

## **SUMMARY OF WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS INTRODUCING THE POLICIES OF THE DRAFT 2030 COUNTYWIDE GENERAL PLAN**

**Capay Valley Advisory Committee (October 1, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

The acquisition of Rumsey Canyon Ranch and the potential for future funding of operations and maintenance.

Confirmation that land use changes for downtown Capay are consistent with the Committee's past work on the Draft Capay Area General Plan Update.

Concerns regarding Action AG-A6 affecting the location of farm dwellings on agricultural parcels. This action could have a greater affect in areas of the County with smaller agricultural parcels and greater physical constraints (e.g. slopes, water availability) such as the Capay Valley.

New land use designations will supersede the old ones. This could increase the yield of housing in some parts of the County.

SR-16 widening to four lanes from I-505 to Esparto.

Bikeways and other non-vehicular modes encouraged. Transit where densities support.

Congestion at Madison.

Growth in Madison and Dunnigan.

Tehama-Colusa canal would supply primary water to Dunnigan. In times of drought, residential takes precedence over agricultural land uses.

Conflicts between organic farming and production farming.

Growth in communities has been included only where the community has been supportive and there has been a need recognized by the Board of Supervisors.

Re-entry Facility – Policy PF 4.6.

Trucking corridors result in a higher priority for improvement and maintenance (Table CI-1, page CI-28), thereby opening up other roads for traffic associated with agricultural operations (e.g. farm labor; field equipment, etc.).

Agricultural spray buffer – 300 feet minimum (Policy LU-2.1 and AG-1.8).

The County should add a new action to seek designation of SR-16 as State Scenic Highway.

Water data (Action CO-A71) – Flood Control District already collects much of this data. The need for the County to do so is redundant.

Upper Cache Creek is designated “wild and scenic” per current State/federal designation.

Major rivers and creeks are designated Open Space.

Farm worker housing is encouraged – Agricultural TDR Program (Policy LU-2.3 and AG-A27).

County expects to adopt a new Green Building Code in 2011 consistent with anticipated new State requirements.

General discussion: the General Plan represents an erosion of property rights over time; there is a lack of funding for operations and maintenance of parkland.

**Sacramento County Planning Department (October 1, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

Sacramento is also in the middle of a General Plan update. The draft document is out (June 2007) and they are awaiting the Draft EIR.

Discussed Yolo County’s proposed development at Elkhorn.

Yolo County Policy CO-1.18 regarding out-of-county mitigation. Expect mitigation pressures from development in Natomas area. When required, Sacramento requires agricultural mitigation be located within five miles of project area and requires hawk mitigation to be located within the County.

Recent state activity regarding Delta regulations, land uses, and governance.

Agricultural tourism – joint opportunities, particularly in Delta wine country; DOC position of agricultural tourism on Williamson Act contract property.

**Madison Community Advisory Committee (October 2, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

Opposition to re-entry facility. The re-entry facility should be shown on the General Plan land use map and should be fully incorporated into the General Plan.

Discussion of Policy CC-3.10 regarding Madison Specific Plan.

Instead of lowering the LOS on Highway 16, the Tribe should provide a separate road to the casino.

SR-16 widening to four lanes from I-505 to Esparto. The widening of only a portion of SR-16 will just result in more congestion in Esparto.

The Fenstra, De Los Reyes, and service station properties are mapped incorrectly in General Plan. The mistake will be corrected so that the designation is commercial.

What part of Madison is considered the “downtown”? What businesses will be located there?

200 year flood protection vs. 100-year – under new state laws the latter applies in Madison.

**Solano County Planning Department (October 2, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

New Solano General Plan was adopted September 23, 2008.

Similar pro-agriculture focus between the two Counties.

In Yolo County, developed portions of the UC Davis campus will be designated “Public Facility”.

Yolo County General Plan designates ±100 acres at SR-128 and I-505 (near Winters) for agricultural processing and/or commercial uses.

Yolo’s General Plan includes Agricultural Districts -- planned areas where regulations may be tailored to encourage agriculturally-related businesses (similar to Suisun Valley and PleasantValley).

