



*Approved*

## MEETING MINUTES

### GENERAL PLAN UPDATE STEERING COMMITTEE

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

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2006 – 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, Mary Ellen Boyet, Stephen Cuddy, Debra Dommen, Tom Gamble, Jim Hendrickson, Guy Kay, Carol Kunze, Peter McCrea, Carole Meredith, Beth Painter, Jeff Reichel, Brad Simpkins, William Trautman, Bob Torres and Duane Wall.

##### **Absent**

George Bachich at the time of roll but later arrived during item 4b, Jon-Mark Chappellet at the time of roll but later arrived during item #3b, *Michael Haley absent*, Carol Poole at the time of roll but later arrived during item #3c, *Stuart Smith absent*.

##### **Staff Present**

Laura Anderson, Hillary Gitelman, Howard Siegel, John Woodbury, Nancy Johnson, Bruce Wilson, Lori Maher and Eliot Hurwitz.

##### **PMC**

Eric Norris and Kendall Flint

#### 2. Public Comment

Kellie Andersen expressed her appreciation to the committee members that came to Angwin and for the attention the committee is giving to Angwin regarding the bubble.

#### 3. Updates

- a) City Representative – No report
- b) Trails Ad Hoc Sub Committee Report – It was decided that the sub committee needs to meet once more before there report is finalized. Staff will bring back the report in January.
- c) Spanish Flat and Pope Valley Workshops – Hillary explained that staff made these working meetings and presented to the folks that came draft policies for them to react to and maps for the to review and comment on. Hillary thanked the committee members that came to the workshops and participated.

#### 4. **Action Items:**

- a) Approval of Minutes from October 25, 2006 Meeting

**Motion:** Made by Duane Wall

**Second:** Jim Hendrickson

**Vote:** AIF

**Discussion:** Tom Andrews asked which gateway was Supervisor Dillon referring to that was originally missed – Butts Canyon Road (Lake County)

Debra Dommen felt that the following two were missed: 1) On page 44 she felt that staff was going to add something about encouraging timber harvest zones where appropriate and 2) On page 4 on the minutes regarding stone fences in Policy CC40 – “to allow access” was not reflected.

- b) Special Meeting – January 10, 2007

The committee agreed to a special meeting on January 10<sup>th</sup> starting at 1:00 PM with a format of the meeting being “Areas of disagreement or need of clarity”. Staff will send out all of the draft elements to the committee in December to review over the holidays. The committee can then let us know (send us their comments before January 10th) what they feel the priorities are that need attention.

#### 5. **Economic Development Element**

Howard reminded the committee that this element is the only element in our General Plan not required by state law and is also one that is a little more nebulous in terms of the nature, or lack thereof, from a land use perspective.

**Public/Board Comments on this Element included:**

Dieter Deiss, a member of the Napa County Economic Development Corporation (NVEDC) Board of Directors, noted that they have 4 major objectives:

- 1) Lead communication among the public, private and non profit sectors
- 2) Area wide economic data analysis
- 3) Promote the retention and attraction of business that are compatible with agriculture
- 4) Promote infrastructure development

On behalf of the NVEDC, he commended the General Plan Steering Committee and the County Planning Staff for their ground breaking work in draft this new element and asked the committee to consider the comments of the NVEDC that was handed out to them before the meeting. They look forward to continuing working with the committee on the Economic Development Element.

Howard noted that, during the last discussion, there were some concerns about the name of the element and that in the staff report (for now) the word “development” has been removed. He asked the committee for their comments on this again. After some discussion it was decided that the title of “Economic Development” would remain for now. Comments on the draft element included:

Page 1 – Paragraph 2

Rather than saying that the tourism/hospitality industry is “closely followed” by the wine and grape based agriculture industry, it should say, that they support each other or

They should be separate statements, calling out agriculture with that level of importance

Line 6, Delete the phrase “ that has already begun”

Page 2 – First paragraph, Last sentence, replace “create” with “enhance or encourage”

