

# PROPOSED TEXT MODIFICATIONS TO JUNE 10, 2009 DRAFT GENERAL PLAN

(AS REVISED BY THE YOLO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
JULY 20-21, 2009)

The following modifications to the June 10, 2009 version of the Draft General Plan were approved by the Board of Supervisors on July 20 and 21, 2009. These include the changes recommended by the Planning Commission in their June 10, 2009 final action on the Draft General Plan, plus additional final clarifications and corrections suggested by staff. These changes are in addition to and/or modify the June 10, 2009 version of the Draft General Plan.

## Chapter 1, Introduction and Administration

Page IN-4, fourth paragraph – Revise as follows:

In May of 2003, the Board of Supervisors gave direction to begin the process of comprehensively updating the General Plan. At the outset of the process, the Board of Supervisors elected to undertake an extensive process of public outreach and involvement. A comprehensive list of stakeholders was identified and throughout 2004 and 2005 over 20 public workshops were held throughout the county in the cities and unincorporated communities to gain input and ideas from the community. One of the workshops was a “Land Use Summit” which convened the first ever joint session of the four City Councils and the Board of Supervisors. As an important outcome of this stage of the process the Board of Supervisors ultimately adopted a “principles and vision statement” to guide the update process, based on the 1983 plan and public input. ~~A new round of community workshops were used to develop issues and land use alternatives, including a Land Use Summit which convened the first ever joint session of the four City Councils and the Board of Supervisors.~~

Page IN-5, first paragraph – Revise as follows:

Between September of 2006 and March of 2007, five key hearings were held before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to explore and ultimately define the basic policy premise and Preferred Land Use Alternative for the Update process. Hundreds of people provided testimony during these hearings and the Board of Supervisors ultimately crafted the Preferred Land Use Alternative from six alternatives. Between March and September of 2007 two additional hearings were held to confirm the precise property mapping to be used with the Preferred Land Use Alternative. In September of 2007 the Board of Supervisors authorized the staff to move forward with various land use changes referred to as the Preferred Land Use Alternative. In November of 2007 and January of 2008, the Board of Supervisors gave direction to further explore the concept of agricultural districts that would allow for voluntary participation in various programs (such as targeted regulatory streamlining, financial incentives and specialized marketing efforts) to encourage agricultural business development and expansion. The Preferred Land Use Alternative was further refined during review of the Draft General Plan by the Board of Supervisors in January and July of 2008 2009.

Page IN-5, second paragraph – Revise first line as follows:

The Preferred Land Use Alternative ~~focuses~~ focused on the following:

Page IN-5, third paragraph -- Revise this paragraph as follows:

The first complete draft of the General Plan, entitled the Public Review Draft, was released September 10, 2008. This Draft General Plan document incorporates the Preferred Land Use Alternative and provides with complementary draft goals and policies reflective of direction from the Board of Supervisors provided in prior General Plan vision and mission statements. A detailed overview of the document was provided to the public at a joint workshop of the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission held September 16, 2008. Following the joint public workshop, 29 additional community meetings, scoping meetings, and workshops were held. The Planning Commission then deliberated the document in a series of public workshops held November 3, 5, and 6, 2008 at which time they recommended acceptance to the Board of Supervisors.

The Revised Public Review Draft General Plan was released on January 20, 2009 for deliberation by the Board of Supervisors at a workshop held January 20 and 21, 2009. The Board at that time authorized commencement of the DEIR based on the January 20<sup>th</sup> document as modified.

The DEIR was released April 28, 2009 for a review period that extended through June 12, 2009. A hearing on the DEIR was held before the Planning Commission on May 14, 2009. The Final Draft General Plan was released June 10, 2009 for deliberation by the Planning Commission at a hearing held that same date. The Planning Commission recommended unanimous approval to the Board of Supervisors. The Board held a hearing July 20, 2009 and passed a motion of intent to approve the Plan as modified. The Final EIR was released \_\_\_\_\_, and final action on the FEIR and General Plan was taken September 15, 2009 (Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_).

Page IN-7, a. Environmental Impact Report – Modify as follows:

~~An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared by the County. The EIR identifies potential adverse impacts of the draft General Plan and feasible mitigation measures that have been integrated into the Plan to address adverse impacts. After the EIR is released and finalized, a summary of results will be inserted here.~~

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Draft General Plan was released April 28, 2009 for a 45-day review period that ended June 12, 2009. Mitigation measures in the DEIR took the form of new or revised Draft General Plan policies and actions which were largely integrated into the Final Draft General Plan. The Response to Comments document was released \_\_\_\_\_. The FEIR was certified by the Board of Supervisors September 15, 2009 (Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_).

Page IN-8, first full sentence – Modify as follows:

~~After the~~These findings of fact ~~are~~ were adopted by the Board of Supervisors, ~~a reference to the adoption as a part of Resolution will be added here.~~ No. \_\_\_\_\_.

## **Chapter 2, Vision and Principles**

No Changes

## **Chapter 3, Land Use and Community Character Element**

Page LU-7, Figure LU-1A – Replace this Figure with final Land Use Diagram that reflects all final land uses changes consistent with Table LU-5 below.

Page LU-8, Table LU-5 – Update all acreages to reflect final land use correction and changes. Add new row at bottom of table: “Covell Specific Plan Overlay 384 acres”.