Solano anticipates developing a strategic plan for each of their 10 agricultural regions – they will identify a central node within each where they will cluster “Neighborhood/Agricultural Tourist Centers”. They will emphasize development of agri-tourism at these rural nodes so as to share infrastructure and protect the openness of the areas. Exceptions would be allowed only for farm stands or tasting rooms connected to wineries.

Solano Agricultural Reserve Overlay – This is a land use category where conservation easements are directed They have also created two new agricultural planner positions (one in Planning and one in Agricultural Commissioners Office) to streamline permit processing and coordinate on behalf of agricultural interests and to staff the Agricultural Advisory Commission.

Solano 1984 Proposition A (Orderly Growth Initiative) – directs growth to cities and limits non-agricultural development in the county - on ballot to extend another 20 years through 2028.

Solano has a County Facility Impact Fee Program for County capital improvements -- fee collected on every building permit applies in unincorporated area and in cities (in exchange for city-centered growth). Large revenue stream for County.

Solano County has Tax-Exchange Agreements and Redevelopment Pass-Through Agreements with each city. They have only two small rural communities and seven growing cities. They have very little sales tax and very low property tax revenue – most of the County's revenue comes from Impact Fees on city growth.

Solano County has an ordinance regulating wetlands development – conversion of agriculture requires a use permit. This is particularly helpful in the Delta.

They allow second units up to 1,200 square feet on parcels under 20 acres and up to 1,800 square feet on parcels over 20 acres.

Solano looking at TDR program between Middle and Upper Green Valleys – the same property owners own land in both areas.

Increased traffic on I-505 will likely result from growth in Madison, the casino expansion, the re-entry facility, and the proposed agricultural development site next to Winters – the City of Vacaville will be interested.

The cities satisfied the County's prior affordable housing allocation in exchange for the County taking a neutral position on the annexation of new parcels to the cities.

**Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)(October 2, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

General overview and review of proposed growth.

Dunnigan – Policy CC-3.3. They support the jobs/housing balance, housing costs/wages match, and language phasing residential development with the creation of jobs.

SACOG suggested that the County consider a carbon performance threshold (per-household carbon cap) for the Dunnigan specific plan. SACOG will run comparative modeling.

There is employment growth associated with the rural economy that needs to be taken into consideration for housing.

The SACOG Blueprint is the land use component of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The Blueprint gets updated every four years.

**Davis City Council (October 7, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

Policy LU-6.11 -- The County should not be telling the City what to do in areas immediately adjoining the city. These are not “projects”. Bio-technical land uses are better located at Hunt Wesson. The County is advocating sprawl.

Discussion of whether future coordination between the two jurisdictions should occur at the 2x2 meetings or whether the entire City Council should be involved.

**Knights Landing Community Advisory Council (October 8, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

A general discussion of flooding and flood insurance, including the Federal government’s role in flood risk assessment and land use restrictions, as well as the implications of a 100-year threshold. The effects of seepage can occur a mile away in a low field in this area. From the Sacramento River to the Ridge Cut is only one mile and it is very wet in between.

Anticipated growth in Knights Landing will require the preparation of a Specific Plan. All community plans will be updated after adoption of the General Plan.

Discussion of the proposed expansion of industrial land at the Spreckels property.

The owner of the Howald property wants to construct a ring levee and construct a sewer and water system that would serve his development only. Table LU-10, referenced in Policy CC-3.7, does not support this. See also Policies CC-3.1 and CC-3.4.

Does the County still want the buildings on Front Street (e.g., the Bank of America building) restored? Yes, but there is no funding source available.

Traffic on SR-113 during peak period is “horrendous”.

The County should add improvements to SR-113 through town (not just to town), so that local traffic can circulate more easily during rush hour.

General Plan identifies no new development and no development further east than the Howald property. The 300-foot buffer to protect agriculture would fall within the Howald property.

Map lines in the Conservation and Open Space Element that delineate the Yolo Bypass are not accurate with regards to the Pollock property.

**Napa County Planning Department (October 2, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

New Napa County General Plan was adopted June 3, 2008. Similar to Yolo County, the new General Plan reaffirms the community's values. Their focus is agricultural preservation and urban-centered growth.

They didn't do the Housing Element during the update but are currently in the process of doing so.

