

Agenda No. _____
Key Words: GP 2040 and Final EIR
Meeting Date: May 18, 2021

SUMMARY REPORT

CITY COUNCIL

DATE: May 18, 2021

TO: Mayor Bird and City Council Members

FROM: Raffi Boloyan, Community Development Director 

SUBJECT: **Additional Correspondence for May 18, 2021 City Council Hearing of Dixon General Plan 2040 and Associated Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR)**

Attached are three additional letters received after the last distribution of public comments in the Friday May 14, 2021 Memo. This represents the last written update of any correspondence prior to the City Council hearing. Anything that is received after 3pm on Tuesday, May 18th, will be emailed directly to the Council and verbally noted during the meeting

1. Letter from Kelly Huff, Dixon Resource Conservation District

This letter thanks the city for previously updating the Draft EIR text to remove reference to the eastern drain project. The letter identifies some subsequent text that is no longer necessary, since the eastern drain project was removed.

Staff concurs with that the text does need to be further updated, therefore the following revisions to reflect that the Eastside Drain is no longer a viable project, are proposed as follows

Revised FEIR, third fourth bullet on page 3.9-8:

“Northeast Quadrant (NEQ) Detention Pond – In the DRWJPA, this detention pond was sized to allow for the development of the City’s NEQ (583 acres) by constructing ~~478 acre-feet of~~ detention storage. ~~It was envisioned that The release from this pond would be 140 cfs, and when there is no downstream flooding, the release could be increased to 214 cfs. The release from this pond would flow into the Tremont 3 channel, and consequently the Tremont 3 channel capacity would also need to be increased by 214 cfs to account for the flow. The channel expansion is the Eastside Drain Project (below). T; however, the NEQ Detention Pond has not been constructed yet. However, the location, size, configuration and discharge rate from this detention pond are currently being re-evaluated to help minimize downstream environmental impacts associated with the Eastside Drainage Project. The design and the location of detention basin(s) and associated flow limits for releases from individual basins are yet to be determined and will continue to be negotiated through work that is ongoing with the Dixon Regional Joint Powers Authority and the Solano County Water Agency.~~ It has been assumed that this pond will be funded and constructed by development in and near the NEQ.

However, this pond is a large regional facility, and it may be difficult for a single developer to successfully implement the NEQ Detention Pond.”

The black strikeout represents revisions to the public review draft, while the red strikethrough and underline are new changes in reaction to the letter received from DRCD. In interest of clarity, staff recommends the resolution say that the entire bullet be replaced to address the comment.

Staff recommends that as part of the action on the CEQA resolution, should the Council consider adoption of that resolution, this change be included in the motion to update this section Final EIR language in its entirety.

2. Letter from Rob White, Lewis Development

This letter supports the General Plan updated and the staff recommendation for the changes to Corridor Mixed use designation to reduce the minimum density from 14 units/acre to 12 units/acre and exception to minimum permitted floor area ratio in Policy LCC-5.F

3. Letter from Old Town Neighbors

Included in this letter to the Council, is a prior letter sent to the Planning Commission as an attached. The letter cites concern with 1) increasing residential densities in the world town neighborhood and loss of historic homes, 2) public health and safety with the railroad corridor bisecting the city, location of 2nd fire station, accessory dwelling unit concerns with state law changes and off street parking, 3) traffic density and lack of review of traffic model .

In addition, staff has included a letter response dated May 17, 2021 that I have sent to the Terry Schmidtbauer, Director of County of Solano Department of Resources Management, in response to their May 10th letter provided to the City Council. The County’s May 10th letter was provided in the supplemental staff report distributed Friday 5/14

ATTACHMENTS

1. Letter from Kelly Huff, Dixon Resource Conservation District, dated May 14, 2021
2. Letter from Rob White, Lewis Land Developers, LLC, dated May 17, 2021
3. Letter from Old Town Neighbors, dated May 17, 2021
4. Letter response from Raffi Boloyan to Terry Schmidtbauer, County of Solano Director of Natural Resource Management, dated May 17, 2021 (without attachments)



May 14, 2021

Raffi Boloyan, Director
Community Development Department
City of Dixon
600 East A Street
Dixon, CA 95620

RE: Comments on City of Dixon Draft Revisions to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) - General Plan Update

Dear Raffi,

Thank you for the notifications of the proposed revisions to the DRAFT EIR and the opportunity to comment. We appreciate the continued cooperative working relationship between the City of Dixon and the Dixon Resource Conservation District and other agricultural districts through participation in the Dixon Regional Watershed Joint Powers Authority (JPA).