Page LU-10, SOI Boundaries figure – Add the following reference to the figure: “Figure LU-1.1”.

Page LU-15, Specific Plan Overlay definition – Modify as follows:

**Specific Plan Overlay (SPO)** applies to existing and planned areas of development, typically adjacent to identified Specific Plan designated land. Land uses consistent with the existing land use designation are allowed until a Specific Plan has been adopted, at which point the Specific Plan takes precedence.

Page LU-17, Figure LU-2 – Modify as follows: on the Zamora inset, add a label that identifies the property for “Agricultural Commercial; on the I-505/SR-128 inset add a label that identifies the property for “Agricultural Commercial or Agricultural Industrial”; on the Madison inset add a label that identifies the property for “Agricultural Industrial”; and on the Clarksburg inset add a label that identifies the property for “Agricultural Industrial”.

Page LU-18, Policy LU-2.3 – Modify as follows:

Prohibit the division of land in an agricultural area if the division is for non-agricultural purposes and/or if the result of the division will be parcels that are infeasible for farming. Projects related to clustering and/or transfers of development rights are considered to be compatible with agriculture.

Page LU-20, Table LU-20 – For Esparto under “Added New Units” replace “521” with “0” to reflect DEIR Mitigation Measure LU-1c related to 79 acres south of SR-16, and correct totals in the table to reflect the change.

Page LU-21, Table LU-9 – Modify table to reflect final land use numbers.

Page LU-23 – Add a new policy as follows:

Policy LU-5.8 Ensure that respect for and protection of private property rights is balanced with all other factors considered by the County in making land use decisions.

Page LU-25, Policy LU-6.11 – Modify this policy as follows:

e) Life science, biotechnology and related research uses. ~~along the Interstate 80 corridor.~~

f) The possibility of commercial and mixed uses at Covell Boulevard/Pole Line Road and the possibility of coordinated planning with the Hunt Wesson site.


Page LU-25, Policy LU-6.14 – Move this policy to Policy LU-7.8 under the regional Coordination goal.

Page LU-26, Policy LU-7.8 – Move Policy LU-6.14 here.

Page LU-34, Policy CC-3.1 – Delete “or Master Plan.”

Page LU-36, Policy CC-3.3 – This policy was printed without underlined text to identify new language. It should have been underlined as shown below, with additional modifications as proposed:

Policy CC-3.3     Ensure that jobs are created concurrent with housing to the greatest feasible extent. Include requirements to ensure a reasonable ongoing balance between housing and jobs by phase and/or other mechanisms to constrain housing to stay balanced with job creation through buildout of the area. ~~Each phase of housing shall be required to be accompanied by balanced job-generating development.~~ Strive to match overall wages to home prices.

For areas within Specific Plans the amount of land designated for residential and job generating uses shall be evaluated during the Specific Plan process, and land uses shall may be “re-balanced” by phase if necessary in order to achieve a jobs/housing balance of 1.2. A jobs/housing monitoring program shall be established as part of each Specific Plan for its planning area. The jobs/housing relationship (balance, phasing, and match) for each specific plan area shall be monitored by phase every five years. To the greatest feasible extent, steps shall be taken to maintain the desired jobs/housing relationships. For example, if one land use sector is out of balance with another, the County shall take immediate actions to ensure that the required jobs/housing relationship balance is achieved. over-built land use type shall be stayed until the under built land use type is rebalanced. (DEIR MM LU-4c) 

Page LU-39, Policy CC-3.5 -- Add the following new text:

M. The need for ramp intersection, ramp interchange improvements, or mainline improvements on the State Highway System shall be identified within the EIR for the Dunnigan Specific Plan.

N. Strive to develop new planned areas from existing neighborhoods outward in a contiguous manner.

Page LU-40, Policy CC-3.7E – Add the following new text at the end of this item: “...as an alternative source of municipal water.”

Page LU-42, Policy CC-3.9 – Items G and H were printed without underlined text to identify new language. These sections should have been underlined as shown below. Also the following new text is added to H: “...as an alternative source of water.”

G. The need for intersection and roadway improvements on State Route 16 between Madison and I-505 shall be identified as part of the Madison Specific Plan consistent with the policy thresholds of the Draft General Plan. (DEIR MM CI-6b)

H. Encourage the Madison CSD to explore the availability of Cache Creek water via the Flood Control District as an alternative source of water. (DEIR MM UTIL-2b)

Page LU-44, Policy CC-3.11 – Modify E as follows:

E. Modify and amend the Elkhorn Specific Plan to accommodate high density dwelling units in the upper stories above the commercial uses, to provide workforce housing. The inclusion of residential development is intended to achieve a jobs/housing balance and reduce the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) of the Elkhorn Specific Plan area. The precise number of units shall be determined through the specific plan process and shall be analyzed for environmental impact in the specific plan EIR.

