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 June 15, 2009

The regular meeting of the Middle Green Valley Citizen's Advisory Committee was held Monday, June 15, 2009, in the Solano County Administration Center, Multi-Purpose Room, 675 Texas St., Fairfield, CA 94533.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Mike Yankovich, Planning Manager, Resource Management; Matt Walsh, Principal Planner; Resource Management; and Diane Buschman, Office Assistant III, Resource Management;
Brendan Kelly, Project Manager, Hart Howerton; Amie MacPhee, Principal, Hart Howerton; Tamsen Plume, Partner, Holland & Knight

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Public Comments for Items Not on the Agenda**
4. **Review and Approve May 18, 2009 minutes**

   - Matt Walsh briefly called the meeting to order and took the roll call. He asked for public comments that were not on the Agenda and asked for an approval of the May 18, minutes. They were approved without comment. Matt Walsh then turned the meeting over to Brendan Kelly (Hart Howerton).
   - Mr. Kelly introduced the three main topics of the meeting: 1) the Specific Plan, 2) the Environmental Impact Report, and 3) the Development Agreement.

5. **Review of General Plan MGV goal, policies, and implementation regulations**
   This item was continued to the next meeting.

6. **Outline of Middle Green Valley Specific Plan**

- Mr. Kelly began the presentation with an image of the sprawl transect as an anti-example of development (See page 1 of the June 15th presentation).

Utilities

- Mr. Kelly presented the proposed County Services Area (CSA) which may include a sewer connection to the City of Fairfield. The County, as a wholesale buyer, could make purchases on a meter supplied by the City of Fairfield (See pages 2-4 of the June 15th presentation).
- Herb Hughes asked how this alternative came about. Mr. Kelly replied that the team researched the expansion of services for the City of Fairfield and this appeared to be a combination of previous utility alternatives.
- Bill Mayben asked if the Board of Directors would be running the CSA. Mike Yankovich replied that the CSA may initially begin with the Board of Directors.
- Nancy Nelson commented that one advantage of the alternative is not having the City of Fairfield responsible for maintenance. She asked if this was true of wastewater services as well. Mr. Kelly responded that this was correct.
- Bill Mayben asked who would maintain the water mains. Mr. Kelly replied that the County would not be interested in maintenance, and that this would potentially be sub-contracted to the HOA. Mr. Mayben also asked "what are the operating costs, and would these be part of the HOA or sales price, who has the capability to provide services and at what cost, and will there be a connection fee".

Conceptual Illustrative Plan and Land Use

- Mr. Kelly then presented a draft conceptual illustrative plan, showing 3 defined neighborhoods (See page 5 of the June 15th presentation).
- He also presented the land use plan, reviewing the proposed land use designations (See page 6 of the June 15th presentation). One update noted was that Mr. Biggs property was not shown as a part of the plan. Mr. Biggs has 7 recorded parcels, and the remaining 7 units will go back into the TDR unit count.
- Herb Hughes asked if Mr. Biggs' conditions of approval allow for a gated entry. Matt Walsh replied that he is unsure of the conditions for the Biggs property.
- Herb Hughes was concerned that the Biggs conditions conflict with the overall project goal and asked if there were any efforts to revisit his conditions. Matt Walsh replied that we need to find out the specifics of Biggs' plans, and that he may be subject to design review and design guidelines.
- Herb Hughes commented that there is the potential to help design Biggs property to be consistent with the vision while also achieving their goals.
- Sarah Lindemann asked for a clarification of the TDR process. Mr. Kelly used the Wirth and Mason properties as an example. Mr. Wirth would sell his parcel to the Masons, and Wirth would receive a percentage of the sale based upon his percentage of units. Then land use restrictions would be applied to the property, and the market would determine the price of units. Mr. Kelly noted that this method avoids the process of typical TDRs which fail when landowners are pitted against one another.

- Sarah Lindemann also asked if transfers affect lot size, land value, etc. Mr. Kelly responded that this is possible, but we wouldn't put additional units that would decrease land value; it can be driven by how much the land can bear.
- Mr. Kelly then also presented the regulation plan, showing 6 transect zones (See pages 7-8 of the June 15th presentation).

