJA responded that although it is not currently proposed in the RDEIR, that this measure could be assessed and added to the RFEIR. Mr. Loewke answered that he believed the storage pond would be fenced. She also asked for confirmation that there would not be any private lots in the 810 acre open space area. Mr. Loewke and Mr. Yankovich affirmed that there would not be any private lots in the open space area and that the area would be maintained by a homeowner's association. Commissioner McAndrew then asked how long the well monitoring would last. Mr. Loewke responded that monitoring was initiated last November and is continuing today; he noted that additional testing will be required before a final map is approved, and that monitoring will continue well after the project is completed.

Commissioner Barnes stated that he thought the revised project plan was an improvement over the initial plan. Fred Barnes also expressed disappointment with lack of comments addressing the long list of design and engineering improvements reflected in the Modified Project. Noted that water conservation has been improved, a single consolidated pond has been provided, Fire Station in 1st phase is positive, and monitoring of the aquifer has shown that fluctuations in the water table have been very low. He stated that the County staff can manage technical oversight of this project. He expressed pleasure to see that a wash rack for construction vehicles was being required. He also suggested that fencing around the recycled water storage pond be confirmed. He followed up on drainage comments presented during public hearing and clarified that requested level and detail may be beyond EIR. Barnes noted that the first phase of the project will include a temporary fire station and 2 fire trucks.

Chairperson Barton asked Mr. Loewke if the trails could be included in Phase 1 and if there were improvements that could be made to the drainage system. Mr. Loewke responded that the Modified Project included a larger first phase with more trail improvements, but that the project design limited the extent of trail improvements that would be physically separated from completed project roadways, in order to minimize the risk of fire and inability to adequately respond; he agreed to look more closely at this issue however. Mr. Loewke noted that the project will discharge less peak storm water into the off-site drainage systems in the post-development condition, than occurs today; however, the applicant wanted to express a desire to participate with the County and private land owners on whose property the culvert runs, to come up with a plan to complete appropriate improvements.

Commissioner Moore expressed concern that a great amount of detailed engineering has already gone into this Modified Project, and questioned how much more engineering should be required as part of the RDEIR? He stated that detailed grading design will be provided to the County prior to the final maps.

Mike Yankovich stated that the next step in the REIR process will be for CAJA to respond to comments heard at the meeting/public hearing in the form of a RFEIR, which will be prepared and presented to the public/agencies and the Planning Commission in late August or early September 2008.

Commissioner McAndrew reminded staff that the minutes from the June 5th meeting still need to be approved.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS and REPORTS**

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