Last paragraph, The reference to the Silicon Valley should be replaced by “technology centers”

Add San Francisco Bay Area to the last paragraph

Page 3 – Paragraph 1, Don’t italicize the words “volume” and “sales” and replace “sales” with “revenue”

Parts of lines 3 & 5 are duplicated

Paragraph 2, Is this a true statement? Eric will check on this and get back to the committee

Clarify that the \$9.5 billion is a low number as it only reflects Napa County grapes

State that the \$8.5 million in taxes doesn’t all go to Napa County

- Paragraph 4, Reword to reflect the competitive nature of the industry
- Page 4 – Emphasize the need for worker housing more or cross reference another element
- Paragraph 1, Second line add that the price is as relates to the local wage level
- Paragraph 2, Line 2 is vague statement – Need to say “high-paying” rather than “high-end”
- Paragraph 3, Are these County median wages? Need to clarify this.
- Paragraph 3, Last sentence Add a graph that shows the almost 65% of new jobs in Napa County are expected to pay at or below minimum wages.
- Call out what the 4 fastest job sectors are, also the 4 fastest growing job sectors
- Paragraph 5 (**Worker Training** paragraph 2) delete “and more”
- Page 5 – Paragraph 2, Take out “public-private partnership”
- Paragraph 2, Correction = New Technology High is a public School operated by the non-profit
- Paragraph 2, Line 3 should say “Napa County” only, remove “and the U.S.”
- Rural Napa County** – Re-title to **Eastern Napa County**
- Needs to sound less negative, don’t use the words “limited” or “suffers”
- Page 6 – **Interagency Coordination and cooperation**
- Title is misleading
- Update NCLOG to reflect wants being done to merge NCLOG with NCTPA
- Recognize American Canyon in paragraph 2 under this section
- Page 7 – **Economic Diversity**
- The demographics in this section is more appropriate for the Housing Section or at least cross reference
- If we are projecting that the median income will decline as the population ages and leaves the workforce and if that is a reasonable project, then this would have a place in the Economic Development Element.
- Can we take out the entire narrative out of the General Plan?
- In the General Plan narrative use more liberal cross referencing to the BDR and the EIR and make dated information a projection to the future.
- Page 9 – **Economic Goals & Policies**
- Goal E-1, Delete “include wine production and grape growing”
- Include a definition of agricultural as a foot note, then cross reference back to the Land Use Element
- Policy E-2, Insert action word or phrase such as “The County supports. . .”
- Policy E-4, use the generic term that the NVEDC suggests – say “Economic Development and other organizations
- Policy E-5, after “and supports functions – ” say “without converting the County’s agriculturally designated land to accommodate these uses. . .”
- Page 10 – Policy E-8c, Replace w “needed” infrastructure. . . with “readily available”
- Policy E-9, Delete “The County supports the need” add “on appropriately designated lands
- Policy E-10, Take out “additional” (before commercial)
- Policy E-11, What do you mean here? This refers to ancillary uses – Rewrite
- Policy E-12, Reword
- Page 11 – Policy E-13, Paragraph 1, starting with line 2, remove the remaining part of the sentence after the dash
- Policy E-14.2, Change Action Item to E14.1
- Goal E-3, Policy E 15, Look into the current needs
- Policy E-16, Reword – Bill Trautman will submit a suggestion
- Policy E-17, State more specifically and show the statistics
- Page 12 – Policy E-18, Add comments of the NVEDC; eliminate “modern infrastructure, particularly”
- Policy E-18, Strike “the expansion of”

## 6. Agricultural and Land Use Element

Hillary explained that she would like to share her priorities with the committee first; then, get the committee’s comments.

**1. CPC Request** – Does the committee want to re-think all the policies related to the rural urban limit line and potentially lay the ground work for re-accessing sites that would be appropriate for affordable housing adjacent to the cities.

*Committee's Comments:* Committee decided not to take this on.

