



County of Yolo

John Bencomo
DIRECTOR

PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695-2598
(530) 666-8775 FAX (530) 666-8156
www.yolocounty.org

WORKSHOP PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

September 9, 2010

FILE #2002-043: Draft 2010 Capay Valley Area Plan	
APPLICANT: Yolo County	
LOCATION: Capay Valley planning area (APN: numerous) (see Figure 1 in Attachment A)	SUPERVISOR: District 5 (Sup. Chamberlain) SOILS: Class I-IV FLOOD ZONE: A, B, and C FIRE ZONE: in the high and very high fire hazard severity zones
GENERAL PLAN: several designations ZONING: several districts	
ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Negative Declaration	
REPORT PREPARED BY: Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner	REVIEWED BY: David Morrison, Assistant Director

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

That the Planning Commission:

1. **REVIEW** the latest draft 2010 Capay Valley Area Plan (**Attachment A** and posted at the PPW Web page at: <http://www.yolocounty.org/Index.aspx?page=728>);
2. **RECEIVE** public testimony;
3. **DIRECT** staff as to further revisions to the document, as needed; and
4. **DIRECT** staff to set the matter for public hearing at the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

The Capay Valley Area Plan (formerly called the Capay Valley Area General Plan) has not been updated since 1982. An update of the plan was completed in 2006 and recommended for approval by the Planning Commission in January, 2007. The Board of Supervisors held hearings on the updated plan and, in September, 2007, directed staff to put the plan on hold until the new 2030 Yolo Countywide General Plan had been approved. The Countywide Plan was adopted by the Board in November, 2009. The draft Capay Valley Area Plan has been

further revised to ensure consistency with the newly adopted Countywide plan, and is now ready for approval as the first of several “area,” “community,” or “specific” plans that will be prepared for portions of the unincorporated area.

BACKGROUND:

History of the Update

The Capay Valley Area General Plan sets growth policies for the Capay Valley and the unincorporated communities of Capay, Guinda, Rumsey, and Brooks. The Capay Valley Area Plan was last updated and adopted in May 1982. The Capay Valley General Plan Advisory Committee (CVGPAC) began work on relatively minor revisions to the plan in early 2002. The intent was to update the plan text and policies, to propose zoning changes that better reflect existing and future uses, and to take into account development that had occurred since 2000. Progress on the plan update was delayed in late 2004 due to a reduction in County staff.

In 2006, the scope of the revision was expanded as a result of input from the Capay Valley Advisory Committee, after a great amount of work had been completed by previous county planners and consultants. A 2006 draft of the updated plan was completed, and, at a public meeting on November 29, 2006, the Capay Valley General Plan Advisory Committee reviewed and approved the updated plan by unanimous vote, and forwarded the document to the Planning Commission for public hearings. On August 9, 2007, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the updated plan to the Board of Supervisors.

The Board of Supervisors held a public hearing on September 25, 2007. Following the hearing, and upon a request of the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians (now known as the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation), the Board directed staff to continue the updated Capay Valley Area General Plan to a later date until after the new 2030 Yolo Countywide General Plan had been approved. The Countywide Plan was adopted by the Board in November, 2009.

2010 Update of the Capay Valley Area Plan

The latest 2010 update of the Capay Valley Area Plan includes the following changes to the 2006 version of the plan that was last heard by the Planning Commission:

- Background descriptive text and figures have been updated or deleted;
- All references to zoning districts and regulations have been deleted;
- All of the land use maps for each of the communities have been updated; and
- Policies and implementation measures have been updated and revised.

Regarding the first point, the biggest single change to the latest draft plan involves editing the document to remove background text and figures that in many cases were out of date and not directly related to the main purpose of the plan, which is to establish growth goals and policies for the Capay Valley. Staff has attempted to make the overall length and format of the Capay Valley plan more similar to the existing area plans for the other unincorporated communities such as Esparto, Knights Landing, and Clarksburg. These other area plans do not have the extensive and lengthy background text and figures that were included in the earlier updates of the 1982 Capay Valley Area General Plan.

For example, the 2006 version of the Capay Valley plan included chapters and background information that mirrored the seven “elements” that are required by State law to be included in city and county General Plans (land use, circulation, housing, conservation/natural resources, open space, noise, public health and safety). The individual area plans for unincorporated

communities are intended to complement, but not repeat or overlap, the Countywide General Plan. Area plans should be concise documents structured around the goals and policies that guide growth and development in the particular geographic area. Area plans should not repeat any information that is already included in the Countywide plan and its background materials, in order to prevent the potential for redundancy, confusion, and inconsistency.

