**COUNTY OF SOLANO**
**MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY**
**LAND USE PLAN**

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

# MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF The Middle Green Valley Citizen's Advisory Committee January 12, 2009

The regular meeting of the Middle Green Valley Citizen's Advisory Committee was held Monday, January 12, 2009, in the Solano County Administration Center, Multi-Purpose Room, 675 Texas St., Fairfield, CA 94533.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Craig Gillespie, Herb Hughes, Sarah Lindemann, Bill Mayben, Nancy Nelson, Anthony Russo and James Wiley

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bob Hagar

OTHERS PRESENT: Birgitta Corsello, Director, Resource Management; Mike Yankovich, Planning Manager, Resource Management; Matt Walsh, Principal Planner; Resource Management; and Diane Buschman, Office Assistant III, Resource Management

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 6:15 p.m.

2. Roll Call
Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

3. Public Comments for Items Not on the Agenda
There were no public comments.

4. Review and Approve November 17, 2008 Minutes
The December 10, 2008 minutes were approved with corrections.

5. Discussion of CAC decision making process
Sarah Lindemann suggested that if an issue comes up concerning a particular landowner(s) that the meeting facilitator let the CAC know in advance so that members could talk to the landowner about the issue before the meeting and report back to the full CAC with their findings. If it was not possible to speak with the landowner before the issue came before the CAC then she hoped that

members could speak to the property owner after the meeting and return to the next meeting with an answer. The CAC members and Solano County staff agreed to the suggestion.

6. Status of Consultant Selection

Mike Yankovich briefly summarized progress of the consultant selection process and stated that back in December the CAC had an opportunity to hear presentations from the four consultant teams being considered for the Middle Green Valley Land Use Plan. After the presentations the CAC members shared their thoughts about each group and concluded that Hart Howerton came out as the lead choice. Town-Green was the second bidder that the CAC favored. Hart Howerton's cost was initially higher than the other bids however in the weeks that followed Hart Howerton revised their cost proposal to an amount in the same range as the other bidders. Prior the January meeting the CAC was sent information on the proposals and cost of Hart Howerton and Town-Green for their review and comments.

Mr. Yankovich began by referring to the information on Hart Howerton and Town-Green that was sent to the CAC for their review prior the January meeting. He stated that staff hoped to be able to go to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for a consultant at the Board's January 27, 2009 meeting. He asked if the committee members had any comments. Regarding Hart Howerton lowering their bid a member asked what they eliminated from their proposed scope of work. Mr. Yankovich stated that Hart Howerton indicated that by reducing the amount of design features, color renderings and illustrations they were able to reduce their cost. They also would be able to access existing background reports instead of creating their own. Staff was asked if there was enough existing material available to create a specific plan and EIR for the Middle Green Valley. Matt Walsh answered that the only thing that Hart Howerton thought that might be needed was more detailed biological analysis.

As far as the deliverables staff thought that the two proposals were fairly close in what they were offering but each put their focus in different areas. There was a minimal difference between the two proposals in terms of the detail in development standards, in the transfer development rights ordinance component. There was a more significant difference in the estimated cost of the EIR. Their hours were also allocated differently in that Hart Howerton put the bulk of their work in the specific plan development of standards and its financing aspects. Town-Green put more of their hours in the environmental review and in meetings and facilitation. Mr. Walsh thought that the financing aspect, the infrastructure aspect and the specific plan would be the heart of the Middle Green Valley Land Use Plan process. After further discussion on the issues including costs, focus, number of meetings and the willingness to meet with individual landowners the CAC agreed that Hart Howerton would be the best choice.

Nancy Nelson stated for the record that the CAC did not officially approve the bylaws and personally felt that they didn't thoroughly address the 7$^{th}$ member issue and that it wasn't particularly consistent with the resolution(s). Ms. Corsello

responded that staff would make sure the Board of Supervisors was aware of that fact. She also stated that the CAC needed to agree as a group on how to resolve the tie-breaker issue. Discussion followed on the pros and cons of using the Planning Commission or a 7th member. The group was not in agreement as to using either choice. It was suggested that rather than using the Planning Commission or a 7th member, that they use assistance from staff, the consultant or other expert resources to work out potential disagreements. The group agreed to a commitment to work thru issues as a collaborative effort.

7. Public Comments for Items on the Agenda
There were no public comments.

8. Adjournment

R:\PLANNING\Long Range Projects\Middle Green Valley Land Use Plan\Middle Green Valley CAC\Minutes\2008\2009\CAC Minutes of 1-12-09.doc