Page LU-45, Policy CC-3.12 – Modify this policy to include the following text:

- Policy CC-3.12 The following development capacities shall guide development of the Elkhorn Specific Plan (these numbers are illustrative)(see Figure LU-7, Elkhorn Specific Plan Conceptual Sketch):
- 348 total acres
  - 305 acres of job producing commercial and industrial land uses
    - 175 acres CG (4,095 new jobs assumed)
    - 130 acres IN (1,354 new jobs assumed)
  - RH uses for upper story units (range of units to be determined through the Specific Plan)
  - 23 acres OS uses
  - 20 acres PQ (no new jobs assumed)

Page LU-45, Policy CC-3.13 – The full text of the deleted policy was inadvertently omitted. It is shown correctly below:

- Policy CC-3.13 The following development capacities shall guide development of the new Esparto mixed-use residential area, (79 acres) located southeast of town, south of State Route 16 and east of County Road 86A (these numbers are approximate):
- 79 total acres
  - 40 5 acres CG (assumes 781 existing industrial jobs are replaced with 460 80 new commercial jobs)
  - ~~2 acres CL (assumes 46 existing commercial jobs)~~
  - 7 acres IN (assumes 112 new industrial jobs)
  - 36 29 acres of residential uses in various densities allowing for approximately up to 590 new units:
    - 34 10 acres RM (range of 340 200 to 649 300 units [typical 465 250])
    - 5 acres RH (400 150 to 200 or more units [typical 425 175]; no new jobs assumed)
    - 14 acres RL (range of 14 to 140 units [typical 77])
    - Potential range 340 364 to 849 640 or more units. [typical 590] General Plan established maximum 590 units by policy.
  - 34 16 acres OS (300 200-foot agricultural buffer on east, west, and south)
  - 7 acres PR (depending on the number of homes)
  - 15 acres roads

The mixed use area shall accomplish the following:

- a. Contribute to achieving a jobs/housing match within the immediate region, including the Cache Creek Casino Resort.
- b. Prohibit commercial land uses that compete with the downtown.
- c. Improve Willow Slough, along the eastern boundary of the project area, to reduce flooding.
- d. Provide restricted senior housing, workforce housing for the Cache Creek Casino Resort, and/or very-low or extremely-low income housing.
- e. Create a signature entry for the town of Esparto, as the “visual gateway” to the Capay Valley.

- f. Provide a safe and effective pedestrian/bicycle crossing for State Route 16 to move people from the project area to the rest of the community.
- g. Ensure the Residential Medium (RM) area immediately north and west of the Industrial (IN) area be used for workforce housing.

Page LU-45, Policy CC-3.14 – Revise as follows:

Policy CC-3.14      There are ~~two~~three alternative identified sites for location of a future winery-related agricultural industrial facility in Clarksburg (see Figure LU-2). Only one site is intended for the described development. The project is intended to complement the Old Sugar Mill and to assist in establishing a successful critical mass of grape processing facilities to support emerging wineries.

Page LU-47, Policy CC-3.19 – Add the following text at the end of this policy: “...(see Action CO-106).”

Page LU-49, Policy CC-4.11 – In the fifth line, change “shall” to “may”. In first line of second paragraph, revise as follows: “~~Each technical study~~ When a technical study is required, it must cover...”

Page LU-51, Policy CC-4.32 – Change the first word to “Require”.

Page LU-54, Action CC-A16 – Modify as follows:

Action CC-A16      Establish a countywide system of consistent “comment” areas for each of the existing Citizens Community Advisory Committees, to ~~eliminate overlap and to~~ ensure all discretionary projects are forwarded assigned to the appropriate Advisory Committee.

Pages LU-61 through LU-67, Figure LU-1B through LU-1H -- Replace these Figures with final insets consistent with the final Land Use Diagram that reflects all final land uses changes consistent with Table LU-5. For I-505/CR 14 inset, correct placement of red star on I-505/CR-14 intersection.

Page LU-70, Table LU-4 -- Specific Plan Overlay definition – Modify as follows:

**Specific Plan Overlay (SPO)** applies to existing and planned areas of development, typically adjacent to identified Specific Plan designated land. Land uses consistent with the existing land use designation are allowed until a Specific Plan has been adopted, at which point the Specific Plan takes precedence.

## Chapter 4, Circulation Element

Page CI-2, Roadway Level of Service – Modify this section as follows:

### 4. Roadway Level of Service

Level of service is a general measure of traffic operating conditions whereby a letter grade, from Level of Service (LOS) A (~~the best~~) to F (~~the worst~~), is assigned. These grades represent the perspective of drivers and are an indication of the comfort and convenience associated with the driving experience as well as speed, travel time, traffic interruptions and freedom to maneuver a typical vehicle. The level of service thresholds for roadways is based on traffic volume thresholds.

Level of service does not represent the perspective of other roadway users such as pedestrians, bicyclists, or transit users, and therefore, is not the only measure of roadway performance used by the County in this element. Policy CI-3.6 requires "complete" streets as part of the roadway network, in order to accommodate all users. The level of service grades for roadways are generally defined as follows (capacity ranges are identified for each level of service; however the actual capacity of a roadway depends on the roadway type):

**LOS A** represents free-flow travel with an excellent level of comfort and convenience and the freedom to maneuver for motorists. LOS A generally represents utilization of less than 30 percent of roadway capacity.

**LOS B** has stable operating conditions for motorists, but the presence of other vehicles on the road causes a noticeable, though slight, reduction in comfort, convenience and maneuvering freedom for drivers. LOS B generally represents utilization of 30 to 50 percent of roadway capacity.

**LOS C** has stable operating conditions for motorists, but the operation of individual motorists users is substantially affected by the interaction with others vehicles in the traffic stream. LOS C generally represents utilization of 40 to 70 percent of roadway capacity.