Upon review of the proposed revisions, it appears that Section 3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality, requires some additional clarification. We appreciate the updates to remove references to the Eastside Drain Project (EDP), which is not currently a viable project. When removing the references to EDP it is also important to strike the references to the related flow release rates that were dependent on increased capacity downstream that would have been provided by the EDP.

Page 3.9-21 “The release from this pond would be 140 cfs and when there is no downstream flooding, the release could be increased by 214 cfs. The release from this pond would flow into the Tremont 3 channel, and consequently the Tremont 3 channel capacity would also need to be increased by 214 cfs to account for the flow.”

At this point, as acknowledged in the proposed revisions to pages 3.9-40 through 3.9-41, the design and the location of detention basin(s) and associated flow limits for

City of Dixon Revisions to General Plan EIR
May 14, 2021
Page 2

releases from individual basins are yet to be determined and will continue to be negotiated through work that is ongoing with the Dixon Regional Joint Powers Authority and the Solano County Water Agency.

We recognize that the City has been a committed and essential partner in establishing regional drainage solutions that are providing multiple benefits to our region. We look forward to continuing to work cooperatively with the City on additional projects.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,



Kelly Huff, District Manager
Dixon Resource Conservation District

Attachment 2

Lewis Land Developers, LLC

9216 Kiefer Boulevard
Sacramento, CA 95826
(916) 363-2617

Rob White
Vice President
Lewis Planned Communities
Direct: (916) 403-1718

May 17, 2021

Attn:

Mr. Raffi Boloyan, Community Development Director
Mr. George Osner, Contract Planner
Community Development Department
City of Dixon
600 East A Street
Dixon, CA 95620

Delivered Via Email: rboloyan@cityofdixon.us and gosner@cityofdixon.us.

RE: Support for Staff Recommendations on Corridor Mixed Use Designation and Policy LCC-5.F in Draft General Plan 2040 Update

Lewis Land Developers, LLC (Lewis) is pleased to see the General Plan 2040 Update process moving forward and are encouraged by the staff recommendations for the Corridor Mixed Use (CMU) and minimum permitted floor area ratio (FAR) in Land Use Element Policy LCC-5.F.

The Lincoln Square project - a proposed mixed use residential and retail project on about 13 acres at the southwest corner of California State Highway 113 (Lincoln Highway) and North Lincoln Street (Vaughn Road) – will be able to move ahead if the City Council approves the helpful recommendations proposed by staff.

Specifically, on Page 17 of the May 18, 2021 Dixon City Council Agenda Item 10.1 staff report, staff recommends:

The new staff recommendation for additional changes relate to a letter from Lewis Development that the Commission considered at their meeting, but did not recommend a change. Staff has re-evaluated the requests related to the minimum density range for the Corridor Mixed Use designation and the minimum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) standards listed for any designation and recommends that changes are warranted, as follows:

- *For the Corridor Mixed Use land use designation (page 3-15 of Draft General Plan), reducing the minimum density for that designation from 14 to 12 units/acre is actually consistent with medium density residential type uses and typical for town home development. The designation would still maintain the upper limit for density of 28 units/acre.*

Attachment 2

- *Add a new action to the Land Use Element (LCC-5.F on page 3-28) that would allow for smaller projects than the FAR range listed in any land use classification. The action would allow the City to “consider exceptions to the minimum permitted FAR in the CMU designation on a case-by-case basis. Adopt clear economic findings that must be made prior to granting a use permit authorizing such exceptions.”*

Without these changes to the CMU designation to reduce the minimum density from 14 units/acre to 12 units/acre and for the City to use clear economic findings to consider exceptions to the minimum FAR in the CMU, Lewis would be unable to move the Lincoln Square project forward. After working collaboratively with the City on this project for over 3 years, it would be disappointing to be unable to bring new housing and much needed retail to this vacant parcel.

Thank you very much for the recommendation to City Council and Lewis looks forward to our continued partnership on this project.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 403-1718 or rob.white@lewismc.com.

