



County of Yolo

PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

John Bencomo
DIRECTOR

292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695-2598
(530) 666-8775 FAX (530) 666-8728
www.yolocounty.org

TO: SUPERVISOR MIKE McGOWAN, Chair,
and Members of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: JOHN BENCOMO, Director
David Morrison, Assistant Director
Heidi Tschudin, General Plan Project Manager
Planning and Public Works Department

DATE: July 20, 21, and 23, 2009

SUBJECT: Adoption of 2030 Countywide General Plan (No additional general fund impact)

RECOMMENDED ACTION

- A. Receive a presentation from staff on proposed revisions to the June 10, 2009 Draft General Plan (Attachment A) including the final recommendations of the Planning Commission (Attachment E), and open the public hearing to receive comments.
- B. Accept the attached report (Attachment D) entitled Draft General Plan Economic Evaluation.
- C. Pass a motion of intent to certify the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (Attachment B) for the 2030 Countywide General Plan, subject to preparation and review of the Final EIR, and preparation and review of appropriate Findings of Fact and other information for certification.
- D. Pass a motion of intent to adopt the 2030 Countywide General Plan consisting of the June 10, 2009 Final Draft (Attachment A), plus changes identified in Attachments F and G to this report, plus any additional changes directed by the Board of Supervisors consistent with the EIR, and subject to preparation and review of the information listed above in Item C, and a package of appropriate plan approval documents.
- E. Continue the public hearing to September 15, 2009, at 1:30 p.m., for final action.

STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

Adoption of the new General Plan is consistent with and will fully achieve several areas of the strategic plan, particularly regarding land use. In addition, the implementation plan will provide a key bridge between the strategic plan, the General Plan, and the annual budget. Specifically, the new General Plan will support the strategic planning goals as follows:

- Financially sustainable county government by creating a detailed implementation plan that identifies county departments responsible for implementation of each action, annually estimates costs for implementation, and sets a priority for each action (Goal IN-1).

- Environmentally sensitive and quality county infrastructure, facilities and technology by providing policy guidance for locating county services and facilities within the downtown areas of existing and planned communities, and through the use of LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certification (Goal CC-2 and Goal PF-12).
- Top quality workforce providing responsive services by establishing minimum services thresholds for existing and planned communities (Goal PF-12).
- Preservation of agriculture and open spaces by identifying where new growth can occur and establishing policies supportive of agricultural and open space land uses (Goals LU-1, LU-2, and LU-3).
- Partnering for a successful Yolo County by reinforcing a policy framework for intra-county coordination (Goal LU-6) and regional coordination (Goal LU-7) on land use matters.
- A safe and healthy community by establishing a policy framework for community design (Goals CC-3 and CC-4) and for safety, noise, and health care in the Health and Safety Element.

FISCAL IMPACT

The cost for the General Plan Update is a general fund item. The staff and consultant team are operating under scopes of work and budgets approved by the Board of Supervisors in previous actions. The total budget for the General Plan Update process is \$2,439,362. Approximately \$2,065,726 (84.7 percent) of the budgeted amount has been expended to date.

The county has previously been awarded a grant of \$221,000 from the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) for preparation of the Circulation Element and related EIR work. A total of \$156,811 (71.0 percent) has been reimbursed to date. In addition, the General Plan cost recovery fees collected on building permits total nearly \$700,000 since 2004. This fee was increased in November 2008 from 0.27 percent of building valuation to 0.40 percent. These incoming funds partially offset the actual cost to the general fund for the General Plan Update.

A separate discussion of the fiscal and market impacts of build-out of the new General Plan is provided later in this report.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDED ACTION

As the Board of Supervisors is aware, this is only the third General Plan for the county in its history. The General Plan was first adopted in 1958 and was later updated in 1983. The 1983 General Plan remains in use today. The county has been in the process of updating the 1983 General Plan since May 2003. Approximately 65 public meetings, workshops, and hearings have been held regarding the General Plan over the past six years. The process has involved the following key steps:

- Identification of key issues and stakeholders
- Development of various technical reports including:
 - Agricultural Preservation Techniques
 - Market Review
 - County Infrastructure Conditions
 - Market and Fiscal Considerations
- Adoption of guiding principles and vision statements
- Development of Background Report
- Joint Land Use Summit with the four city councils

- Identification of ten land use alternatives:
 - No Project (Existing Conditions)
 - No Project (1983 General Plan)
 - City-Focused Growth Alternative
 - Town-Focused Growth Alternative
 - New Town Alternative
 - Rural Sustainability Alternative
 - Speculative Development Alternative
 - Market Demand Alternative
 - Planning Commission Alternative
 - Preferred Land Use Alternative
- Publication of three public drafts of the General Plan
 - Public Review Draft (September 10, 2008)
 - Revised Public Review Draft (January 20, 2009)
 - Final Draft (June 10, 2009)
- Release of the Draft EIR
- Consideration of hundreds of hours of testimony
- Consideration of hundreds of pages of written comments

This extensive process has now reached its end and it is time for the county to take final action on the new plan. It arrives during a time of great fiscal challenge and enormous economic strife. The General Plan remains true to the county's historic vision of active and productive farmland and open space, and it continues the tradition of directing most growth to the incorporated cities. However, this plan does identify a modest amount of growth in several existing rural communities, primarily in the town of Dunnigan, with the requirement that this growth will improve the existing quality of life and bring new opportunities for existing residents and the county.