They have 40-acre minimum parcel sizes on the valley floor and 160-acre minimum parcel sizes elsewhere within agriculturally designated lands. Second dwelling units are not allowed on the valley floor.

They have five cities and only one rural community. They get a lot of new agriculture out of their small parcels. The people moving onto them build mansions and farm for intrinsic value – they don't need to make money on their farming.

Wine is their number one focus and industry. Wineries are strongly regulated to ensure they stay production facilities and do not turn into commercial facilities. There is a concern about over-competition within the wine industry, but developing the regulations is a challenge.

Napa County has growth management practices voted on in 1980 and incorporated into the General Plan as policy. It limits the number of new dwelling units annually. They have Measure J voted on in 1990 that requires a vote of the people to change any agricultural land to another designation.

In general the County is fiscally sound, has high property taxes, and is required to provide only limited community services.

The interface between Napa and Yolo is limited primarily to open space and trails in the Blue Ridge area.

They do not do TDRs or clustering.

Napa has a new countywide regional park and open space district, and is preparing an open space master plan.

Napa County wineries are all reliant on small water and sewer systems which have not been an issue. Groundwater depletion is a concern in one area.

**Yolo Resource Conservation District (October 8, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

State interests and efforts in the Delta.

The status of the Tribal Compact and latest negotiations.

Policy AG-1.6 -- confirmation that the County does not currently apply the 1:1 agricultural mitigation requirement to habitat conversion.

**Clarksburg Community Advisory Committee (October 9, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

New third site for agricultural processing added by Board during September 16, 2008 workshop.

Specifics regarding the Agricultural District will be available for public review by the end of the year.

All General Plan policies apply in Delta. Some specifically mention and only apply to Delta, such as Goal 9 in the Conservation and Open Space Element. The Delta Protection Overlay is a land use designation that indicates which properties lie in the Primary Zone.

Solano County requires land use permits for habitat creation (Lower Delta). They are trying to protect agricultural land and get ahead of Bay Delta Plan.

Agriculture and habitat in Yolo have always co-existed well. There has been no need for regulation in the past. But now, the potential scale and location of agricultural conversions to wetlands is changing. Board of Supervisors will be examining this issue. Taking farmland for aquatic species as proposed in Delta is different – the two cannot co-exist.

Where a buffer is needed between agriculture and habitat, the burden should fall on habitat. Activities allowed in the buffer need to be specified.

New Delta governance likely to be similar to Coastal Commission with little land use authority left at local level. Clarksburg needs to build economic and social value into the community to create a more defensible position against possible State proposals.

Does the Draft General Plan limit the size of a house in the agricultural area? Yes and no -- Policy LU 2.3 discourages farm dwellings on agricultural parcels below 20 acres and Action AG-A6 requires development of criteria for location of all farm dwellings that may involve size.

The County should allow big houses as a way to keep the state from flooding the area.

The Board should come out to the rural communities and hold night meetings to hear directly from the people.

Why were certain land uses changes specific to downtown Clarksburg made? Where existing non-conforming land uses were in place (e.g. residential in commercial; schools

in residential; etc.) and unlikely to change, the staff has recommended changes in the land use designation to match existing conditions.

The loss of a neighborhood or even one home in a small town like Clarksburg is a greater impact than elsewhere because of the inability to create “replacement” housing.

Protecting Clarksburg requires protecting the entire Clarksburg agricultural district.

Discussion of having a mixed use land use designation in Clarksburg to allow for flexibility, but such an idea may not be consistent with policies of the Delta Protection Commission (DPC). Both proposed commercial districts allow for a mix of uses.

**Parks, Recreation, and Wildlife Committee (October 13, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

County has two community/neighborhood parks and several open space or “resource” parks. The Draft General Plan proposes a major shift in the provision of parks services, to move the County out of the neighborhood park business. These facilities, existing and future associated with town growth, would be run by locally elected Community Services Districts or other financing structure, rather than by the County. The County would instead focus on the resource parks.

The Draft General Plan establishes a threshold of 5 ac/1,000 population for neighborhood parks (Policy PF-3.1), and 20 ac/1,000 for resource parks (Policy CO-1.11). Achieving these thresholds will help improve the quality of life within the towns and reinforce the distinctness of the towns through intervening open space.