Sincerely,



Rob White
Vice President – Lewis Planned Communities

cc: Mayor Steve Bird
City Council Members Jim Ernest, Don Hendershot, Kevin Johnson, and Scott Pederson
Jim Lindley, City Manager – City of Dixon
Doug Mull, Senior Vice President - Lewis Planned Communities

May 17,2021

Dixon City Council
600 East A Street
Dixon, California 95620

Dear Councilmen:

We are writing to reiterate our opposition to the adoption of the General Plan Update 2040. A copy of our letter addressed to the Planning Commissioners for their March 9, 2021 consideration of the plan update is attached. In addition to the concerns that we presented at that time, we urge the Council to take the following points into account.

LOCATION OF MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING

As we understand it, the Council is considering the proposed General Plan Update based on an evaluation that its professed benefits outweigh its negative impacts.

In analyzing the recommendation in regard to the advantage of providing more multi-family housing, we were reminded of a 2019 amendment to the Southwest Dixon Development Agreement. Section 4.07 of the original agreement called for 231 high density units, a combination of market rate and affordable. The D.A. was amended to require only 131 units. By eliminating the requirement of the other 100 units, the City lost a prime location for multiple family housing.

Similarly, Section 4.06 (e) of the Southwest Dixon Development Agreement reads: "Developers anticipate building "Second Units" as described in California Government Code section 65852.2 as part of construction of detached single-family homes distributed within the Specific Plan. City acknowledges that such second units by nature of their size and other characteristics will serve as additional affordable housing units." While we have heard a great deal about the RV garages certain developers are building in the southwest area; we are unclear as to whether some of the single-family homes will include second units. At the time this was brought up at a Planning Commission meeting, there was reluctance to including second units as part of construction at Southwest Dixon. From our perspective, second units attached to new construction would have the advantage of being sprinklered. Residents of second units in the Southwest would also have access to the other amenities that the development offers, including a park, shopping and jobs.

If providing locations for more multi-family housing is to be considered an advantage of the proposed General Plan, we question why opportunities for multi-family (and ADU) housing are being overlooked during the development at Southwest Dixon. The new development, with its retail and jobs center, is by far superior to concentrating multiple family housing in Old Town or along busy mixed used corridors. The residents of the existing multiple family housing in downtown and to the southeast have limited; if any, jobs, goods and services nearby.

Another consequence of increasing residential density in our Old Town neighborhood is the purchasing and combining of lots in order to develop larger parcels. The result has been the demolition of modest, affordable residential properties that have provided home ownership opportunities for disadvantaged residents. Many historic homes have also been lost when densities were increased.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

One of your foremost responsibilities involves ensuring public safety and health. Increasing development and density in the downtown commercial core and nearby residential areas is unwise for a number of safety related reasons including but not limited to:

First, a major railroad corridor runs right through Dixon, conceivably separating the downtown commercial core and the surrounding residential neighborhood (as well as other neighborhoods to the east and southeast) from vital emergency services. Plans to locate a second fire station on the same side of the railroad tracks as the existing station fail to address worst case scenarios.

Newspaper headlines this morning report a town evacuated in response to “47 railcars carrying fertilizer, ammonium nitrate derail, police clear 5-mile radius.” Should a similar disaster befall Dixon, the railroad crossings at First Street, A Street and even the eventual Parkway Boulevard (perhaps beyond) could all be impacted, leaving the downtown and neighborhoods to its east and southeast without direct emergency services. A number of years ago, a similar derailment in another area resulted in hazardous materials flowing into storm drains.

Emergency services and evacuation planning should take into account the potential shutdown of both at-grade and even future above-grade crossings. We would point out that residents from our neighborhood and others have addressed concerns about the location of the second fire station for years. We appreciate the renewed attention that a former fire chief is directing at the problem.

Second, we would remind you that fire associations objected to the passage of State law allowing un-sprinklered Accessory Dwelling Units in cases where the primary residence is not equipped with fire sprinklers. The majority of older homes and most existing multi-family complexes in Old Town are not sprinklered. By law, ADU's are allowed at reduced setbacks,

further compounding the danger. While the law does allow a city to limit locations where ADU's can be located, to date the Council has not seen fit to do so.

