



Approved

MEETING MINUTES

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE STEERING COMMITTEE

NAPA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
2121 IMOLA AVENUE, NAPA, CA

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 2007 – 1:00 PM

**Steering Committee
Members:**

Chair

Peter McCrea

Vice Chair

Tom Andrews

George Bachich

Mary Ellen Boyet

Jon-Mark Chappellet

Stephen Cuddy

Debra Dommen

Tom Gamble

Michael Haley

James Hendrickson

Guy Kay

Carol Kunze

Carole Meredith

Beth Painter

Carol Poole

Jeff Reichel

Brad Simpkins

Stuart Smith

William Trautman

Bob Torres

Duane Wall

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Peter McCrea called the meeting to order and roll was called alphabetically.

Present

Tom Andrews, George Bachich, Debra Dommen, Tom Gamble, Michael Haley, Jim Hendrickson, Guy Kay, Carol Kunze, Peter McCrea, Carol Poole, Stuart Smith, William Trautman, and Duane Wall.

Absent

Mary Ellen Boyet absent, Jon-Mark Chappellet absent, Stephen Cuddy absent, Carole Meredith at the time of roll and later arrived during item 2, Beth Painter at the time of roll and later arrived during item 2, Jeff Reichel at the time of roll and later arrived during item 2, Bob Torres at the time of roll and later arrived during item 2, and Brad Simpkins absent.

Staff Present

Laura Anderson, Hillary Gitelman, Patrick Lowe, Howard Siegel, Patrick Lynch, Brian Bordona, Steve Lederer, Nancy Johnson, Bruce Wilson and Lori Maher.

PMC

Eric Norris, France Hermansky and Julie Jessen

2. Public Comment

John Stephens of Napa addressed the committee regarding his concern of the rise in ocean levels within the next 50 years. He feels that the general plan update should focus on addressing this concern and options for preparation.

Peter McCrea, Chair, asked staff how they plan to address these issues.

Hillary noted that the Committee did give staff direction regarding Conservation and climate change; however, no direction on sea level rise. This can be added to the plan as it moves forward if the Committee desires.

John Clifton of Napa also addressed the committee regarding the flood control program and the elevation of our properties. He noted that he is against putting homes in any of the floodway areas as they would have to be raised by 10 feet. John also addressed the transportation issues that involve the waterways and requested emphasis on commercial properties.

3. Updates

- a) City Representative – Carol Poole had nothing to report
- b) Summary of Public Outreach Associated with Release of Public Draft & EIR – Hillary noted that staff provided a handout that includes the up-coming public hearings and community meetings that staff will be attending to summarize the process of the plan. Hillary encouraged other community groups to give us a call if they are interested in presentations and asked committee members to reach out to their friends & associates.

4. Action Items:

- a) Approval of minutes from the January 10, 2007 meeting
Motion: Made by Bill Trautman to approve the minutes of the January 10, 2007 meeting.
Second: Michael Haley
Vote: AIF

5. Discussion of the Draft General Plan Elements

- a) Land Use Element – Goal 5 & Related Policies – Hillary noted that edits made were based on the committee’s last conversation. Staff has made mild changes to goal 5 and suggested adding two additional policies to the implementation section.
 George Bachich noted that he appreciates staff’s efforts regarding the rights of property owners; however, he feels the content of the sentence tends to weaken property rights and feels they deserve equal status. George submitted alternative wording that he would like to see added to the general plan that the committee had not seen before. The committee agreed to have copies made for each member and continue the discussion later in the meeting.
- b) Angwin – Kevin Block, representing Pacific Union College (PUC), spoke of plans for an “Eco Village” and noted that over 90% of the PUC lands will be preserved forever through conservation easements, as open space, agriculture or parks. The proposal includes 170 net new dwelling units on campus and over 400 in the “Echo Village.” PUC also proposed narrowing Howell Mountain Road, a village square with mixed use surrounding it, and other amenities.