Great care has been taken by the Board of Supervisors to ensure that allowed growth is consistent with emerging trends in community design and "green" building, and to be responsive to concerns about climate change and emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs).

The county is already receiving accolades that this plan is one of the more forward-thinking and cutting edge long-range planning documents in the state at this time. It is therefore with great pride that this plan is brought before the Board of Supervisors for final consideration and action.

STAFF PRESENTATION

At the first hearing, the staff will provide an oral presentation summarizing the staff report, the Draft General Plan with final proposed revisions, and the Draft EIR. Following the presentation, the staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors move consecutively through each chapter of the Draft General Plan using the following format:

- Questions from Board Members
- Public comment
- Comments from Board Members
- Consensus direction for each Chapter

Following discussion of all nine chapters the staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors deliberate the Draft EIR and any other remaining aspect of the Draft General Plan that is of interest or concern. At the conclusion of the Board of Supervisor's deliberations, staff requests direction in the form of intent motions regarding the entire General Plan, and the EIR, together with a

continuance of the public hearing to September 15, 2009 for final action (see the Recommended Actions on page one of this report).

In addition to staff representatives, several key members of the consulting team will be available during the first half of the first day of the hearings:

- Judy Malamut of LSA Associates, Project Manager for the environmental analysis
- Ron Milam of Fehr and Peers Associates, Project Manager for Circulation Element and circulation analysis
- Matt Kowta of Bay Area Economics, Project Manager for the Economic Evaluation

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is the adoption of a new General Plan for the County of Yolo [2030 Countywide General Plan, Yolo County, Final Draft dated June 10, 2009 (Attachment A)], with additional proposed revisions provided in Attachment F and G. A detailed project description is provided in Chapter III of the Draft EIR.

The General Plan applies to the unincorporated areas of the county. It establishes county policy, and identifies planned land uses and infrastructure. California law requires each jurisdiction to adopt a General Plan to guide physical growth within its jurisdictional boundaries.

The proposed General Plan has a planning horizon of 2030. It incorporates growth that would be allowed under build-out of the 1983 General Plan, plus a modest amount of additional “new” growth. In total, most of the new urban growth allowed under the General Plan would occur in the communities of Dunnigan, Elkhorn, and Madison. Agricultural processing (Agricultural-Industrial land uses) and tourism-related activities (Agricultural-Commercial land uses) would be encouraged throughout much of the unincorporated area.

Assuming full build-out of the General Plan, the unincorporated population would increase from 23,265 currently to 64,700; the number of dwelling units would increase from 7,263 to 22,061; and the number of jobs would increase from 20,818 to 53,154. However, full build-out is not expected to occur by 2030.

Currently, urban land uses are designated on about 13,857 acres out of a total of about 621,224 acres that comprise the unincorporated county, or about 2.2 percent. Adoption of the new General Plan would result in the designation of about 10,148 additional acres to urban uses, bringing the urbanized total to 24,005 acres or about 3.9 percent. Although a 42 percent increase in the amount of developable urban land, the new total represents a net change of only 1.6 percent of the unincorporated area. This information is based on the comparison of land uses allowed under the existing 1983 General Plan, with those proposed under the Draft 2030 General Plan, as provided on page 62 of the DEIR and updated to include the staff recommendations contained within this report. It should be noted, however, that 65 percent of this change is the result of designating existing uses as Public/Quasi-Public (e.g., UC Davis, DQ University, County Airport, Central Landfill, etc.) and does not involve the conversion of farmland. On that subject, the Draft EIR estimated that the 2030 General Plan would result in the loss of 9,072 acres of farmland. About half of the loss (53 percent) would be due to urban growth and roads, with the remainder coming from the creation of new open space, resource parks, and trails.