Third, another public safety issue resulting from further development and increased density, in and around downtown, involves on-street parking. Oftentimes, on-street vehicular parking blocks line-of site at intersections. Not long ago, the Council discounted the problem by rejecting a Transportation Advisory Commission recommendation to mark curbs at intersections with red paint. Whether it is officially acknowledged or not, inadequate parking allotted for multi-family development, results in unsafe conditions in impacted neighborhoods. Overflow parking from downtown into residential neighborhoods exacerbates the problem. We would add that some areas of Old Town are also impacted by events at the fairgrounds. Photographs document vehicles parked over drainage culverts at corners during events downtown and at the fairgrounds.

Fourth, issues related to the unsafe conditions at the B Street intersection with North First Street have also been pointed out at various city meetings over the years. Old Town pedestrians and school children encounter the dangers of that location regularly.

Next, exposure to noise is also a public health hazard that impacts the downtown residential areas. The proximity of homes to the downtown commercial core should be a consideration in terms of the frequency of events and the hours of outdoor entertainment.

While we have limited our focus to select issues, there are numerous others related to the public health and safety hazards of concentrating development and density in older areas downtown.

TRAFFIC DENSITY

It is our understanding that a recent traffic model was completed in the Fall of 2019. But in our review of Transportation Advisory Commission minutes, we find no agenda item presenting that model to the public. Had a report on the travel model been made public prior to the request for comments on the Environmental Impact Report, the people of Old Town and the greater community would have had a better understanding of the impacts of the proposed General Plan Update. "Significant" and "unavoidable" traffic impacts should not occur in a town the size of Dixon. It is the result of poor planning on the part of our city officials. Certain residential neighborhoods should not bear most of the burden resulting from the mistakes of our decisionmakers.

CONCLUSION

In closing, we would add that there were no appendices related to the EIR posted on the General Plan Update pages of the City's website. Instead, there are notations for each appendix that the relevant "page was deliberately left blank."

Attachment 3

As we pointed out to the Planning Commission, we have not been able to collect signatures in opposition to the General Plan Update due to the pandemic. But we can assure you that the public record over the years is full of correspondence and petitions from Old Town residents regarding many of the issues that we are now reiterating.

Thank you.

Old Town Neighbors

March 9, 2021

City of Dixon Planning Commissioners
600 East A Street
Dixon, California 95620

Dear Commissioners:

As members of an informal neighborhood group known as the Old Town Neighbors, we have a number of comments regarding the proposed 2040 General Plan. Before proceeding, we would like to introduce our group to those who may not be familiar with our activities.

Background

Formed well over a decade ago, one of our missions has been to keep our neighbors informed of land use issues that pertain to the older residential areas that surround downtown. A number of years ago at the direction of a former Planning Commission, the City's Community Development Director kept us updated on a variety of land use matters. For example, during the lengthy Omnibus V Zoning Amendment process, representatives of our group met regularly with the Director. At the request of our representatives, the Community Development Director also held a series of at-large neighborhood meetings pertaining to the proposed zoning amendments as related to our neighborhood.

Over the years in an ongoing effort to keep the neighborhood informed and involved, members of our group have also collected signatures on numerous petitions pertaining to land use matters. Petitions have been presented to the Planning Commission, the Transportation Advisory Commission, the General Plan Committee and the City Council.

Comments about the General Plan process

We were surprised to learn that the City is moving forward with the General Plan Update process while restrictions on social gathering are still in place. Many of the Covid 19 orders have not been lifted; and as a result, we have been unable to go door to door to gather signatures related to the 2040 General Plan Update. In an August, 2020 letter to one of our members, the City Attorney acknowledged the right of the people to petition their government and offered assurance that those rights would not be forfeited.

We would also point out that sustaining public interest in a General Plan Update process that has been underway since 2007 has been problematic. We have documentation from the initial

years of the process which highlights far greater community involvement than in later years (2015 onward). In that regard, a former Community Development Director publicly acknowledged that the workshop at Anderson School was poorly promoted and attended. At the time, more workshops were promised but never came to pass. We would also add that several members of the GPAC were highly critical of the Community Survey citing very limited participation by “disadvantaged” groups within Dixon.

In the event that the Commission decides to proceed with recommendations to forward the Plan to the City Council without benefit of input collected by petition, we have summarized a few of the issues that we know to be of the greatest concern to many of the residents of Old Town.