Questions of the committee included:

- Q: How does PUC intend to address the parking with the events that take place in Angwin?
 A: The plan is to go underground with the parking which is doable and a cost of the project
- Q: What is the long term plan for the Airport and is it compatible with the housing proposal? Concern is the airport will eventually get closed due new housing.
 A: Airport will remain and PUC hopes to convince the Airport Land Use Commission that the limited housing in the “Farm” neighborhood will not be adversely impacted by noises
- Q: How do intend to deal with sewage for the roughly 550 new units?
 A: Upgrade the existing treatment plant, it will be improved and enhanced so that the waste gets treated to a much higher level that will be available for irrigating crops
- Q: How many total units will be added?
 A: 170 units on the PUC campus, 200 single family homes in Eco Village and 220 homes of other types that included flats, apartments, town homes and cottages.
- Q: How will you fix the Howell Mountain water situation?
 A: The plan is to reclaim and recycle waste water for irrigation and conserve potable water so there would be no increase in groundwater use from the PUC well.
- Q: What about the existing septic systems on the hillside?
 A: We will look at this and do what is feasible, but this will probably be a “self help” situation if people want to move away from septic systems.

Q: What is the total population going to be, due to these build outs?

A: The current population is about 3200, with the campus units this will be an increase of about a thousand or approximately 1/3 of the population.

Verbal public comments included:

Aubyn Fulton – Lives in Angwin and is a teacher for PUC and wants to preserve the natural rural nature of Angwin. The question shouldn't be "Do we have a discussion about rural Angwin" but, a discussion of how we are going to preserve the natural rural setting of Angwin.

EG Blackburn – Feels the TRIAD plans for Angwin will considerably hinder emergency vehicles on the busiest section of Howell Mountain Road.

Duane Cronk – Addressed the committee again asking the committee to redraw the Angwin Urban Bubble, removing the three large agricultural parcels north of the college. He is also concerned with the statement in the General Plan that reads: "the amount of agricultural land within the area shall not be less than existed in 2006" (referring to the urbanized area). He would like this removed.

Kellie Anderson – (Angwin) Again addressing the Urban Bubble and agricultural land in Angwin presented a petition to remove 5 agricultural parcels from the bubble to be protected.

John Tully – Addressed the Urban Bubble noting he wanted to save rural Angwin and take the parcels out of the bubble.

Dorothy Lind Salmon – (Representing Napa Valley Economic Development Corporation) Wants to support PUC's process of involving the community in its planning. She feels this take great courage and leadership and what they are proposing is extraordinary.

Hebert Ford – Feels it is our responsibility to give property owners a reasonable right to use their land to his/her profit.

Steven Booska – Is concerned with the Urban Bubble in Angwin. He feels the agricultural lands northeast of the corner of the bubble, is very viable and profitable and should be preserved. Agricultural lands should be used as agricultural land and should be sold to only those that will to use it as such.

Gail Hamilton – (Alumni of PUC) Feels that putting in homes will take away the rural environment and will be very detrimental to PUC.

Douglas Hamilton – Noted that after putting in all most 600 new homes, the population would grow from 1500 to 2000 people, where are these people going to work? Will PUC increase this many jobs in Angwin?

Reldon Tonsberg (Angwin) Is a PUC graduate noted that there is no reason for another 170 homes for PUC staff when there are current plans for 150 plus homes for PUC staff now. Adding more housing means the cost of his home will decrease. There will be a greater need for water usage which will create higher rates and more homes will cause more traffic. He feels that "what PUC is trying to create will become the demise of PUC".

Marsa Tully – Feels the lack of well-water in the community is a major concern and asked why, in LU7, has the word "wells" been removed and how is the committee going to deal with this? Hillary noted that we have included LU8 and could add well water to this or back into LU7 if desired by the committee.

Karen Widmer – Addressed the audience and challenged them to put themselves in PUC shoes and asked what would they do in this situation?

Michael Hackett – (Napa Valley) Addressed the safety issue of the plan. He feels the plan will create traffic problems that will result in accidents and the injuries will be on the hands of the supervisors and all that allow the development to go on.

Maria Lopez – Believes that Angwin needs a change and that there are new technology advances that can be used to improve how we use our natural resources.

John Himpel – Asked the committee to extend the decision making process for up to 6 months.