The plan promotes agricultural tourism and eco-tourism.

Policy CO-1.18 addresses out-of-county mitigation and characterizes it as acceptable provided certain criteria are met.

The plan supports the Blue Ridge trail as a voluntary program (Policy CO-1.19), as well as a new state park (Policy CO-1.20) and an OHV park (Policy CO-1.22).

Discussion about the Blue Ridge trail and concerns about impacts to private property rights. The way the trail is shown on Figure CO-2 is controversial. May have general benefits but some property owners remain opposed.

Figure CO-2 should be modified to explain the yellow boundaries (denoting general areas where trails may be located), and to change the existing purple line (which appears to be a precise alignment for the Blue Ridge trail) to a similar yellow boundary.

Discussion of Policy CO-A11, which proposes a tax measure for open space/resources parks.



Discussion of the generation of energy by wind power, which is encouraged in the Draft Plan (Goal PF-10; Actions PF-A65 and A-66).

Upon adoption of the Yolo Natural Heritage Program, the General Plan will be amended to identify habitat preservation areas.

Discussion of groundwater management policy (Action CO-A78) and the formation of a countywide water agency (Action CO-A92).

Discussion of State efforts to create new tidal wetlands in Clarksburg area to mitigate for Delta habitat impacts associated with water pumping.

**Esparto Community Advisory Committee (October 14, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

Opposition to the proposed land use change for the 80-acre property south of SR-16 from industrial to residential and commercial.

Many concepts from Esparto Design Guidelines have been incorporated into the community character policies.

Discussion of the future of the Esparto waste transfer center, as described in Policy PF-A54.

The Draft General Plan promotes mixed uses in downtowns similar to the proposed Esparto DMX zone.

Discussion of Action CC-A16, which requires the establishment of formal comment areas between all Community Advisory Committees.

Discussion of the integration of General Plan and HCP.

Discussion of the Cache Creek Area Plan; aggregate mining and creek improvements; and Cache Creek parkway plan and their incorporation within the Draft General Plan.

Discussion of various topics, including climate change; Clarksburg and the consistency of the Draft General Plan with Delta issues; the proposed Level of Service policy (Policy CI-3.1); planned roadway improvements (page CI-11); and the encouragement of roundabouts (CI-3.15).

CR-19 should be turned into a four-lane toll road to the casino. Discussion of the costs and constraints associated with a new road to extend through the Capay Hills.

Discussion that school siting criteria is set by the State.

Is Esparto growth boundary consistent with the Community Plan? Yes.

All Circulation Element figures should show the entire County.

The Casino should consider dorm housing for its employees.

Esparto is getting too many modular homes and low-income homes. The community needs more custom home development.

Discussion of various topics, including antiquated subdivisions; Transfers of Development Rights (TDRs); and the poor quality of bus service – standing room only and more service is needed.

Support for the use of gray (reclaimed) water systems – Policy CO-5.15.

The County should not allow any development within the floodplain.

Are there policies on annexation? No.

Discussion about the lack of community parks in Esparto because development pays a fee instead. New development has resulted in the construction of approximately 20-25 percent of a segregated peripheral bicycle route.

Semi-trucks are parking in residential areas – code enforcement concerns. County should consider creating truck parking areas.

The Community Service District (CSD) is problematic – they are not a part of County government.

A new natural gas line may need to be extended from Esparto to Madison along SR-16 right-of-way.

Discussion of the Safety Improvement Project for SR-16. Caltrans keeps moving back the EIR release.

**Dunnigan Community Advisory Committee (October 15, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

Climate change – since Dunnigan is the County's primary growth area there is a strong emphasis on jobs/housing – balance, match, and phasing (Policy CC-3.3).

Establishment of the Dunnigan Hills and Capay Valley Agricultural Districts are discussed in the Draft General Plan, but no boundaries were established. The only existing Agricultural District to date that has been created is Clarksburg.

Growth is not a goal of the County. New growth must be justified by ensuring that communities are left significantly improved once growth has occurred. Policy CC-3.5 and Table LU-10. Policy PF-12.10 and 12.11. Action PF-A26.

Because Dunnigan will be a future community with a population of greater than 10,000, the applicable flood standard is 200-year flood protection.

