



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

**APPROVED**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**GENERAL PLAN UPDATE STEERING COMMITTEE**

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

**WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 2007 – 1:00 PM**

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Chair called the meeting to order and roll was called alphabetically.

**Present**

George Bachich, Mary Ellen Boyet, Jon-Mark Chappellet, Debra Dommen, Tom Gamble, Michael Haley, Jim Hendrickson, Guy Kay, Carol Kunze, Peter McCrea, Beth Painter, Carol Poole, Jeff Reichel, Stuart Smith, Brad Simpkins, William Trautman, and Duane Wall.

**Absent**

*Tom Andrews absent, Stephen Cuddy absent, Carole Meredith at the time of roll and later arrived during item 5, Bob Torres at the time of roll and later arrived during item 5.*

**Staff Present**

Krishan Chopra, Hillary Gitelman, Howard Siegel, Patrick Lowe, Brian Bordona, Nancy Johnson, Bruce Wilson and Lori Maher.

**PMC**

Eric Norris and Pat Angell

**2. Public Comment on items not schedule on today's Agenda – None**

**3. Updates**

a) City Representative – None

**4. Action Items:**

a) Approval of minutes from the May 30, 2007 Meeting

**Motion:** Made by George Bachich/Bill Trautman to approve the minutes of the May 30, 2007 meeting.

**Second:** Duane Wall

**Vote:** AIF

**Note:** Debra Dommen wanted to remind Staff to take in consideration that, at the last

meeting there were comments related to having a couple of meeting up valley during harvest time.

Hillary announced that there will be two meeting up valley at the St Helena Fire Station, one in August and one in October and they will be the extra meetings the committee agreed to.

Hillary also noted that the committee received additional comments letters today that were not included in the meeting packet. Staff is working on getting the remainder of the letters coded and to the committee, as well as posted to the web site.

## 5. Overview of Public Comments Received & Discussion of Possible “Big Picture” Adjustments to the General Plan Update

Chair, Peter McCrea noted that at the last meeting the committee agreed to review and discuss the totality of the plan and asked if there were any Public Comments on this subject. There were none.

The committee discussed the following questions at some length:

1. *Shall the General Plan Update focus on clarifying and updating the language and policy framework provided in the current General Plan, making few substantive policy changes, and only where they are necessary to reflect changes or issues that have arisen since the current General Plan was comprehensively updated in 1983?*
2. *Shall the General Plan Update retain the current General Plan’s commitment to agricultural preservation, urban centered growth, and growth management?*
3. *Shall the General Plan Update articulate a future that is generally consistent with the growth management goal commonly referred to as Measure A and the 1% annual growth rate? (Please also see the separate, specific memorandum regarding Draft Policy Ag/LU-120 in the Draft General Plan Update.)*
4. *Shall the General Plan Update retain the definition of “urban” contained on the current Land Use Map of the County, or somehow clarify the plan by using and better defining terms like “urbanized,” “non-agricultural,” “already developed,” or etc.?*
5. *Shall the General Plan Update include policies specific to non-agricultural geographic areas in the Agricultural Preservation & Land Use Element, and are there agricultural areas that should be similarly called out?*

The “Big Picture” questions that would be helpful to get the committees thoughts on are numbers 7, 8, 10 & 11. Numbers 6 &9 can be discussed next month.

6. *Are there better ways to integrate policies of the Circulation Element and the Agricultural Preservation & Land Use Element?*
7. *Are there ways to eliminate some of the significant unavoidable impacts identified for all alternatives in the Draft EIR (agricultural zoning, population & employment, traffic, sensitive biotic communities, noise, air quality & green house gas emissions, geologic & seismic hazards, groundwater, historic resources)?*
8. *Shall the General Plan Update be revised to emphasize energy conservation, reduced air emissions, and other benefits of urban-centered growth in all elements?*
9. *Shall the General Plan Update be revised to incorporate an over-arching philosophy such as sustainability, or an over-arching concern such as global climate change, and if so how?*

There was no formal action on any of these questions, however Hillary indicated that the committees observations and discussion will be useful when staff assembles revised elements. Hillary noted that one of the things we have been challenged to do by the commenters is develop a better connection between areas like agricultural preservation, urban centered growth, and sustainability. As we go through each element of the plan we will make connections where they exist and strengthen them where they can be strengthened.

**6. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Committee’s Recommendations to the Napa County Conservation, Development & Planning Commission on the following matters:**

- a) Proposed American Canyon Rural Urban Limit Policies & Map
- b) Proposed Angwin General Plan Policies & Map
- c) Proposed “Transitional” Land Use Designation & Related General Plan Policies
- d) Draft General Plan Land Use Element Policy AG/LU-119 &120 About Growth Management

It was decided to first take Public comment on any new issues related to these matters before discussion of the committee. Public comments included:

**John Tully**, Angwin Resident – Spoke of why Angwin should not be included in Policies AG/LU-119 & 120.

**Richard Osborn**, President of Pacific Union College (PUC) – Noted that PUC is at a crossroad and the college needs to change the way it is financed. He noted that PUC is not asking for favors but only the flexibility that plans its future, to the same rules that have been in place for more than 30 years. Richard asked the committee to send the Urban Bubble on to the Board of Supervisors in its present configuration.