Regarding the second point, the previous 2006 draft plan was accompanied by a proposed set of rezoning actions that was meant to bring all properties in the area into conformity with the new General Plan. This 2010 draft plan does not propose rezoning at this time; a countywide rezoning program will be proposed later this year when new countywide zoning regulations are being considered. Thus, the 2010 draft plan has been edited to remove all references to zoning districts and zoning regulations.

Regarding the third point, all of the General Plan land use designation maps (as opposed to zoning maps) for each of the communities in the Capay Valley have been updated to incorporate the revisions to the land use designations that were adopted last November as part of the 2030 Yolo Countywide General Plan. The proposed 2010 Capay Valley Area Plan land use maps have been updated to include "Urban Growth Boundaries" for each of the separate communities of the Capay Valley, including Capay, Guinda, Rumsey, and Brooks.

Two additional minor changes have been proposed to the land use maps for the Capay Valley. The first land use change is the proposed redesignation of two adjacent properties (APNs: 060-247-01 and 060-243-01) in Rumsey from the current General Plan designation of "Commercial General" to "Commercial Local." This change reflects the intention that any commercial development along Route 16 in Rumsey will be developed at a less intensive "local" scale, not a regional-serving "general" scale, because of a lack of services such as public sewers and water. This change will bring the commercial properties in Rumsey into conformity with the commercial areas along Route 16 in the towns of Capay and Guinda, which are also designated "Commercial Local."

The other change involves the redesignation of one small 0.2-acre property in Guinda (APN: 060-100-10) from a General Plan designation of "Commercial" to "Agricultural," to reflect the existing use (a farmworker rental home).

Finally, several of the policies and implementation measures included in the 2010 Capay Valley Area Plan have been slightly updated and revised. The goal and policy statements in Chapter 2 of the 2010 draft plan in Attachment A include two separate sets of edits that are indicated in "legislative" font (additions in underline and deletions in ~~strikeout~~). A third set of edits of the transportation policies has been proposed by Public Works staff.

The first set of edits includes those changes to policy language that were recommended by the Capay Valley General Plan Advisory Committee in the previous 2006 draft plan. Also included is new text regarding cultural resources that was recommended in 2007 by the Yoche Dehe Wintun Nation.

The second set of edits (in bold font (underline and ~~strikeout~~) are further language changes that are recommended by staff in order to update and bring the policies into compliance with the countywide General Plan.

The third set of edits of the transportation policies that has been proposed by Public Works staff is included in **Attachment B**. These edits have been incorporated into the latest draft plan.

Growth Anticipated Under the Updated Area Plan

The policy and land use designation changes that are proposed as part of the 2010 updated Capay Valley Area Plan are anticipated to have little impact on growth in the study area. Overall, the amount of new housing that could be developed under the updated 2010 plan versus the 1982 plan is expected to be small, largely due to the lack of urban services (water and sewer) in the valley. According to estimates prepared for the 2030 Countywide General Plan environmental impact report, the 1982 Capay Valley Area General Plan would allow approximately 53 additional housing units to be constructed within existing residential zoning, added to the estimated 576 existing units in the valley (Table LU- 2 in the draft plan). This does not include those farm houses which may be built on agriculturally designated land.

While housing growth under the updated Area Plan is expected to be minimal, the proposed changes in commercial development under the new plan are harder to quantify. The 1982 General Plan designates properties for commercial use in the downtown areas of Capay, Guinda, and Rumsey, as does the 2010 plan. However, since adoption of the 1982 plan, no significant commercial development has occurred, with the notable exception of the Cache Creek Casino.

PUBLIC AND AGENCY COMMENTS:

The Capay Valley Advisory Committee has extensively reviewed the previous 2006 version of the draft plan and recommended adoption of the plan with some additional revisions. The most recent 2010 draft plan was circulated to members of the citizens committee in July 2010, and the committee is scheduled to review the new proposed changes at their meeting on September 1.

A Negative Declaration was completed and circulated from August 1, 2006 to September 1, 2006, along with the previous draft plan, for public comments. No comments of a substantive nature were received.