**LOS D** represents high-density, but stable flow for motorists, however they will Users experience severe restriction in speed and freedom to maneuver, with poor levels of comfort and convenience. LOS D generally represents utilization of 60 to 90 percent of roadway capacity.

**LOS E** represents operating conditions at or near capacity for motorists. Speeds are reduced to a low but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver for motorists is difficult. Unstable operation is frequent and minor disturbances in traffic flow can cause breakdown conditions. LOS E generally represents utilization of 80 to 100 percent of roadway capacity.

**LOS F** is used to define forced or breakdown conditions for motorists. This condition exists wherever the volume of vehicular traffic demand exceeds the capacity of the roadway (i.e., utilization of roadway capacity is over 100 percent). Long queues can form behind these bottleneck points with queued traffic traveling in a stop-and-go fashion.

These definitions of level of service for motorists are contained in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) (Transportation Research Board, 2000). The HCM methodology is the prevailing measurement standard at this time used throughout the United States.

Page CI-3, State Transportation Planning, second paragraph under item 5 – Add the following text to the end of the paragraph:

...In addition to the concept report, a Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) has been developed for Interstate 5 (State Route 99 & Interstate 5 Corridor System Management Plan, Caltrans, May 2009), which addresses the segment between the Sacramento County line and the City of Woodland in Yolo County. CSMPs are intended to provide for the integrated management of travel modes and roadways to facilitate the efficient and effective mobility of people and goods within California's most congested transportation corridors.

Page CI-3, third paragraph under item 5 – Modify as follows:

The Interstate 80 Transportation Concept Report (Caltrans, January 2001) identifies the 20-year concept and ultimate facility for the corridor as widening the existing six lanes through Yolo County (including the Yolo Causeway) to include high occupancy vehicle lanes in both directions. The concept also includes increasing transit service and implementing traffic operation systems such as ramp metering and changeable message signs along the corridor. Caltrans has established a concept LOS of E for Interstate 80 through Yolo County. In addition to the concept report, a CSMP has been is currently being developed for Interstate 80 (Interstate 80 and Capital City Freeway Corridor System Management Plan, Caltrans, May 2009). ~~which is intended to provide for "the integrated management of travel modes and roadways to facilitate the efficient~~

~~and effective mobility of people and goods within California's most congested transportation corridors.~~ This document identifies the addition of HOV lanes between Mace Boulevard (in Davis) and Enterprise Drive (in West Sacramento) along Interstate 80 in both directions.

Page CI-4, top paragraph – Modify as follows:

... The concept report also identifies the need for a traffic signal at the State Route 16/County Road 89 intersection within the community of Madison. Caltrans has also prepared the State Route 16 Safety Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (~~December 2005~~) (May 2009) that identifies safety improvements for State Route 16 from near the town of Brooks to Interstate 505 (excluding the towns of Capay and Esparto). The project would generally provide 12-foot-wide lanes, 8-foot-wide shoulders and left-turn lanes at appropriate locations. The Safety Improvement Project is will not ~~anticipated to~~ provide capacity enhancing improvements.

Page CI-9, Figure CI-2B – Modify this Figure to include an asterisk for I-80 and I-5. Add the following note:

\* Caltrans' current plans include widening these facilities to include HOV lanes in both directions on I-80 between Mace Boulevard and Enterprise Boulevard and on I-5 between the Sacramento County Line and SR 113. The County has established objectives for increasing State highway capacity in Policy CI-3.3A.

Page CI-15, Figure CI-3B – Eliminate the proposed bikeways shown south of West Sacramento, along the deep ship channel levee, Old River Road (County Road 22), and South River Road; add a Class III route along Willow Point Road, from Clarksburg to Z Line Road, then south to Courtland Road, and east to State Route 84 (Jefferson Boulevard).

Page CI-25, Policy CI-3.1-- Modify Policy CI-3.1 as follows:

- Interstate 5 (County Road 6 to Interstate 505) – LOS D is acceptable to the County, assuming that one additional auxiliary lane is constructed in each direction through this segment. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from planned development. LOS D is anticipated by Caltrans according to Interstate 5 Transportation Concept Report 1996 to 2016 (Caltrans, April 1997).
- Interstate 5 (Interstate 505 to Woodland City Limit) – LOS D is acceptable to the County. LOS D is anticipated by Caltrans according to Interstate 5 Transportation Concept Report 1996 to 2016 (Caltrans, April 1997).
- Interstate 5 (Woodland City Limit to Sacramento County Line) – LOS F is acceptable to the County. The County will secure a fair share towards intersection improvements from all feasible sources including planned development at the Elkhorn site. LOS C is anticipated by Caltrans according to State Route 99 & Interstate 5 Corridor System Management Plan (Caltrans, May 2009).
- Interstate 80 (Davis City Limit to West Sacramento City Limit) – LOS F is acceptable to the County. LOS F is anticipated by Caltrans according to Interstate 80 and Capital City Freeway Corridor System Management Plan (Caltrans, May 2009).

Page CI-25 and 27, Policy CI-3.1 – Letter the bullets as “A” through “W”. On page CI-27, letter the paragraph that reads, “Additional exceptions ...” as “X”. Number the remaining bullets below this paragraph as “1” through “8”.



Page CI-27 and 28, Policy CI-3.2 – Letter the bullets as “A” through “K”. Revise “C” as follows to be consistent with other policies in the General Plan: “New development shall utilize a grid pattern for ~~local~~ all roadways.”