**Kellie Anderson**, Angwin Resident – Would like to see “wells” contained in Policy 55. She addressed mitigation measures related to increasing roads in order to mitigate traffic impacts, ground water studies, and other pending projects. She also suggested that the Baseline Data Report does not adequately address historical, cultural or Paleontological resources in the area.

**Ginny Simms**, Noted that not all comments were in the packet that the committee received and to please not come to any conclusion until all comments have been read. She wanted to say two words to the committee, one “study” as it is addressed in “transitional study area”. Secondly “General Plan Amendments”, are always an option of the Board of Supervisors, and there is no need to make room for them.

**Keith Rogal**, Napa Pipe Group Leader – He wanted to let the committee and the public know that he is available to address any questions or concerns, either now or in the future they may have regarding the development of the Napa Pipe Area.

Hillary addressed the committee on their next discussion and noted that staff needs to perform additional analysis, work and put more thought into these issues before going to the Planning Commission with these “Big Four” issues. Due to the time frame of this meeting, staff was unable to complete all the analysis needed. She noted that if the committee wishes to forward a recommendation to the Planning Commission, it would require a two-thirds vote of those present today.

Regarding the *Proposed American Canyon RUL*, staff has made a recommendation that this issue be decided by the Board of Supervisors and she feels that ultimately it will be decided at this level anyway.

After discussion a motion made and a vote taken.

**Motion:** Made by George Bachich to recommend to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors that the RUL at the minimum protect the area around the airport and by keeping it under County control.

**Second:** Duane Wall & Michael Haley

**Vote:** Passed – 16 In Favor, 3 Opposed

***Proposed Angwin General Plan***

**Item 1** of the Analysis of Options in the staff report. “*Should the Board of Supervisors place an initiative on the ballot pursuant to Measure J that would expand the Urban Residential designation westward, recognizing the residential community of Angwin as shown in Scenario 2 &3 (p.52 & 53)?*”

After discussion a motion was made and a vote taken.

**Motion:** Made by Duane Wall to send to the Board of Supervisors a recommendation that they place an initiative on the ballot pursuant to Measure J expanding the Urban Residential designation westward, as we see on some of the map scenarios.

**Second:** Bill Trautman

**Vote:** Failed – 11 In Favor, 7 Opposed

**Item 2** of the Analysis of Options in the staff report. “*Should properties that are currently designated Urban Residential (i.e.) properties within the urban bubble) retain their current designation or receive an alternate designation (i.e.) reducing or eliminating the bubble), and if so, what?*”

After discussion a motion was made and a vote taken.

**Motion:** Made by Carol Kunze to recommend eliminating the Angwin Urban Bubble, recognizing the underlying zoning the way we have in other areas of the County.

**Second:** Jon Mark Chappellet

**Vote:** Failed – 7 In Favor, 12 Opposed

**Motion 2:** Made by George Bachich to move pass the Angwin Urban Bubble on to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors exactly as it is configured with our recommendation that they decide for themselves what to do.

**Second:** Duane Wall

**Vote:** Failed – 8 In Favor, 11 Opposed

**Motion 3:** Made by Bill Trautman that we recommend taking the land zoned agricultural out of the bubble so if the college wants to develop it, they have to go through the same procedures that everyone who ever had agriculture land when Measure J was passed had/has to go through.

**Second:** Carol Kunze

**Vote:** Failed – 12 In Favor, 7 Opposed

Chair, Peter McCrea directed staff to inform the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors that there is no clear consensus in regards to this issue.

**Item 3** of the Analysis of Options in the staff report. “*Should the policies in the Draft General Plan be revised to comments received, and if so how?*” **Was not discussed by the committee.**

### ***Proposed “Transitional” Land Use Designation & Related General Plan Policies***

After discussion a motion was made and a vote taken.

**Motion:** Made by Bill Trautman to recommend revising policy AG/LU 47 so the word “study area” is used instead of “transitional” and the property be so designated on the general plan land use map. Part two of the motion recommended that in the first bullet point on page 7, “study area” be substituted for transitional, and part three, the words “study area” be substituted for transitional in bullet 2(Map AG/LU-2 and Policy AG/LU-90).

**Second:** Jeff Reichel

**Vote:** Passed – 13 In Favor, 6 Opposed

### ***Draft General Plan Land Use Element Policy AG/LU-119 &120 About Growth Management***

After discussion a motion was made and a vote taken.

**Motion:** Made by Tom Gamble to recommend the elimination of Policy AG/LU #120.

**Second:** Stuart Smith

**Vote:** Passed – 17 In Favor, 2 Opposed

## **8. Future Agenda Items**

- a) July 25, 2007 Meeting – Agriculture Preservation & Land Use Element
- b) August 08, 2007 Meeting – (St. Helena) Circulation Element

**9. Adjourn – 4:54 PM**