

**Subject: GPAC Questions**

**Date:** May 6, 2021 at 4:17:35 PM PDT

**To:** <[admin@dyettandbhatia.com](mailto:admin@dyettandbhatia.com)>

**Reply-To:** <[dkkromm@gmail.com](mailto:dkkromm@gmail.com)>

Thanks for the chance to submit questions:

First, in terms of process, is a road trip planned for GPAC members to get everybody out to edges and to see existing conditions in Central Fairfield? Nothing like actually seeing the land and surrounding areas to have a better understanding of what changes might look like.

There is very limited discussion, so far, of a few significant external land uses.

LU Page 12 has a brief discussion of the Middle Green Valley Specific Plan. This is a significant plan for hundreds of houses immediately N of the Fairfield ULL which will likely have an impact on schools, fire and policing in the immediate region. It seems like more details should be provided to help GPAC members understand how future N. Cordelia development will intersect with MGV development.

LU Page 12, mentions the County has a Suisun Valley Specific Plan but no discussion of its major focus on Agricultural Tourism Centers, ATCs. Seems like a deeper understanding of this plan would help inform GPAC members about the ag/urban interface.

Again, perhaps I have missed it, the Vacaville-Fairfield Buffer Zone helps define the edges of both cities. I did not see a discussion of this, just a hint about open space on Page 9 of LU.

Similarly, the Tri-City and County Cooperative Planning Area has created a significant buffer zone between Benicia, Fairfield and Vallejo. This area offers significant recreational opportunities and plays a major role in defining Fairfield's Western ULL. Again, it seems worthy of additional discussion.

As is mentioned in several places Fairfield is rather unique given its proximity to high value agricultural lands. It would be helpful if the amount of prime farmland in Suisun Valley and Green Valley were quantified so GPAC members could better appreciate the consequences of any proposals to convert prime land to development.

Thanks

Duane Kromm, 707-580-7321

Treasurer, Solano County Orderly Growth Committee





Alison Moore &lt;alison@dyettandbhatia.com&gt;

---

**Fwd: Public Comments for your written record**

2 messages

**Hazel O'Neil** <hazel@dyettandbhatia.com>

Fri, May 7, 2021 at 8:31 AM

To: Alison Moore &lt;alison@dyettandbhatia.com&gt;, Katherine Stiegemeyer &lt;katherine@dyettandbhatia.com&gt;

----- Forwarded message -----

From: &lt;mjfarley01@gmail.com&gt;

Date: Thu, May 6, 2021 at 6:21 PM

Subject: Public Comments for your written record

To: &lt;admin@dyettandbhatia.com&gt;, &lt;planning@fairfield.ca.gov&gt;

Please include my comments in your written record. See attached. Please provide the staff with the clarification that Robin Cox requested. I asked the Committee to advocate for a new voter-approved ULL. As I said at the beginning of my comments, it would be respectful of the public to show their faces. Thank you for your consideration. Marilyn

Marilyn Farley

[827 Coventry Ln](#)[Fairfield, CA 94533](#)

707-249-6900

“Hope is not a state of mind. It is a state of action. It is in the praxis of resistance, solidarity, and love that we can find a path to a brighter world. That is how I get through the darkness.” Ady Barkan

--

**Hazel O'Neil**

Graphic Designer / Urban Planning Project Assistant

**DYETT & BHATIA**

Urban and Regional Planners

[1330 Broadway Suite 604](#)[Oakland, CA 94612](#)[dyettandbhatia.com](#)**Marilyn Farley comments to GP Citizen Advisory Committee 5-6-2021.docx**

14K

---

**Alison Moore** <alison@dyettandbhatia.com>

Fri, May 7, 2021 at 8:41 AM

To: "Kreimeier, Amy" &lt;akreimeier@fairfield.ca.gov&gt;

[Quoted text hidden]

My name is Marilyn Farley. I'm a past member of the Fairfield City Council and was the chair of Fairfield's Measure P oversight committee for the first six years after the 1% sales tax was approved. I am pleased that the City Council decided your meetings should be open to the public. The more exposure the public has to you and to the new General Plan as it is developed, the better the outcome will be.

I've read many of the documents presented so far, including your notes from initial brainstorming, the vision statement and your comments, and the key findings in your packet for today's meeting.

I am heartened that you are moving in a direction that will serve our citizens well. I agree that the vision statement needs work. I would encourage you to take an expansive view about what we want for the future of Fairfield.

Our vision needs to engage the imagination and enlarge the realm of possibility. We are all concerned about climate change. I hope we will collectively concentrate our energy on sustainable, regenerative environments. I envision our city becoming an urban forest, green with trees and plants that provide shade, food, and habitat for wildlife while reducing energy costs, air pollution, noise and hotter days.

Let's also image a future where we are known for active promoting living wages for our residents so that no one needs to be unhoused and that we have a caring and compassionate community that ensures that will happen.

And while we're at it, let's imagine a community where there are no guns and much less violence than we experience today, where the police and fire departments focus on their core functions, freeing up resources to provide more support for our youth, for mental health services, for parks and recreation, for cultural amenities and for our urban forest.

Let's embrace a model for compact growth that emphasizes infill and reuse and eliminates the need for any major expansion of our urban limit line. Urban Limit Lines are recommended by the Association of Bay Area Governments in their 2050 Plan as a tool for containing sprawl, protecting agriculture and open spaces AND reducing greenhouse gases. I would advocate that this group recommend voter approval for a new Fairfield Urban Limit Line, as we had from 2002 until December 2020.