The Draft General Plan is organized into nine chapters, as follows: Introduction and Administration, Vision and Principles, Land Use and Community Character Element, Circulation Element, Public Facilities and Services Element, Agriculture and Economic Development Element, Conservation and Open Space Element, Health and Safety Element, Housing Element. Within each chapter, the following information is generally provided: introduction and background information, regulatory

framework, policy framework (consisting of goals and policies), and an implementation program with specific actions, responsible parties, and timing.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Comments

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Draft General Plan (Attachment B) was released April 28, 2009 for a 45-day review period that ended June 12, 2009. On May 14 and June 10, 2009, the Planning Commission held public hearings to receive oral comments on the DEIR and Draft General Plan. During the review period, a total of 40 comment letters were received. Responses to these comments are being prepared, and will be included in the Final EIR. Several of the comments requested an extension of the comment period. This issue was considered by the Board of Supervisors on June 30, 2009, and no extension was granted.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures in the DEIR take the form of new or revised Draft General Plan policies and actions which (with one exception discussed below) have been integrated into the Final Draft General Plan (with some clarification of the original EIR language). Some of the notable mitigation measures are summarized below:

- Mitigation Measure LU-1c amends Policy CC-3.13 of the Draft General Plan to retain the 79 acres southwest of the Town of Esparto (south of SR16 and east of CR 86A) as Industrial rather than allowing for future mixed use residential development.
- Mitigation Measure LU-2a amends Policy CC-3.1 of the Draft General Plan to require preparation of a Specific Plan or Master Plan for the Covell/Pole Line Road Industrial property.
- Mitigation Measures LU-4a, b, and c amend the Policies CC-2.10, CC-2.11, and CC-3.3 relating to jobs/housing balance, match, and phasing respectively to be stronger by adding the words “to the greatest extent feasible”.
- Mitigation Measure LU-4c also amends Policy CC-3.3 to require a program to monitor the jobs/housing relationship in each specific plan area, including monitoring (and rebalancing land uses if necessary) every five years.
- Mitigation Measure LU-4d amends Policy CC-3.11 to require high density upper-story residential development in the Elkhorn Specific plan to accommodate work force housing.
- Mitigation Measures CI-1a and b identify new policies that would establish a threshold of 44 vehicle miles of travel (VMT) generated per household per weekday as a maximum within the Dunnigan Specific Plan area (with performance monitoring required at each development phase), and as a target or goal within the other specific plan areas.
- Mitigation Measure CI-1e identifies a new policy that would require the establishment of mode split goals (including biennial household surveys to ensure performance) for walking, bicycling, and transit trips within Transit Plan required (per Action CI-A6) for each specific plan area.

- Mitigation Measure UTIL-1a identifies a new policy to establish maximum daily water use thresholds (e.g. on a “per-dwelling unit equivalent” (DUE) basis within the Dunnigan Specific Plan, and to use those thresholds for purposes of sizing infrastructure.
- Mitigation Measure UTIL-2c identifies a threshold of no new net water demand, for development within water districts where there is an insufficient water supply.

Only one identified mitigation measure has not been integrated into the Final Draft General Plan, and instead is recommended for rejection. Mitigation Measure NOI 2 recommends a new policy for the Noise Element section of the Health and Safety Element as follows:

NOI-2: The Draft General Plan shall be amended to include the following new policy in the Health and Safety Element.

Policy HS-#: All proposed new development of noise sensitive land uses in areas that would experience traffic noise levels in excess of 60 dBA L_{dn} shall submit an acoustical analysis prior to issuance of building permits demonstrating how all reasonable and feasible noise insulation features have been incorporated into the project design that would reduce traffic noise impacts to meet the County’s interior noise level standard for such land uses.

The staff recommends rejection of this measure as duplicative of policies and actions already included in the Draft General Plan including Policy HS-7.4, Action HS-A61, and Actions HS-A63 through A66.

Significant Impacts

The DEIR identifies the potential for significant effects in the following impact areas: Land Use and Housing; Agricultural Resources; Transportation and Circulation; Air Quality; Noise; Global Climate Change; Public Services; Utilities and Energy; Cultural Resources; Biological Resources; Hydrology and Water Quality; Geology, Soils, Seismicity and Mineral Resources; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; and Visual and Scenic Resources. The EIR concludes that the many impacts may remain significant and unavoidable even after identified mitigation measures are implemented.

The DEIR concludes that there are "significant and unavoidable" impacts in each area of analysis except Public Services and Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources. In total, there are 41 countywide impacts, and 12 cumulative (regional) impacts identified as significant and unavoidable.

Alternatives

The DEIR includes a full comparative analysis of three alternative General Plan scenarios:

- The CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act)-required **No Project alternative** assumes that the proposed project would not be adopted or implemented, and that development would continue in accordance with the 1983 General Plan.
- The **Rural Sustainability alternative** assumes that a moderate amount of growth would occur in several unincorporated communities, increasing the level of economic development and restricting housing in the rural agricultural areas.
- The **Market Demand alternative** assumes that the county’s historic constraints on growth would be removed.