Comments Related to Density

From its beginnings, our Old Town Neighbors’ group has raised objections to any plan that would increase density in our neighborhoods. For instance, we collected signatures on numerous occasions opposing the designation of the downtown residential neighborhoods as part of a Priority Development Area. We raised concerns about increased density in the planned mixed-use zones in downtown. We were also involved when residents objected to an increase in the number of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU’s) per lot in our area. Other examples of our participation are likewise documented in the public record.

Increased density impacts the neighborhood in many undesirable ways, including more traffic, parking problems, increased noise, sanitation issues, public safety issues and historic preservation. We would add that certain of the census tracts discussed in the General Plan under Environmental Justice are in our downtown neighborhoods.

Specifically, designating planned mixed-use corridors in the downtown area should be re-examined. Since the proposed Plan extends mixed use along the North First Street corridor, we see no reason to impact areas of Old Town with a designation that does not reflect the preferred single family use of land along sections of North and South Second Street, East and West Mayes Street and South First Street. For instance, three new single-family homes have recently been constructed along East Mayes and South Second Streets. Another historic home on South First Street has been converted back to a single-family residence, as has a home on East A Street adjacent to the back of the Catholic Church. Clearly, the market and the community support the area as residential rather than mixed use. We would add that public documents reveal that there was opposition to the planned mixed-use designation in 1993, particularly in regard to extending mixed use zoning on South A Street between Mayes and Broadway. The older homes on that block are significant in their contribution to the historic character of the downtown area and their continued use as single family residences should be encouraged.

We want to reiterate our longstanding concern that increasing density with plans such as the Priority Development Area (PDA) could lead to displacement of “disadvantaged” residents, particularly in certain census tracts in the downtown area. The smaller, fixer upper homes have long provided an opportunity for members of those “disadvantaged” groups to obtain home ownership. Similarly, the smaller, older homes have served as affordable rental housing for other “disadvantaged” families. Encouraging the investment in greater density may well lead to the demolition of too many of those older, fixer uppers, thereby denying other “disadvantaged” families similar opportunities.

We would point out to new members of the Planning Commission, that allowing unsprinklered ADU’s was opposed at the State level by firefighter associations. Legislation at the time allowed the City to limit areas where ADU’s would be allowed. In addition to the fire hazard issues, shared sewer laterals are common in the older areas of town and should be a consideration as to where ADU’s are located.

While we strongly support the preservation of agricultural land, it shouldn’t come at the expense of disrupting and destroying long established neighborhoods that are home to many disadvantaged families. Rather than using infill to accommodate density, we would ask that you take another look at new developments such as the Southwest in terms of its inadequate contribution to meeting multiple family and affordable housing demands.

Comments on Noise

While the older residential neighborhoods near downtown are zoned as planned mixed use and multiple family (RM1 and RM2), in reality the area was historically single family homes. Thankfully, in recent years, new affordable single-family homes have been constructed on numerous vacant lots throughout the downtown residential area. Taking that into account, we would lobby that noise levels should be in keeping with allowances for single family neighborhoods.

In regard to noise, we also have concerns about some of the uses proposed for downtown Dixon. Economic development of the downtown area should take into account the close proximity of residential uses. Increased traffic, overflow parking into neighborhoods, frequent large events, live entertainment, etc. all contribute to increased noise for residents in the vicinity. The quality of life of those residents shouldn’t be sacrificed for the sake of economic interests. Many residents of the area do not have the economic means to escape new sources of noise by moving to more privileged neighborhoods such as the Southwest Development area.

Make no mistake, we would like to see downtown thrive. We only ask for consideration of those who live nearby.

Comments on Public Safety

We have already discussed our concerns about unsprinklered Accessory Dwelling Units in our neighborhood. We would also point out that our older residential neighborhoods, as well as the downtown commercial area, are more vulnerable to fire and earthquake hazards. For that reason, we continue to question the location of both fire stations on the north and west sides of the railroad tracks. Even with the eventual completion of the Parkway Boulevard overcrossing, emergency access to our older downtown neighborhoods and the commercial downtown area, is restricted by the bottleneck created where South First Street drops from four lanes near the Brookfield and Valley Glen subdivisions to two lanes near the fairgrounds. Similarly, there is a bottleneck on North First Street entering the downtown area. Depending on vehicular traffic and the rail activity at the crossing on First Street, emergency access to our neighborhoods could be delayed or cut off. Years ago, the City had fire stations located on both sides of the railroad tracks providing all residents of town better access to emergency services.