Page CI-28 – Add a new policy as follows:

Policy CI-3.2.1 CEQA review for subsequent projects will analyze project traffic and circulation impacts using both the Yolo County General Plan policies and Caltrans policies (based on the CSMPs, TCCRs, or other guidelines) as applicable.

Page CI-28 and 29, Policy CI-3.3 – Number the bullets under item “A” as “1” through “6” and number the bullets under item “B” as “1” through 5”.

Page CI-29, Policy CI-3.5 – Letter the bullets as “A” through “C”.

Page CI-31, Table CI-1 – Add a new entry in this table for “County Road 22” (Old River Road) from “Interstate 5” to “West Sacramento City Limits”.

Page CI-31, Table CI-1 – County Road 95, change “From” segment to “State Route 16”.

Page CI-31, Policy CI-3.10 -- Letter the bullets as “A” through “C”.

Page CI-31, Policy CI-3.11 – Modify this policy as follows:

Policy CI-3.11 Require new development to finance and construct all off-site circulation improvements necessary to mitigate a project’s transportation impacts (including public transit, pedestrian and bicycle mobility, safety, and level of service-related impacts, and impacts to the State Highway System). For mitigation to be considered feasible, it must be consistent with the policies of the General Plan.

Page CI-32, Policy CI-3.11 – Renumber this policy as CI-3.11.1 to distinguish it from a policy with the same number on the prior page. Modify this policy as follows:

Policy CI-3.1.1 Collect the fair share cost of all feasible transportation improvements necessary to reduce the severity of cumulative transportation impacts (including public transit, pedestrian and bicycle mobility, safety, and level of service-related impacts, and impacts to the State Highway System). For mitigation to be considered feasible, it must be consistent with the policies of the general plan.

Page CI-32, Policy CI-3.14 – Letter the bullets as “A” through “D”. Revise “C” as follows, to be consistent with Policy CI-3.2C: “~~Encouraging~~ Requiring a grid-based system.”

Page CI-32, Policy CI-3.18, first paragraph, last line – Clarify as follows: “...and may include, ~~but are not limited to,~~ the following types of actions: ...”

Page CI-32, Policy CI-3.18 – Letter the bullets as “A” through “N”.

Page CI-34, Policy CI-4.3 – Letter the bullets as “A” through “H”.


Page CI-36, Policy CI-5.13 – Letter the bullets as “A” through “H”.

Page CI-36, Policy CI-5.19 – Clarify Policy CI-5.19 as follows:

Policy CI-5.19 Before abandoning a County right-of-way, ensure easement rights are preserved or obtained to provide for ~~When a public road is proposed for abandonment, reserve an easement for use by the public to allow for continued~~ access to public lands, natural features, or to provide connections to other existing or planned trail systems. The easement may be held by the county or other public agency.

Page CI-39, Policy CI-9.3 – Modify policy to add “as” after “such” in the third line.

Page CI-40, Action CI-A3 – Clarify this action as follows:

Action CI-A3 Update the Bicycle Transportation Plan, ~~including~~ to include: the California Delta Trail; a dedicated multi-purpose bikeway between Woodland and Davis; and other potential routes along levees, abandoned railroads, waterways, transmission right-of-ways ~~and willing landowners.~~ (Policy CI-5.1, Policy CI-5.2, Policy CI-5.6, Policy CI-5.11, Policy CI-5.15)   
Responsibility: Planning and Public Works Department  
Timeframe: 2014, 2019, 2024, 2029

Page CI-45, Action CI-A26 – Correct the timeframe to read “2013/2014”.

Page CI-45 – Add a new action as follows:

Action CI-A31 Investigate the possibility of restricting private buses to SR 16, east of Interstate 505 (Policy CI-3.13).  
Responsibility: Planning and Public Works Department  
Timeframe: 2014/1015

## **Chapter 5, Public Facilities and Services Element**

Page PF-10 -- Add a new policy as follows:

Policy PF-2.5 Incorporate new ways to pave streets, parking lots, sidewalks, and trails with pervious surfaces that allow for water to penetrate the surface.

Page PF-16, Policy PF-4.3 – Modify this policy as follows:

Policy PF-4.3 Maintain a minimum ratio of ~~3.9~~ 1.75 sworn officers per 1,000 ~~people~~ service population, which is defined as both the number of residents and employees located solely within the unincorporated area. For the purposes of this policy, an employee is weighted at 0.26 the cost of service for a resident. Maintenance of this ratio includes ~~including~~ the necessary facilities, equipment, and non-uniformed personnel to support that ratio. Commercial and/or industrial projects, businesses, events, and other proposals that generate higher demands for Sheriff’s services shall be evaluated to determine if additional resources are needed to address potential fiscal impacts.

Page PF-16, Policy PF-4.6 – Delete this policy.

Page PF-20, Policy PF-5.9 – Modify as follows:

Policy PF-5.9 The County shall require, and applicants must provide, a will-serve letter from the appropriate fire district/department confirming the ability to provide fire protection

services to the project, prior to each phase and any required terms of service.  
(DEIR MM PUB-1)

Page PF-21, Policy PF-5.10 and PF-5.11– Add the following:

Policy PF-5.10 Reduce vegetation and other wildland fuels on County-owned land within the State Responsibility Area to reduce the intensity of fires, consistent with biological, scenic, and recreational considerations.