The EIR concludes that the Rural Sustainability alternative would be the “environmentally superior” alternative, because it would reduce impacts in the greatest number of topic areas compared to the Draft General Plan. However, the overall level of remaining significant and unavoidable impacts is similar between the Rural Sustainability alternative and the Draft General Plan, and the analysis contained in the DEIR demonstrates that adoption of the Draft General Plan would be the superior choice when comparing and balancing land use, policy, economic viability, environmental impact, and community values.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission heard this item on June 10, 2009. The Commission took final action in the form of recommendations to the Board of Supervisors to certify the Draft EIR with various changes, and to adopt the Draft General Plan with various changes. The adopted minutes from the Planning Commission hearing are attached (Attachment E). The actions of the Planning Commission were made by a series of 5:0:2 votes reflecting unanimous action by the members in attendance.

All of the changes recommended by the Planning Commission have been incorporated into the Proposed Modifications to the Draft General Plan (Attachment F). An overview of these changes is provided below.

The staff report for the Planning Commission included comment letters that had been received since the January 21, 2009 hearings of the Draft General Plan. Responses to these comments were provided in the staff report. Both the letters and the brief responses were considered by the Planning Commission in their deliberations. As required by state law, letters received during the Draft EIR comment period (April 28, 2009 through June 12, 2009) will be responded to as a part of the Final EIR which is expected to be released on or before August 31, 2009. These are discussed above, and a list of the DEIR comments is provided in Attachment C.

OTHER PUBLIC COMMENT LETTERS

Since the close of the DEIR comment period, additional comments have been submitted on the Draft General Plan. At the time of this writing, three additional comment letters have been received. A brief summary, and response to each letter is provided below:

Mark Wilson (received July 7, 2009) – The letter raises a number of concerns regarding various policies as they may potentially affect the Clarksburg region. A brief staff response is provided for each, as follows:

- Policy HS-2.8 (which allows for the ecological benefits of flooding) could be used to support portions of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan and other similar efforts that could affect large areas of farmland within the Clarksburg region. In response, the staff concur that this policy is more appropriately applied to drainages and immediately adjoining areas and is not intended to support widespread inundation. The policy has been revised as shown in Attachment F.
- Action HS-A115 which prohibits new below-grade septic systems and wells within 500 feet of flood control levees. In response, the staff is recommending no change. These measures were adopted by the Board of Supervisors for the Old Sugar Mill Specific Plan, based on recommendations from an engineering consultant regarding levee protection measures.
- Policy AG-1.13 prohibits residential subdivisions in agricultural areas and AG-1.18 describes agricultural buffer requirements, both of which may preclude farm labor

housing, single-family agricultural housing, and/or Transfers of Development Rights (TDRs). In response, neither farm labor housing nor single-family agricultural housing are considered residential subdivisions, and these policies would not apply. Action AG-A25 has been revised to reflect this clarification as shown in Attachment F.

- Section 3 in the “Agricultural Resources” chapter of the Draft EIR appears to be internally inconsistent, as it does not require agricultural mitigation for farm dwellings, agricultural commercial and agricultural industrial uses; but does require habitat mitigation for these same uses. In response, staff clarifies that the section is not inconsistent. The county has determined that the resulting loss of farmland from compatible land uses are an enhancement and do not create an environmental impact to the agricultural economy. However, these same uses may have impacts to state and federally protected species, which must be mitigated by law.
- Impact AG-2 of the Draft EIR regarding potential conflicts with the Williamson Act may result in policies that preclude or discourage farm labor housing, single-family agricultural housing, and/or TDRs. In response, the only mitigation measure recommended under AG-2 would ensure that the phasing of urban development avoid the need for contract cancellation, where feasible. Farm labor housing and single-family agricultural housing are not residential subdivisions. The development of new housing through TDRs within Williamson Act contracts, if allowed under current state law, will be addressed in the implementing ordinance.
- Policies Ag-1.3, 1.6, 1.8, 1.11, 1.12, 1.13, and 1.15 address a variety of issues, primarily focused on protecting agriculture from urban encroachment. They may preclude farm labor housing, single-family agricultural housing, and/or TDRs, as well as agricultural support businesses and services, and agri-tourism. In response, staff advises that the majority of the policies deals with urban uses and do not address the concerns listed by Mr. Wilson. Action AG-A25 has been revised as shown in Attachment F.
- Section 1 of the “Utilities and Energy” chapter of the Draft EIR indicates that ground water would be the best option for a future water supply, should Clarksburg develop at higher densities than currently allowed. A municipal supply based on ground water would not be safe considering the use of individual septic systems. In response, staff observes that a centralized water system would allow for testing and treatment, whereas the existing drinking water supply already relies on ground water without any regular testing or treatment requirements.