We are also alarmed to learn that certain census tracts in the downtown area are among the most impacted by environmental hazards including air, noise and water pollution. No doubt, density exacerbates some of those hazards and would be more appropriate in newer areas of town.

Comments on Traffic

We would suggest that there has been one unspoken “silver lining” to the pandemic lockdown. With schools not in session, our neighborhoods have experienced a significant reduction in traffic. With the high school and elementary schools in or near our older neighborhoods reopening, traffic will once again become a major issue. The relocation of the junior high school to the campus of the old high school will compound the problem, as will the construction of more and more new homes to the South and West of our Old Town neighborhoods.

Not long ago, the City reduced the Level of Service (LOS) in order to avoid widening of streets. The reality for our older neighborhoods meant accepting a further decline in our quality of life and public safety associated with ever increasing traffic (LOS issues) OR sacrificing the historic character of our neighborhoods and losing much needed on street parking by widening streets to accommodate more traffic. The idea that the opening of the Parkway Boulevard overcrossing will alleviate the traffic issues is nothing more than a pipe dream. It won't address traffic created by more and more families from throughout town needing to access the junior high school.

Traffic in the downtown area diverting onto local residential streets has been another longstanding concern as it relates to public safety and quality of life for residents of the downtown neighborhoods. The 1993 General Plan addressed that issue and we would suggest that goals to limit such traffic diversion be included with the current Plan.

Comments on Historic Preservation:

We would request that you to review the 1993 General Plan in terms of its emphasis on historic preservation. The draft 2040 General Plan is very lacking in provisions to encourage the preservation of our historic structures and homes. We were unable to find an appendix to the 2040 Plan with an inventory of historic homes and structures in Dixon. Over the course of time since the 1993 General Plan, many more homes should have been added to that inventory. Any claims to maintain the small-town character of Dixon are disingenuous without an emphasis on the historic preservation of the older neighborhoods surrounding downtown Dixon and their contribution to the City's charm and uniqueness.

The history of the Carnegie Library (as presented in the General Plan) should recognize the group that saved the historic resource from demolition. While the Women's Improvement Club was instrumental in securing a Carnegie Library for Dixon, the Dixon Carnegie Library Preservation Society formed many years later in order to ensure that the Carnegie was spared from demolition and took its rightful place on the National Register of Historic Places. For the City to recognize one group for its contribution and slight another is inappropriate.

Conclusion

While we have highlighted a number of longstanding concerns shared by many of our neighbors, we would respectfully suggest that you hold off on recommending the General Plan Update to the City Council until such time as groups such as ours can exercise our right to petition our government.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Old Town Neighbors

MAYOR STEVEN C. BIRD
VICE MAYOR JIM ERNEST
COUNCILMEMBER DON HENDERSHOT



COUNCILMEMBER KEVIN JOHNSON
COUNCILMEMBER SCOTT PEDERSON
CITY TREASURER JAMES P. WARD JR.

May 17, 2021

Terry Schmidtbauer, Director
County of Solano - Department of Resource Management
675 Texas St, Ste 5500
Fairfield, CA 94533-6342
TSchmidtbauer@solanocounty.com

VIA: US MAIL & EMAIL

Re: General Plan 2040 Public Comments from Solano County

Dear Terry,

Thank you for your letter of May 10, 2021, regarding the City of Dixon's ("City") pending General Plan 2040 Update ("Plan") scheduled for the adoption hearing on May 18th before the Dixon City Council. We appreciate your support in seeking opportunities for partnership and continue to welcome ongoing collaboration and discussion with respect to all opportunities to better our community.

Your letter suggests that there are portions of the Plan and associated environmental documents that require further analysis and justification before the Plan should be adopted, including loss of agricultural land, transportation impacts and utility and infrastructure services. The County and City have engaged in collaborative discussions on some of these issues, including:

- Continuing implementation of the greenbelts to the east and west of Dixon (outside the City's sphere of influence) between the City and Davis and the City and Vacaville in furtherance of the preservation of Solano County's agricultural base and heritage.
- Continuing implementation of the countywide approach to Regional Housing Needs Assessment requirements from the California Department of Housing and Community Development, recognizing that new housing growth is to occur in cities, rather than the unincorporated County's areas.