Policy PF-5.11 Incorporate fire infrastructure elements into County roads within the State Responsibility Area where feasible, such as turn-outs, helispots, and safety zones.

Page PF-21, Action PF-A31 – Add the following:

Action PF-A31 Develop an ordinance to require reconstruction of and/or substantial additions to existing structures within High Fire Hazard Areas to incorporate fire-resistant building standards within 100-feet of the structure.

Page PF-40, Figure PF-6 – Correct the figure to properly show the Woodland City Limits.

Page PF-45, Policy PF-12.8 – Modify as follows:

Policy PF-12.8 Ensure that fees and assessments used to fund facilities and services are paid for by those who benefit, and are reviewed regularly to ensure the fee/assessment reflects the true cost.

## **Chapter 6, Agriculture and Economic Development Element**

Page AG-1, 4<sup>th</sup> line, last word – The word “development” is misspelled.

Page AG-24, Policy AG-3.1 – Add “Promote tourism” to the Suggested Programs and Actions for the Capay Valley Agricultural District.

Page AG-27 – Add a new policy as follows:

Policy AG-3.21 Promote best management practices in agricultural operations (including animal operations) to reduce emissions, conserve energy and water, and utilize alternative energy sources. 🌱

Page AG-34, Action AG-A25 – Add the following sentence to the end: “Projects in receiving areas of the TDR program would not be considered residential subdivisions and/or the division of land for non-agricultural uses for the purposes of this General Plan.”

Page AG-43, Action ED-A6 – Modify the Action to include the following text:

Action ED-A6 Work to ensure that all County entities, including advisory committees, respond quickly and effectively to concerns raised by businesses regarding new or existing operations and/or planned expansions. Work with applicants to ensure

project feasibility within the context of the goals and policies of the General Plan.

## **Chapter 7, Conservation and Open Space Element**

Page CO-13, Policy CO-1.3 – Delete the word “natural”.

Page CO-14, Policy CO-1.17 – Modify as follows:

Policy CO-1.17 Out-of-county mitigation easements in Yolo County for the loss of open space, agriculture, or habitat in other jurisdictions, and flood easements in Yolo County are not acceptable, ~~provided the easements~~ unless the project meets all of the following criteria:

- Prior notification to Yolo County;
- Consistency with the goals and policies of the Yolo County General Plan, particularly as related to planned growth, infrastructure, and agricultural districts;
- Secured water rights and infrastructure to economically maintain the proposed mitigation use;
- Requirements that existing agricultural operations continue to be farmed for commercial gain;
- Prohibitions on residential use;
- Mandatory wildlife-friendly strategies and practices;
- Compensation to Yolo County for all lost direct and indirect revenue; and
- Accommodation of recreational uses, such as hunting, fishing, bird-watching, hiking, etc.

Where proposed easements meet the ~~identified~~ above criteria, no further approval is needed. Where one or more criteria are not met, discretionary approval is required.

Page CO-15, Policy CO-1.18 – Delete the word “Tuleyome,”.

Page CO-15, Policy CO-1.19 – Delete the words “the Great Central Valley initiative to create”.

Page CO-15, Policy CO-1.20 – Modify as follows and move to Policy PF-6.10:

~~Policy CO-1.20~~ Policy PF-6.10 Encourage the Department ~~Bureau~~ of the Interior and/or the General Services Administration to transfer the site of D-Q University to the County, or other appropriate local public agency ownership, should it no longer be used for tribal education (see also Policy LU-6.3).

Page CO-15, Policy CO-1.22 – Replace the word “landscaping” with “restoration”.

Page CO-16, Policy CO-1.26 – Revise as follows:

Policy CO-1.26 Support development of a the new California Indian Heritage Center in the City of West Sacramento ~~located at the confluence of the Sacramento and American rivers.~~

Page CO-20, bottom paragraph – Modify as follows:

Climate change is anticipated to result in great changes to the biological resources within the county. Shifts in food sources, timing of natural processes (e.g. hibernation, migration, reproduction, and estivation) and active growing periods, chilling and heating, will all have direct links to shifting climate and will redefine many essential relationships in natural communities...

Page CO-27, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph – Modify as follows:

Prairie grasslands provide important habitat for small rodents, ground-nesting birds, and a variety of reptiles and burrowing mammals, ~~and are important foraging habitat for bird and mammal species.~~

Page CO-28, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence – Modify as follows:

~~Most of t~~These species are listed in Table CO-4.

Page CO-28, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph – Change “Bald eagle” to “bald eagle”.

Page CO-31, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph – Add: “This program is administered by the Audubon California Landowner Stewardship Program.”

Page CO-34, Policy CO-2.12 – Modify as follows:

Policy CO-2.12 Support the use of controlled fire management where feasible and appropriate as a natural ecosystem process, to reduce the threat of catastrophic wildfire, to encourage oak recruitment, and to meet other resources management objectives in higher elevation woodland and chaparral communities.

Page CO-34, Policy CO-2.13 – Modify as follows:

Policy CO-2.13 Promote the use of oak woodlands conservation banks to mitigate for both losses due to development impacts and to provide carbon sequestration for greenhouse gas emissions under ~~the proposed~~ applicable State ~~carbon credit~~ programs.

Page CO-36, Policy CO-2.22 – Add a new second sentence: “A larger buffer is preferred.”