Jay Zeigler, Clark Pacific (received July 2, 2009) – The letter provides a general discussion of the landowner’s request to change 30 acres of existing agricultural buffer from Industrial to Open Space, and to change 30 acres of existing farmland from Agriculture to Industrial at the Spreckels site. The request is supported by staff and was included in the Planning Commission’s recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Brenda Cedarblade (received June 30, 2009) – The letter addresses various concerns regarding: (1) the availability of the revised Draft General Plan, (2) alleged misconduct of the Planning Commission during the hearings on the Draft General Plan and EIR, and (3) potential environmental impacts related to the proposed change to the Industrial designation at the Spreckels site. County Counsel has contacted Ms. Cedarblade to respond to the first and second issues. The third issue is being reviewed as a part of the Final EIR.

LIST OF RECOMMENDED CHANGES

Attachment F contains proposed text modifications to the June 10, 2009 Draft General Plan. Attachment G identifies proposed land use changes. These modifications are the result of the Planning Commission action, responses to various comments received, and additional recommendations by staff. A brief summary of these changes is provided below.

As a preliminary matter, one of the obligations of the county in contemplating these changes after release of the Draft EIR, is to ensure that the changes fall within the scope of the environmental impact analysis, and do not trigger the need for additional environmental review or circulation. Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines governs this situation. Based on the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to this staff report, the staff and environmental consultant will perform this analysis for inclusion in the Final EIR. If the results demonstrate that additional CEQA analysis is merited, the staff will immediately return to the Board of Supervisors for further discussion of the implications of this and possible alternatives. If the results substantiate that the changes fall within the CEQA analysis that has already been completed, this information will be released as a part of the Final EIR.

It is the staff's preliminary assessment that the changes will not trigger the need for additional CEQA analysis. The majority of the text changes are clarifications of existing language, and new or amended policies and actions that are directed by the mitigation measures. There are a few proposed new policies and actions that further support goals already in the General Plan. The remainder of recommended text changes are corrections to grammar and punctuation. In total, these recommendations clarify and support the vision and principles, and fundamental goals and policies, of the General Plan

The majority of the recommended land use changes are corrections based on existing land uses. In total, these recommendations would result in the following adjustments to land use by designation:

Summary of Draft General Plan Land Uses Comparison (1983 to 2030)

Land Use Designations	1983 Acreage	2030 Acreage	July 20, 2009 Land Uses Changes
Open Space	2,722	52,969	-31.8
Agriculture	603,544	544,723	-280.8
Parks and Recreation	1,121	866	+16.9
Residential	3,237	3,088	-16.1
Residential Rural (1du/5ac to <1du/ac)	1,668	1,602	+59.8
Residential Low (1du/ac to <10du/ac)	1,342	1,280	-34.7
Residential Med (10du/ac to < 20du/ac)	196	179	-36.7
Residential High (≥20 du/ac)	31	27	-4.5
Commercial	406	651	-16.1
Commercial General	263	532	-16.2
Commercial Local	143	119	+0.1
Industrial	1,195	1,049	+69.7
Public and Quasi-Public	694	7,001	+258.5
Specific Plan	145	3,285	-0.2
Other (roadways, railroads, highways)	8,160	8,592	0
Unincorporated County Total	621,224	621,224	0

Source: Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department, 2009; Tschudin Consulting Group, July 20, 2009.

The effect of these final minor changes is to reduce the total number of housing units by 1,201 and to increase the total number of jobs by 858, compared to the Draft General Plan analyzed in the EIR. The majority of these changes would occur in Esparto, and would improve the existing jobs/housing imbalance.

It should be noted that the act of formally responding to public comments in the Final EIR; will undoubtedly result in additional edits that will be identified in the recommendations presented to the Board of Supervisors on September 15, 2009. Specific analysis will be provided in the Final EIR of all proposed changes to the Draft General Plan since January 2009, however, staff believes that the recommendations identified through this point are consistent with, and will not change, the Draft EIR conclusions.

General Plan Text Changes

As identified in Attachment F, staff is proposing a number of changes to the text of the June 10, 2009 Draft General Plan, most of which are clarifications and corrections. A brief summary of these changes is provided below:

Chapter 1, Introduction and Administration – The text describing the background and history of the General Plan Update is revised to reflect the last few years of the process.

Chapter 2, Vision and Principles – No changes.