Alison Moore &lt;alison@doyettandbhatia.com&gt;

---

**Fwd: GPAC Meeting #3**

2 messages

**Rajeev Bhatia** <rajeev@doyettandbhatia.com>

Thu, May 6, 2021 at 6:12 PM

To: Alison Moore &lt;alison@doyettandbhatia.com&gt;

Cc: Katherine Stiegemeyer &lt;katherine@doyettandbhatia.com&gt;, "Kreimeier, Amy" &lt;akreimeier@fairfield.ca.gov&gt;

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** n mdiz <2014nmd@gmail.com>**Subject:** GPAC Meeting #3**Date:** May 6, 2021 at 6:03:49 PM PDT**To:** admin@doyettandbhatia.com

Comment:

There is a great push for revitalization of downtown Fairfield which has all the city services (Heart of Fairfield).

The Train Station Specific Plan includes great plans for a "town center" and retail development.

The section of Fairfield farthest away is the Cordelia-Green Valley- Ranch area which has no city service center. Original plans for the Cordelia Community Park included a community building... which was eliminated.

If the park was built as described, the utility lines were put in place in case the community building could be built in the future. At present, that part of the park is grass/lawn.

That community building should be built to serve this area.

Nora Dizon  
(707) 864-5736

---

**Hazel O'Neil** <hazel@doyettandbhatia.com>

Fri, May 7, 2021 at 8:31 AM

To: Alison Moore &lt;alison@doyettandbhatia.com&gt;, Katherine Stiegemeyer &lt;katherine@doyettandbhatia.com&gt;

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** n mdiz <2014nmd@gmail.com>**Date:** Thu, May 6, 2021 at 6:04 PM**Subject:** GPAC Meeting #3**To:** <admin@doyettandbhatia.com>

Comment:

There is a great push for revitalization of downtown Fairfield which has all the city services (Heart of Fairfield).

The Train Station Specific Plan includes great plans for a "town center" and retail development.



Alison Moore &lt;alison@dyettandbhatia.com&gt;

---

**Fwd: Questions, comments and concerns**

3 messages

**Rajeev Bhatia** <rajeev@dyettandbhatia.com>

Thu, May 6, 2021 at 9:03 PM

To: Alison Moore &lt;alison@dyettandbhatia.com&gt;, AddieRose Mayer &lt;amayer@pcrcweb.org&gt;, Katherine Stiegemeyer &lt;katherine@dyettandbhatia.com&gt;

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** rangerchik <rangerchik@att.net>  
**Subject:** Questions, comments and concerns  
**Date:** May 6, 2021 at 7:50:09 PM PDT  
**To:** admin@dyettandbhatia.com

Hello. I am listening to the webinar this evening and have some real concerns about the facility portion of the meeting. As someone who actually works in Fairfield parks and for the department who maintains the Parks, its unrealistic to think that there is enough staff to assume more responsibility for Park operations. Covid has literally blown public access up to a level that is no longer manageable.

The responsible department would never talk openly about it but its a LARGE problem. There is not enough staff to address public access concerns or public safety issues. The local fire agencies cannot locate injured visitors fast enough; local law enforcement cannot address the lawlessness thats occurring in Parks and there is not even enough staff to be present during hours of operation.

Its interesting that the general plan addresses the number of fire houses/staffing levels for that side of public safety but there is no mention of staffing levels for something like parks that are a requirement of the current general plan.

Fairfield is YEARS behind owning and operating parks and open spaces and this Plan should really try and make a difference in the way things are going to be shaped for the future. Just my 2 cents....

TL

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

---

**Rajeev Bhatia** <rajeev@dyettandbhatia.com>

Thu, May 6, 2021 at 9:04 PM

To: Alison Moore &lt;alison@dyettandbhatia.com&gt;, Katherine Stiegemeyer &lt;katherine@dyettandbhatia.com&gt;, "Kreimeier, Amy" &lt;akreimeier@fairfield.ca.gov&gt;

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Hazel O'Neil** <hazel@dyettandbhatia.com>

Fri, May 7, 2021 at 8:31 AM

To: Alison Moore &lt;alison@dyettandbhatia.com&gt;, Katherine Stiegemeyer &lt;katherine@dyettandbhatia.com&gt;

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** rangerchik <rangerchik@att.net>  
**Date:** Thu, May 6, 2021 at 7:50 PM

5/7/2021

Dyett & Bhatia Mail - Fwd: Questions, comments and concerns

Subject: Questions, comments and concerns

To: <[admin@dyettandbhatia.com](mailto:admin@dyettandbhatia.com)>

Hello. I am listening to the webinar this evening and have some real concerns about the facility portion of the meeting. As someone who actually works in Fairfield parks and for the department who maintains the Parks, its unrealistic to think that there is enough staff to assume more responsibility for Park operations. Covid has literally blown public access up to a level that is no longer manageable.

The responsible department would never talk openly about it but its a LARGE problem. There is not enough staff to address public access concerns or public safety issues. The local fire agencies cannot locate injured visitors fast enough; local law enforcement cannot address the lawlessness thats occurring in Parks and there is not even enough staff to be present during hours of operation.

Its interesting that the general plan addresses the number of fire houses/staffing levels for that side of public safety but there is no mention of staffing levels for something like parks that are a requirement of the current general plan.

Fairfield is YEARS behind owning and operating parks and open spaces and this Plan should really try and make a difference in the way things are going to be shaped for the future. Just my 2 cents....

TL

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

--

**Hazel O'Neil**

Graphic Designer / Urban Planning Project Assistant

**DYETT & BHATIA**

Urban and Regional Planners

[1330 Broadway Suite 604](#)

[Oakland, CA 94612](#)

[dyettandbhatia.com](http://dyettandbhatia.com)