Chris Carmichael – (Angwin resident) Asked who will responsible for the expense of rebuilding the road in order to get work trucks to the top of the hill after each year? Also if a new sewer system has to be put in to

accommodate the new housing, why isn't this extended all over Angwin? Water issues are a very big concern! Frank Grodins – (Resident of Angwin) Noted that Triad should consider the requirement for new homes to use rain water catchment tanks instead of taking water from the groundwater table. This could save up to 40% of rain water that can be reused.

Susan French – (Angwin home owner) Moved to St. Helena due to poor safety on the roads, hoping to move back someday. Also there is no bus service for high school students who do not attend PUC. Will PUC be adding a bus service for these students?

Sandy Elles – (Napa County Farm Bureau) Urged the committee to consider postponing the adoption of LU5 and LU6 in the Angwin portion of the Draft General Plan until there is more dialog and certainty of the parcels and their long term impact on agriculture.

Submitted Written Comments included:

Dee Cuney – Feels that private property rights need to be included in the General Plan

Jacalyn Spence – If maps are included in the draft, they need to be simple and clear (Scenario 2 is not clear). The dotted line in #2 should move to show proposed bubble outline – not just agricultural parcels as green.

Hillary asked the committee's direction on Policies 5, 6 & 8. She suggested amending Policy 5 to quote “the urbanized area of Angwin shown on the County's land use map shall contain institutionalized uses i.e. the college, residential uses and limited neighborhoods serving commercial uses.”

She then suggested that the committee discuss the map first. After a long discussion the committee voted on the following:

Motion: Made by Duane Wall to add Maps 1, 2 & 3 into the Draft General Plan that goes out to the public.

Second: Michael Haley

Vote: 14 in Favor, 3 Opposed

Hillary then suggested that Policies 5 and 6 be added to the draft for public comments with an amendment to Policy LU5 to end after “neighborhood-serving non-residential uses.”

Add on to Policy LU7 the subject of encouraging replacement of existing septic systems with municipal wastewater treatment as feasible.

Change Policy LU8 to say “Nothing in this General Plan is intended to preclude consolidation of private water districts”

Change Policy LU12 to say the “County supports the ongoing operation of the Angwin Airport including any improvements required by the FAA in the AV zoning district.”

- c) Addressing George Bachich's language regarding Private Property Rights, it was agreed to insert the first paragraph in lieu of LU3 with suggested amendments to read as follows:
 “With the proviso that no rights are absolute, that we will all best be served by striking a balance between private property rights and all our others rights and our other important community values, this general plan nevertheless explicitly acknowledges that private ownership provides valuable incentives for the proper care of property and the environment, that preservation of property rights is an important cultural, economic and community value, that protects property rights as one of the primary and necessary functions of government at all levels, and that private property rights are therefore deserving of respect and consideration whenever land use decisions are made.”

It was also agreed that the second paragraph, be replaced in the Glossary with the accepted legal definition from the Blacks Law Dictionary that Bill Trautman will provide. The second paragraph currently reads as follows:

“With no intent either to limit existing rights or to create new rights, “property rights” as used in this General Plan means all the rights customarily and traditionally residing in ownership of real property and attaching to a fee interest deed, including the right to possess, occupy, use, and enjoy the property and the water, mineral,

and other resources on, under and over the surface thereof: to control the use of the property and to exclude other from it, to protect the property from damage and from pollution, to farm the property and otherwise improve it, to benefit economically from the property and its improvements, and to temporarily or permanently transfer, encumber, assign, or alienate certain of those rights through bequest, sale, mortgage, lease, deed, easement, or otherwise.”

Motion: Made by Michael Haley to add the language as amended

Second: Duane Wall

Vote: 12 in Favor, 5 Opposed

Note to the committee: Subsequent to the meeting staff determined that “Blacks Law Dictionary did not contain a useful definition and Bill and George consulted about a revised version of George’s 2nd paragraph.

6. Future Agenda Items

- a) February 28, 2007 Meeting – Review of Draft EIR
- b) March 28, 2007 Meeting – Public Hearing on the Draft General Plan & Draft EIR

7. Adjourn – 4:50 PM