Chapter 3, Land Use and Community Character Element – References to the Covell Specific Plan Overlay were added. References to the residential uses in Esparto south of SR-16 were deleted. All land use diagrams and acreage tables were identified to be updated per the final changes by the Board of Supervisors. A new Policy LU-5.8 referencing respect for and balancing of private property rights was added. Policy CC-3.3 was modified pursuant to the DEIR, and clarified, to give the county more options for addressing jobs/housing imbalances. Clarifications to Policies CC-3.5 and CC-3.9 were added to address concerns of Caltrans. Policies CC-3.11 and CC-3.12 related to the Elkhorn Specific Plan, were modified pursuant to the DEIR, to require upper-story, high-density workforce housing.

Chapter 4, Circulation Element – Clarifications to Policy CI-2 regarding roadway level-of-service (LOS) were added. References to various Caltrans documents, and capacity thresholds for state facilities, were added at the request of the state. Clarification was added, as related to improvements on state facilities, that consistency with the General Plan is required for a finding of feasibility (Policies CI-3.11 and 3.11-1). An action was added to examine limiting routing of casino buses to SR-16.

Chapter 5, Public Facilities and Services Element – New Policy PF-2.5 was added to encourage use of pervious surfaces for paving. The level of service for libraries (Action PF-A38) was adjusted, based on new data. Policy PF-12.8 was modified to require regular review and assessment of fees, and assessment for facilities and services.

Chapter 6, Agriculture and Economic Development Element – A new Policy AG-3.21 was added to promote best management practices in agricultural operations.

Chapter 7, Conservation and Open Space Element – Policies related to California tiger salamander (Policies CO-2.41 and 2.44) were clarified to allow for flexibility in mitigation so long as the requirements of trustee and responsible agencies are satisfied. A new Policy CO-5.34 was added related to water supply to reduce peak demand for water, and allow for smaller pumps that use less energy. Action CO-A106 was expanded to include a land use buffer table developed by the State Air Resources Board. Action CO-A115 was modified to clarify that the County Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan/Climate Action Plan must be in place prior to adoption of any specific plan. A new Action CO-A115.1 was added to provide interim significance thresholds for project analysis until the County Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan/Climate Action Plan is in place.

Chapter 8, Health and Safety Element – Minor corrections.

Chapter 9, Housing Element – Minor clarifications.

Land Use Designation Changes

As described in Attachment G, staff is proposing a number of changes to the Land Use map for the 2030 General Plan that was accepted by the Board of Supervisors in January 2009. A brief summary of these changes is provided below:

Central Landfill – 221 acres that were shown as Agriculture (owned by the City of Davis adjoining the wastewater treatment plant) would be corrected to Public/Quasi-Public.

Chiles Road – 14 acres that were shown as Agriculture (the AYSO soccer complex) would be corrected to Parks and Recreation. An additional 18 acres of Agriculture (Department of Fish and Game, and the City of Davis park-n-ride lot) would be corrected to Public/Quasi-Public.

Clarksburg – 15 acres that were shown as Agriculture (the Northwest Interceptor Pumping Station) would be corrected to Public/Quasi-Public. Three home sites totaling one acre, which are shown as Residential Low Density, would be recommended to be changed to Commercial Local, at the request of the owners. A 0.2 acre site that is shown as Specific Plan (pumping station no longer used) would be corrected to Industrial. A vacant 0.2 acre home site shown as Residential High Density would be corrected to Residential Low Density.

Covell – As recommended in Mitigation Measure LU-2a, a Specific Plan Overlay designation would be added to the 383-acre property currently shown as Industrial.

Esparto – 25 acres within the Orciuoli, Capay Cottages, E. Parker, and Story residential subdivisions (consisting of approved parks, trails, detention basins, canals, and sloughs), that are shown as Residential Low Density, would be corrected to 16 acres of Open Space, 4 acres of Public/Quasi-Public, 3 acres of Parks and Recreation, and 2 acres of Agriculture. As recommended in Mitigation Measure LU-1c, the 31 acres of Residential Medium Density, 31 acres of Open Space, 10 acres of Commercial General, 5 acres of Residential High Density, and 2 acres of Commercial Local are being recommended to be changed to 79 acres of Industrial.

Interstate 505 – 15 acres (the existing paintball facility) that were shown as Commercial General are being corrected to Agriculture. Although this site was analyzed as Commercial General in the Draft EIR, the Board of Supervisors has not yet selected which of the two alternative interchanges under consideration (I-505/Road 12A or I-505/Road 14) will be selected for future Commercial General development.

Knights Landing – 9 acres within the Rivers Edge subdivision (levees, detention basin), that were shown as Residential Low Density are being corrected to Public/Quasi-Public. 1 acre of State-owned land that is shown as Commercial Local is also being corrected to Public/Quasi-Public. An existing home site of 0.4 acres shown as Commercial Local is being recommended to be changed to Residential Medium Density, at the request of the owner.

Madison – 3.5 acres of outdoor storage uses that were shown as Industrial are recommended to be changed to General Commercial, at the request of the owner.