**2. Pope Valley** – Do we want to pursue a Measure J vote to create an urban bubble around the cross roads around or the junction at Pope Valley. If so what should the boundaries be?

Question 1 – Do you agree that we should include this in the General Plan draft that goes out to the public and get their feedback on this idea?

Question 2 – Should we show the lines on the map we handed out or others?

*Committee's Comments:* The committee agreed that the General Plan will note that the committee is undecided and would like to see the responses of the residents of Pope Valley before making a decision. The committee suggested elimination of the non-conforming use policy.

**3. Lake Berryessa** – Starting with Page 41, these are the policies that were addressed at the meeting in Spanish Flat. Hillary wanted comments on any of the new ideas that were put on the table and if the committee has changed their mind on any of the ones previously discussed.

*Committee's Comments:* Rephrase last paragraph on page 42 and do not initiate mixed-use zoning, but indicate the County's willingness to entertain proposals.

**4. Hess Vineyard** – Just as an update, we talked to the property owner's representative of Hess Vineyard and the text changes you see reflect their input.

*Committee's Comments:* Is the property owner okay with this? Yes and future buyers will be put on notice

**5. Regional Planning** – Some policies were carried over from the old version of the element and were poorly written. We consulted with LAFCO staff to make these policy understandable and the results are here starting with Policy Ag/LU 125.

*Committee's Comments:* Policy Ag/Lu 125, Does this mean we support conversion of Agriculture and Open Space but at the right time? Please rewrite to say protection from inappropriate or say similar.

Policy Ag/LU 127, this looks as if use permits in properties within the RUL line are prohibited. Is this the intent? And why is Policy Ag/LU 128 different from Ag/LU 127? Hillary will do some further research and get back to the committee on this.

Policy Ag/LU 127, are we encouraging the city to annex county property? This has been the policy frame work that has been in place for a long time now and the RUL will be the extent of the City's growth.

**6. Pages 11-13 Edits** – *Committee's Comments:*

Policy Ag/LU 12 & 15, break up the sentence.

Policy Ag/LU 4, We spoke about taking out "Prime" from agriculture land however, if you take it out in this section we need to rewrite this. Tom Gamble suggested the following: "The county will reserve agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for grazing excepts for those lands south of Soscol Ridge which are shown on the . . ."

Policy Ag/LU 2, Delete "related and necessary support services such as"

Policy Ag/LU 12, Does non-commercial mean you can't charge for these? This was meant to mean no restaurants. Is there any suggestions? None

Policy Ag/LU 7, Replace "ever greater" with "stronger"

Policy Ag/LU 9, Still not referring to the aesthetics. Strike the first sentence and change "wineries in agricultural" to "agricultural processing"

Someone suggested that at the top of page 11 in the first paragraph at the end of the sentence, delete the date. Staff will also reword to say "or as extended by the voters"

At the bottom of page 15, regarding Maximum Building Intensity, staff will add a note that explains that under state law, a second unit is permitted. And will do the same in the AR.

Sandy Ellis of the Napa County Farm Bureau Association noted that the Williamson Act and State law precludes

second units from being rented, unless it is for farm worker housing.

Dr. Delmer Fjarli of (Howell Mountain Company) Angwin, regarding Policy Ag/LU 18, he feels Angwin needs some type of protection of their watershed and water company as they supply half of the population there. He would like to have this added to the record.

**7. Page 22 Question** – Policy Ag/LU 43, County Counsel suggested that staff consider eliminating or modifying this policy

*Committee's Comments:* Policy Ag/LU 44, is the same and also needs to be looked at.

Hillary asked the committee to let her take another attempt at these two policies and it was agreed.

She also asked the committee to send her their questions /concern and priority topics that need to be discussed and we will have these ready for the January 10<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Staff would like to go before the Board of Supervisors in January and get permission to release a draft of all the elements to the public for their review and comments.

**7. Future Agenda Items**

a) Review of Early 2007 Schedule of Activities – Vote on a new meeting schedule

**8. Adjourn – 4:57 PM**