City of Dixon

600 East A Street • Dixon, California • 95620-3697
PHONE (707) 678-7000 • TTY (707) 678-1489

To: Terry Schmidtbauer

Date: May 17, 2021

Page 2

- Collaborating on regional transportation issues and cooperation in seeking State and Federal grants jointly, as available, to enhance a broad range of transportation infrastructure needed to serve the citizens of Dixon and Solano County broadly.
- Finding creative approaches to the provision of storm drainage and other infrastructure to serve both important region-serving employment and storm drainage from both within and outside Dixon city limits, as part of a multi-agency, regional partnership.

The attachment to your letter provides a number of issues that the reviewer identified as concerns and questions. After review, it appears that there were some assumptions made and/or misunderstanding of the City of Dixon's current and Draft General Plans.

As to agriculture issues, the City's currently in-effect General Plan (1993) covers the same area as this update. There are no proposed changes to the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI) or jurisdictional area. Furthermore, nearly all of the areas that are currently within the City's SOI, but not yet annexed into the City of Dixon, have urban land use designations, not agricultural land use designations. This has been the case in both the current 1993 General Plan and the proposed Plan.

The City's General Plan strives to make provisions for the ultimate development of its General Plan area/SOI. As such, it establishes broad policy guidance and land use designations to be implemented over the coming years through tools such as specific plans, zoning, other development regulations, and capital improvements. It recognizes that lands outside the City limits, but inside the City's planning area/SOI, remain within the jurisdiction and stewardship of the County, which has responsibility for governance until such time as the land is annexed to the City. To this extent, City and County land use designations will quite often vary within the boundary area.

The reviewer further notes the designation around the northern part of the major interchanges along the I-80 corridor throughout Dixon as Regional Commercial land use designation. This is, for the most part, a carrying forward of the designations in the 1993 General Plan. There is a small portion of the Milk Farm property at the Currey Rd/SR-113 exit that is currently located within the City's jurisdiction and currently has an Agricultural designation. The Draft General Plan 2040 does propose to change that small portion of that site to Regional Commercial, to match the rest of the site.

Transportation, is an important opportunity area for cooperation and collaboration, and the City of Dixon welcomes the opportunity to continue interagency discussions on this matter. Traffic knows no boundaries and flows across borders requiring collaborative approaches. Further, there seem to be opportunities for greater collaboration as to non-motorized modes including bike routes, pedestrian routes, and transit.

City of Dixon

600 East A Street • Dixon, California • 95620-3697
PHONE (707) 678-7000 • TTY (707) 678-1489

To: Terry Schmidtbauer

Date: May 17, 2021

Page 3

Prior to the Planning Commission meeting, the City received a letter from James Laughlin, County Counsel, dated March 8, 2021, which cited concern with the adequacy of the Draft EIR relevant to storm drainage to serve the Northeast Quadrant Specific Plan area. I had sent a written response, dated April 13, 2021, responding to those comments, and noting that the city had added additional clarifying language in the Final EIR that addressed the County's concerns noted at that time. I have attached another copy of my April 13th letter for your information.

In conclusion, the City's current efforts to update the 1993 General Plan are solely focused on updating our Plan to be consistent with new state laws and bringing the City into compliance. The General Plan 2040 land use map maintains generally the same land use allowances that have been in place since the 1993 General Plan, with the exception of creating some new mixed-use designations in key areas and corridors within our City.

I look forward to an ongoing productive relationship and endeavor to use this opportunity to identify specific areas and projects for synergistic approaches. Should you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to me at (707) 678-7000 x1114 or rboloyan@cityofdixon.us

Sincerely,



Raffi Boloyan

CITY OF DIXON

Community Development Director

Attachments:

1. Letter to George Osner, Contract Planner, from Terry Schmidtbauer, Director Solano County Department of Resource Management Re General Plan 2040 Public Comments, dated May 10, 2021
2. Letter from Raffi Boloyan, to James Laughlin, Solano County Counsel, dated April 13, 2021 Re Response to March 8, 2021 County Comments submitted to Planning Commission

City of Dixon

600 East A Street • Dixon, California • 95620-3697
PHONE (707) 678-7000 • TTY (707) 678-1489