Monument Hills – 60 acres of vacant land that were shown as Open Space are recommended for change to Residential Rural at the request of the property owner.

North Davis Meadows – 2 acres of golf cart paths that were shown as Residential Low Density are being corrected to Parks and Recreation. An existing home site of 3 acres that is shown as Parks and Recreation is being corrected to Residential Low Density.

Spreckels – 30 acres that were shown as Industrial (the agricultural buffer) is being corrected to Open Space. At the request of Clark-Pacific, 30 acres of Agriculture are recommended to be changed to Industrial, so that the 160 total acres of Industrial land at this location is maintained.

Zamora – 4 acres that were shown as Industrial (the Shell gas station) are being corrected to General Commercial.

DRAFT GENERAL PLAN ECONOMIC EVALUATION

Bay Area Economics (BAE) has prepared an analysis of the market implications and fiscal impacts of build-out and implementation of the Draft General Plan (Attachment D). According to the study by BAE, the Draft General Plan has designated adequate land in the various land use categories to accommodate potential market demand through at least 2030. The study concludes that by ensuring that businesses have a range of possible locations from which to choose, the Draft General Plan is positioned to capture a portion of regional growth. In particular, BAE estimates that by 2030, the Draft General Plan could generate the following:

- 1.5 million square feet of new commercial development (including retail, office, hotel, etc.), resulting in about 3,000 new jobs;
- 8.3 million square feet of new industrial development (including research/development, warehousing, distribution, etc.), resulting in about 5,000 new jobs, with Spreckels being the site with the best potential outside of Dunnigan and Elkhorn;
- 3 million square feet of agricultural industrial uses; and
- 8,300 new residential units (the amount that could be absorbed by the market by 2030 may be nearly 14,000, but would be constrained by the requirement for a jobs/housing balance based on the above commercial and industrial levels of expected development).

Based on the expected amount of growth described above, the fiscal impact for the entire unincorporated area would be as follows:

- Additional general fund service cost increase of about \$12.5 million annually
- New general fund revenues of about \$11 million annually;
- Net deficit of about \$1.5 million per year, although the bulk of this deficit appears to be attributed to model factors that may over estimate the average salary/benefits costs of Sheriff's patrols;
- Expected surpluses for the Library, Road, and ACO funds;
- For scenarios where the residential and job-generating land use absorption estimates are balanced, the fiscal results are neutral to positive; and
- Where jobs-housing balance policies are suspended, and residential development outpaces job-generating development, the result is projected fiscal deficits.

The fiscal model is only approximate, but the conclusion that the 2030 Countywide General Plan may result in an added county deficit is of strong concern. Staff will continue to work with BAE to review the assumptions used in developing these costs and will provide additional information at the September 15, 2009, hearing.

Dunnigan

A large portion of this growth would be accounted for in the Dunnigan Specific Plan, which was the focus of a sub-area analysis within the BAE study. In Dunnigan, the following amount of new development would be expected to occur by 2030:

- 250,000 square feet of commercial space (including a supermarket, drug store, local shopping, mid-box retailers, and additional highway commercial uses – hotels, gas stations, and restaurants);
- 3 million square feet of industrial (primarily warehouse and distribution facilities); and
- 1,900 new residential units (the amount that could be absorbed by the market by 2030 may be more than 7,000, but would be constrained by the requirement for a jobs/housing balance based on the above commercial and industrial levels of expected development).

Based on the expected amount of growth described above, the fiscal impact for the Dunnigan Specific Plan would be as follows:

- Additional general fund service cost increase of about \$2.9 million annually;
- New general fund revenues of about \$2.6 million annually; and
- Net deficit of about \$300,000 per year, although the bulk of this deficit appears to be attributed to model factors that may over estimate the average salary/benefits costs of Sheriff's patrols;
- Expected surpluses for the Library, Road, and ACO funds.

The fiscal model is only approximate, but the conclusion that the Dunnigan Specific Plan may result in an added county deficit is of strong concern. Policy CC-2.16.D states that: "The fiscal impacts of development projects shall be revenue neutral or positive in terms of impacts to the county general fund. Appropriate exceptions for socially beneficial projects such as affordable housing, parks, etc. may be allowed." The net fiscal impact to the county of future growth in Dunnigan will require further economic analysis as a part of the Specific Plan consideration.

Elkhorn

Another focus of the BAE study was the feasibility of the Elkhorn Specific Plan. Expected levels of growth for this area include:

- 300,000 square feet of hotel/conference center (the success of which is dependent on the ability to develop a facility that emphasizes its natural setting, and caters to small – medium size groups);
- 2.3 million square feet of industrial space (development of which is highly variable, depending on its ability to compete against the nearby Metro Air Park at the Sacramento International Airport); and
- These levels of expected job growth would require the development of 1,700 new residences in the Elkhorn Specific Plan.