Page CO-37, Policy CO-2.38 -- Change the word “implementation” to “development of approved projects.”

Page CO-38, Policy CO-2.41 – Add the following new text to this policy:

...Implementation and funding of mitigation measures for projects that will be developed in phases over time may also be phased, with the applicable mitigation being implemented and funded prior to the final approval of each phase or sub-phase.

Page CO-38, Policy CO-2.41 – Clarify as follows:

Policy CO-2.41 Preserve grassland habitat within 2,100 feet of documented California tiger salamander breeding ponds or implement required mitigation (equivalent or more stringent) as imposed by appropriate agencies or through the County HCP/NCCP, to and require that impacts be fully mitigated impacts consistent with local, State, and federal requirements. (DGEIR MM BIO-4c)

Page CO-38, Policy CO-2.44 – Clarify as follows:

Policy CO-2.44 Projects that have the potential to impact California tiger salamander (CTS) breeding or terrestrial habitat in the Dunnigan Hills area, shall conduct ~~require~~ that a project-level biological assessment ~~be conducted~~ to determine the potential to impact California tiger salamander upland or breeding habitat (if such assessment has not already been done as part of an approved HCP/NCCP). Such an assessment will be required for all projects located within 1.3 miles of a known or potential breeding site. Development activities that would result in isolation of the breeding or upland habitat will be required to mitigate for such impacts. Mitigation shall consist of two components: 1) habitat preservation and enhancement of suitable upland habitat, and 2) preservation and construction of new breeding habitat. Mitigation ratios and locations shall satisfy the requirements of appropriate local, state, and federal agencies, and shall be coordinated with the HCP/NCCP program if adopted. ~~CTS upland habitat will be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1 (preserved:impacted). Preserved upland habitat must be located within 2,100 feet of an occupied habitat and must have at least one suitable breeding pond.~~ (DEIR MM BIO-5c)

Page CO-38, Action CO-A25 – Delete the words “with the NHP”.

Page CO-39, Action CO-A27 – Change “establishment” to “establish”.

Page CO-39, Action CO-A28 – Modify as follows:

Action CO-A28 Create a program to encourage the planting of new oak seedlings in appropriate locations and the protection of plantings from damage by animals, insects, and people until seedlings are of sufficient size.

Page CO-39, Action CO-A30 – Modify as follows:

Action CO-A30 ~~Develop a program to e~~Encourage landowners to participate in programs that restore degraded creek resources by: ...

Page CO-47 -- Add a new action as follows:

Action CO-A-52.2 Implement the Cache Creek Area Plan (Policy CO-3.2).  
Responsibility: Parks and Resources Department  
Timeframe: Ongoing.

Page CO-69, Policy CO-5.25 – Change the word “suppliers” to “supplies”.

Page CO-69, Policy CO-5.31 -- Add the following text at the end of this policy: “...as an alternative source of municipal water.”

Page CO-70 – Add a new policy as follows:

Policy CO-5.34 Require measures that reduce peak demand for water, and therefore allow for smaller pumps that use less energy overall.

Page CO-79, Action CO-A106 – Modify this action as follows:

Action CO-A106 Regulate the location and operation of land uses to avoid or mitigate harmful or nuisance levels of air emissions to the following sensitive receptors: residentially designated land uses; hospitals, and nursing/convalescent homes, and similar board and care facilities; hotels and lodging; schools and day care centers; and neighborhood parks. Home occupation uses are excluded. New development shall follow the recommendations for siting new sensitive land uses consistent with the CARB's recommendation as shown in the table below DEIR Table IV-D-8. (DEIR MM AIR-3) (Policy CO-6.1, Policy CO-6.2):

### Recommendations on Siting New Sensitive Land Uses

Source	Category Advisory Recommendations
Freeways and High-Traffic Roads	Avoid concentrating sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway, urban roads with 100,000 vehicles/day, or rural roads with 50,000 vehicles/day.
Distribution Centers	Avoid avoid concentrating sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a distribution center (that accommodates more than 100 trucks per day, more than 40 trucks with operating transport refrigeration units (TRUs) per day, or where TRU unit operations exceed 300 hours per week).  Take into account the configuration of existing distribution centers and avoid concentrating residences and other new sensitive land uses near entry and exit points.
Rail Yards	Avoid concentrating sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a major service and maintenance rail yard.  Within one mile of a rail yard, consider possible siting limitations and mitigation approaches.
Ports	Avoid concentrating sensitive land uses immediately downwind of ports in the most heavily impacted zones. Consult local air districts or the CARB on the status of pending analyses of health risks.
Refineries	Avoid concentrating sensitive land uses immediately downwind of petroleum refineries. Consult with local air districts and other local agencies to determine an appropriate separation.
Chrome Platers	Avoid concentrating sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a chrome plater.
Dry Cleaners Using Perchloroethylene	Avoid concentrating sensitive land uses within 300 feet of any dry cleaning operation. For operations with two or more machines, provide 500 feet. For operations with 3 or more machines, consult with the local air district.  Do not concentrate sensitive land uses in the same building with perc dry cleaning operations.
Gasoline Dispensing Facilities	Avoid concentrating sensitive land uses within 300 feet of a large gas station (defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater). A 50 foot separation is recommended for typical gas dispensing facilities.