Specific Plan

- Mr. Kelly presented the partial working draft of the Specific Plan (See pages 9-63 of the June 15th presentation).
- Mr. Kelly noted that this was a brief introduction to the format and main elements of the document. He encouraged the CAC to provide comments, particularly to the preamble in the beginning of the document (See pages 11 of the June 15th presentation).
- Mr. Kelly also pointed out the Specific Plan will provide consistency references between proposed policies and the goals and policies of the adopted General Plan; these are highlighted in green side bars throughout the document (See page 21 of the June 15th presentation as an example).
- Craig Gillespie asked if the trail along Green Valley Road will be moved. Mr. Kelly replied that there will be planting improvements and that the trail may be resurfaced.
- Herb Hughes asked whether art in public places would apply here. It is possible that only applies to the City of Fairfield.
- Sarah Lindemann asked if the EIR will be consistent with the Specific Plan. Mr. Kelly replied that both will be consistent.
- Mr. Kelly also briefly introduced the neighborhood code portion of the Specific Plan (See pages 64-77 of the June 15th presentation).
- Herb Hughes suggested staggering front yard setbacks.
- Erin Beavers commented the need to include discussions for public services (i.e. schools, fire department) and utilities. He noted it is better to revitalize an existing fire station or school, noting an existing school that has a failed septic system.
- Craig Gillespie added that it makes great sense to provide a link to an existing school.
- Erin Beavers commented that schools contribute to community, and the City of Fairfield is currently trying to attract private schools.

7. **EIR Status- NOP, Scoping Meeting, and Resource Agencies**

- Mr. Kelly stated that the EIR will try to address and solicit comments from regulatory agencies, including the Army Corps, Fish & Game, Fish & Wildlife, and the Water Quality Board. The EIR scoping meeting is scheduled for June 23.
- Tamsen Plume stated that the role of the Specific Plan is to address potential concerns on various levels that include: landowners interests, the local jurisdiction, state law, and federal rules and requirements.

CEQA

- Nancy Nelson asked what happens when agencies don't comment on the NOP. Ms. Plume replied that the State requires CEQA for a permit and noted that it is

important to contact agencies in order to avoid later input that may result in further work.

- Herb Hughes asked how the team would address potential State requirements to concentrate development for transportation. Ms. Plume replied that AB-32 address greenhouse gas emissions. A chapter in the EIR will analyze AB-32 and address consistency. There is the potential that the amount of open space in the proposed plan will be sufficient to self-mitigate impacts.
- Erin Beavers commented that the City of Fairfield is in contact with the traffic consultants (Abrams Associates) to address traffic counts.
- Herb Hughes asked if both utility options will be explored in the EIR. Mr. Kelly responded that the final utility plan will be a hybrid of the current alternatives.

8. **Development Agreement**

- Tamsen Plume described the development agreement (DA) as a negotiated agreement between landowners and the County. There will be one master agreement, and the approved Specific Plan will be the controlling document for the entire study area, independent of participation in the TDR process.
- The DA freezes policies until its termination, which may range from 5-20 years. The DA provides certainty in the rules, and allows people to plan, especially as jurisdictions adopt new policies.
- Ms. Plume discussed the DA process, which begins with establishing a “term sheet” with the County, including creating a draft DA, circulating the draft for comment, receiving a Staff Report, and having the DA adopted by ordinance.
- Anthony Russo commented that numerous questions need to be addressed as early as possible. He stated is it advantageous to have collaboration between landowners and an integrated plan, especially when dealing with agencies.
- Bill Mayben asked how delays in building/phasing can impact the timeframe of the DA. Mr. Kelly replied that the Specific Plan will continue to serve as the zoning overlay.
- Herb Hughes asked how long the DA process will take. Mr. Kelly replied that he expected the DA and Specific Plan to be approved at the same time.

9. **Schedule Update for EIR, Specific Plan and other Milestones**

<u>Next Steps</u>

- EIR Scoping Meeting
- Planning Commission Meeting
- Regulatory Agency Meeting

10. **Adjourn to next CAC meeting**
    July 20, 2009