Based on the expected amount of growth described above, the fiscal impact for the Elkhorn Specific Plan would be as follows:

- Additional general fund service cost increase of \$93,000 annually;
- New general fund revenues of \$645,000 annually, for a net surplus of \$553,000 per year;
- Expected surpluses for the Library, Road, and ACO funds; and
- These numbers do not take into account the likely increase in service costs should housing be provided within the Specific Plan.

HOUSING ELEMENT

Of the seven mandatory elements of the General Plan, the Housing Element is the only one that requires “approval” by the state. Pursuant to Section 65585 of the Government Code, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is required to review draft local Housing Elements for compliance with state law and report on their findings. The County’s Housing Element has been revised to address comments received from the state in their initial November 25, 2008 comment letter. On July 16, 2009 the staff resubmitted the revised draft Housing Element to the state. The results of the second compliance review are expected to be received prior to the Board’s final action on the General Plan on September 15, 2009. If the state concludes that the final element satisfies the legal requirements, they will issue a final letter that finds the element “in compliance”. A compliant Housing Element, required in order to qualify for most housing loan and grant programs, is necessary in order to achieve the statutory presumption of legal adequacy afforded by Government Code Section 65589.3, and is necessary in order to take full advantage of opportunities presented under the Federal “stimulus” package.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

A key component of the Draft General Plan will be the General Plan Implementation Plan. When completed, the General Plan Implementation Program (GPIP) will integrate all of the action items within the various chapters of the General Plan into a single, readable spreadsheet-based document. The GPIP will allow actions to be tracked and sorted in a variety of ways, for example, by department responsibility, estimated cost, year of implementation, and/or General Plan element.

The GPIP is currently in administrative form, and is under consideration by the County Administrator, and affected Department Heads. Departments having implementation responsibilities will need to provide the following in conjunction with the establishment of each annual budget:

- Assign workload factors (estimated labor hours and staff positions) to each action item;
- Establish a proposed priority ranking for each action item, including fiscal impacts and projected costs (in addition to workload costs, if any) for implementation; and
- Specifically note previous actions that have been completed, require no activity during the fiscal year, or are recommended to be deferred. Confirm the proposed timeframe for completion of each action item.

However, as noted in new proposed text in Chapter One, the current severe economic and fiscal crisis will affect the county’s ability to implement the General Plan in accordance with the targeted timeframes. Crippling budget cut-backs, and extensive staff lay-offs, face the county at this time and the effects of the current economic downturn are expected to continue into the foreseeable future. It is anticipated that this crisis will be resolved over time. In the meantime, implementation items contained in the General Plan will be annually considered in conjunction with the county’s annual budget process, which will allow those items to be considered in the same context as all budgetary decisions of the Board of Supervisors.

This process will enable the Board of Supervisors, staff, and the public, to better understand, and consider the fiscal implications of General Plan implementation, and will allow for structured priority-setting of the general plan actions in the future. As currently drafted, the General Plan contains over 500 separate implementation actions. This represents a very ambitious vision over the next twenty years, the implementation of which will depend largely on the availability of resources. Allocating resources and balancing these actions in the context of the full roles and responsibilities of the county is a fundamental policy decision of the Board of Supervisors that will have significant impacts

on the economy, the environment, and on the county budget. Funding for completion of the implementation plan will be an important part of that decision, whether through fees, grants, partnerships, or the general fund. Public input during future general plan workshops and hearings is encouraged to assist the Board of Supervisors in determining general plan implementation priorities and balancing among factors such as the degree of benefit, cost to the county (including staff time), costs to property owners, and effects on other General Plan policies and actions.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

The county's Economic Development Strategy (EDS) will be an important implementation tool for the General Plan. Though not a part of the General Plan, a draft of the EDS was circulated in September 2008, along with the Draft General Plan, so that the public would have an opportunity to review both draft documents together. Several comments were received on the Draft EDS, and those have been considered by the County Economic Development Manager. Appropriate revisions will be made to the Draft EDS to address these concerns and ensure consistency with the final General Plan. It will be brought forward to the Board of Supervisors for final action following approval of the General Plan.

ATTACHMENTS

All of the following documents are on file with the Clerk of the Board and the Planning and Public Works Department:

- A Final Draft 2030 Countywide General Plan (dated June 10, 2009) (distributed separately)
- B Draft EIR (two volumes) (distributed separately)
- C DEIR List of Commenters and Copy of Comments (distributed separately)
- D Draft General Plan Economic Evaluation
- E Planning Commission Minutes (June 10, 2009)
- F Proposed Modifications to June 10, 2009 Draft General Plan
- G Proposed Land Use Changes Since Release of DEIR