Notes:

1. These recommendations are advisory. Land use agencies have to balance other considerations, including housing and transportation needs, economic development priorities, and other quality of life issues.
2. Recommendations are based primarily on data showing that the air pollution exposures addressed here (i.e., localized) can be reduced as much as 80% with the recommended separation.
3. The relative risk for these categories varies greatly. To determine the actual risk near a particular facility, a site-specific analysis would be required. Risk from diesel PM will decrease over time as cleaner technology phases in.
4. These recommendations are designed to fill a gap where information about existing facilities may not be readily available and are not designed to substitute for more specific information if it exists. The recommended distances take into account other factors in addition to available health risk data (see individual category descriptions).
5. Site-specific project design improvements may help reduce air pollution exposures and should also be considered when siting new sensitive land uses.
6. This table does not imply that mixed residential and commercial development in general are incompatible. Rather it focuses on known problems like dry cleaners using perchloroethylene that can be addressed with reasonable preventative actions.
7. A summary of the basis for the distance recommendations can be found in Table 1-2 (see ARB's *Land Use Handbook*).

Source: California Air Resources Board, 2005. *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*. April and Tschudin Consulting Group, April 2009.

Page CO-81, Policy CO-7.3 – Modify this policy as follows:

Policy CO-7.3 Require all projects to incorporate energy-conserving design, ~~and construction,~~ and operation techniques and features into all aspects of the project including buildings, roofs, pavement, and landscaping. 🌍

Page CO-87, Action CO-A115 – Add a new sentence to the end of this policy as follows: “...This plan must be in place prior to adoption of any specific plan.”

Page CO-87 – Add a new action as follows:

Action CO-A115.1 -- In the interim until the GHG Emissions Reduction Plan/Climate Action Plan is in effect, the following significance thresholds shall be used for project analysis:

- Projects consistent with the General Plan and otherwise exempt under CEQA – Assumed to be de minimus.
- Projects consistent with the General Plan and subject to CEQA – net zero threshold to be achieved as follows:
  - Apply practical and reasonable design components to bring project GHGs down to net-zero levels;
  - For any remaining GHG emissions require applicant to undertake permanent and verifiable offsets that are: locally based, project relevant, and consistent with other long term goals of the County. Examples of acceptable offsets include funding heating, ventilation, air conditioning, lighting, water heating equipment, insulation, and/or weatherization for existing residents in the community. (Policy CO-8.9). 🌍

Responsibility: Planning and Public Works Department; Parks and Resources Department  
Timeframe: Ongoing

Page CO-91, Policy CO-9.1 – Modify as follows:

Policy CO-9.1 Advocate ~~to establish~~ for the establishment of funding mechanisms independent of the State budget for payment to the County of in-lieu property taxes and other fees on land acquired in the Delta for habitat restoration and water conveyance.

## **Chapter 8, Health and Safety Element**

Odd numbered pages – Correct the coding of the odd-numbered pages to read “HS-x”.

Page HS-16, Policy HS-2.8 – Modify as follows:

Policy HS-2.8 Consider and allow for the ecological benefits of flooding within historic watercourses while balancing public safety and the protection of property.

Page HS-27, Action HS-A46 – modify the text as follows:



Provide adequate separation between areas where hazardous materials are present and sensitive uses. The following land uses are considered sensitive receptors for the purpose of exposure to hazardous materials: residentially designated land uses; hospitals, ~~and~~ nursing/convalescent homes, and similar board and care facilities; hotels and lodging; schools and day care centers; and neighborhood parks. Home occupation uses are excluded.

Page HS-59, Action HS-A62 – modify the text as follows:

Regulate the location and operation of land uses to avoid or mitigate harmful or nuisance levels of noise to the following sensitive receptors: residentially designated land uses; hospitals, ~~and~~ nursing/convalescent homes, and similar board and care facilities; hotels and lodging; schools and day care centers; and neighborhood parks. Home occupation uses are excluded.

Page HS-63, under list of prominent health issues in Yolo County, add the following text:

- Mental health care access for children
- Dental care for low-income children and adults
- Access to medical specialties for under or uninsured residents
- Drug and alcohol abuse
- Obesity
- Lack of transportation from rural areas
- Lack of affordable housing
- Lack of affordable childcare
- Lack of transportation as a health access issue
- Lack of organized after-school activities for teens
- Lack of affordable health care for farm families, ~~and~~ agricultural workers, and undocumented workers

## Chapter 9, Housing Element

Page HO-8, Limited Land Supply for Housing, 4<sup>th</sup> line – Delete “...new housing in non-residential areas, particularly...” and replace with “...farm dwellings ...”.

Page HO-49, Land Use Controls, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph – Add the following text to the end of the paragraph:

...In many cases County policies are already assisting with the expansion of housing for persons with disabilities. Below are existing land use regulations that reduce potential constraints on the expansion of transitional, supportive, and single room occupancy housing:

Page HO-49, Land Use Controls, 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet – Clarify as follows: “The Yolo County Zoning Ordinance does not establish any ~~distance requirements for~~ minimum spacing requirements between locations for residential care facilities.”

Page HO-108, Action HO-A50 – Modify as follows;

Action HO-A50	Create a <del>Universal Design</del> <u>Reasonable Accommodation</u> Ordinance to ensure that construction or modification of homes in the County allows individual to remain in those homes as their physical needs and capabilities change.
---------------	---