Letters have been sent to the two Native American tribes in the county (Yoche Dehe Wintun Nation and the Cortina Band of Indians) to invite formal consultation, if requested by either tribe, on the proposed Capay Valley Area Plan, as required by State law (SB 18, enacted in 2004). As of the date of this writing, no response has been received from either tribe.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – 2010 Draft Capay Valley Area Plan

Attachment B – Edits of the transportation policies proposed by Public Works staff

Attachment A

**2010 Draft Capay Valley Area Plan
(August, 2010)**

Attachment B

Further edits of transportation policies proposed by Public Works staff

Circulation:

Goal 1, Policy 1: Revise as follows:

Policy 1: The County shall ~~maintain or improve existing county roads, bridges and road levels of service including shoulders, road surfaces, and drainage, and shall~~ review projects to ensure that ITE Level of Service (LOS) ~~C~~ is maintained on County roadways in the Capay Valley Planning Area in accordance with the General Plan.

Goal 1, Policy 1, Implementation Measure 2: Remove in its entirety, or replace with the following (See General Plan Policy CI-1.9):

~~*Implementation Measure 2: County Public Works Department shall regularly maintain existing drainage channels which only relate to County Roadways and establish a program to monitor and correct those particularly subject to flooding, and landslides such as Road 57, 63, Road 49, and Laurel Avenue in Rumsey.*~~

~~*Implementation Measure 2: Residents of the Capay Valley Area may investigate the possibility of establishing a Capay Valley Area Assessment District in order to dedicate funding for road and drainage maintenance in the Capay Valley Area that is above and beyond the County Public Works' maintenance activities.*~~

Goal 1, Policy 1, Implementation Measure 3: Remove in its entirety. Maintenance and resources are budgeted by the department based on available funding each year, but not to specific areas of the county (See General Plan Policy CI-1.6).

~~*Implementation Measure 3: A list of Funding sources earmarked for County Road Maintenance and Improvements in the Capay Planning Area shall be provided for public review at each adopted road improvement budgetary cycle of the County of Yolo.*~~

Goal 1, Policy 2: Revise as follows:

Policy 2: The County will continue to ~~shall~~ coordinate with CALTRANS on the design of bridges ~~and culverts~~ in the Capay Valley Planning Area to ensure compliance with State design standards.

Goal 1, Policy 5 and Implementation Measure 1: Revise as follows:

Policy 5: When considering improvements to County Roads, the County must consider agricultural and other agricultural-related vehicles, and shall accommodate use by farm equipment on its local roadways in as safe and practical a manner as possible (provided these vehicles do not contribute to road damage).

Implementation Measure 1: The County will shall review the Caltrans safety improvement project (Yolo-16 SIP) and all future Caltrans safety programs.

Goal 2, Policy 2, Implementation Measure 2: Revise as follows:

Implementation Measure 2: Any upgrades or improvements to State Route 16 within the Capay Valley Planning Area will be encouraged to must be planned and designed to accommodate bicycle lanes and bike safety enhancements.

Goal 2, Policy 3, Implementation Measure 1: Change “Yolo Public Transit Authority” to “Yolo County Transportation District.”

Goal 2, Policy 3, Implementation Measure 3: Is there a planned location for the park-and-ride lot?

Public Health and Safety:

Goal 3, Policy 2, Implementation Measure 1: Revise as follows (there is no safety warrant to prohibit parking on the bridge):

Implementation Measure 1: The County shall post ~~Cache Creek for the following:~~ the egress points for boaters and rafters along Cache Creek, and the Rumsey bridge for parking restrictions. The County Facilities General Services Department assumes the lead role in constructing and placing the signs in the appropriate locations.

Pages CIR-4, 5:

Last four sentences of **Traffic Generation on SR 16:**

“According to the TEIR, turnouts?? turn-pockets located within SR 16 will be constructed in consultation with Caltrans, whose Yolo-16 Safety Improvement Project identifies the need for turnouts?? turn-pockets on SR 16 in a location somewhere between Capay and CR 82 (sentence unclear). The Cache Creek Casino has been and will continue to be a major traffic generator in the Capay Valley. Additional traffic in the Capay Valley area is generated by the recently completed Yocha Dehe Golf Club at Cache Creek Casino Resort, which was approved by the County in 2004. Another generator of traffic along SR 16 is the annual Almond Festival, held throughout the valley during a mid-March weekend ~~the last weekend of February.~~”