A variety of types and density of housing is required.

Were the land use designations changed? Yes, around 75 designations have been consolidated into about 13, and the densities for the residential categories have been generally increased and given both a maximum and minimum range. The increased densities were necessary to meet SACOG Blueprint principles and to satisfy the state assigned allocation of affordable housing.

The first bulleted item on page IN-5 should be replaced with the second full sentence on page IN-6.

The importance of trucking locally as an industry and economic driver was discussed. Table CI-1 is not a restriction it is a prioritization. All forms of goods movement are encouraged – truck, rail, ship, air.

Does the Specific Plan have to be consistent with the General Plan regarding items like street widths and design, grid pattern, etc. Yes.

Does the Dunnigan boundary include the railroad adjoining CR-99W? Yes (see Policy CC-3.5G).

The General Plan should identify more truck stops to accommodate the current and future increase in truck traffic. The Plan should also add CR-99W to Table CI-1 of road prioritizations.

With the current drought, water from the Tehama-Colusa canal isn't reliable and won't be a good long-term source for the town.

Noise from traffic and railroad is already getting worse, especially along CR-99W.

**Transportation Advisory Committee (October 16, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

There was a discussion of the Circulation Element and its key components, including truck corridor priorities, an emphasis on bicycle paths, and the changes in LOS policy.

The County should coordinate with the Yolo County Transportation District. A representative from YCTD was there and a separate meeting is scheduled (See noted below).

Are the improvements identified in the Draft General Plan consistent with the Caltrans corridor plans? We believe so and will verify that with the consultant.

**Yolo-Zamora Community Advisory Committee (October 20, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

The General Plan designates 13 acres of new highway commercial in Yolo and 16 acres of new agricultural commercial in Zamora. The Town Hall and other public facilities in Zamora are designated as PQ (Public/Quasi-Public).

The southerly border of the Dunnigan Specific Plan area is Bird Creek (CR-9 at I-505).

New allowed development is required to be dense, provide jobs, create community-wide infrastructure, provide open space and parks, support transit, retail, schools, etc. These strategies let people live and work in same place, which is key to meeting the County's climate change requirements.

The County should leave land use to the marketplace and not be so heavy handed.

Will the Pierce Unified School District build new schools in Dunnigan? The school district will make those decisions, but the idea is try to have neighborhood schools.

Be careful of school yield numbers. Districts allow children to attend school in the community where their parents work as opposed to where they live, which can alter expected student enrollment.

Will jobs in Dunnigan be established before housing? Not necessarily, but the proposed phasing schedule will ensure that the two are developed concurrently.

How can you force someone to live where they work? You can't, but you can create the conditions and incentives to make it more likely.

Zamora would like to have their community plan prepared before the General Plan is complete.

There was a discussion regarding Policy CC-2.12. You won't get 16 jobs per acre from many uses like agricultural industrial or solar farms. That is correct, but the number is an average and is expected to be offset by more jobs-dense uses within the industrial designated areas.

There was a discussion regarding city/county relationships as well as the proposed buffers between communities. How does the Hillcrest area (in Monument Hills) fit into Dunnigan's or Zamora's boundaries? The comment areas for each Advisory Committee will be established as implementation to the General Plan.

There was discussion regarding several topics. Will Dunnigan growth be contained? Yes. Can the detention pond count as open space? No. Can it fall outside the growth boundary? No.

Policy CC-3.15 – Zamora supports the CR-14 alternative.

On Table CI-1, CR-14 should be identified all the way to I-505 as a primary truck transportation corridor. CR-14 also needs speed control and enforcement.

How do you pay for services in Dunnigan? Services have to pay for themselves, by those who primarily benefit; probably through the use of special districts and similar funding mechanisms.

No community should be developed at the expense of another.

There was a discussion of why Dunnigan was picked for growth. The reasons included: a local desire to grow; environmental conditions (minimum constraints); need for significant infrastructure improvements; likelihood for success in attracting economic development; good location; relieves pressure to meet regional share of housing need (cities don't want to grow and many are surrounded by easements).

The third sentence in the Agriculture and Economic Development Element needs to be clarified. The conservation easement is the tool, not the trigger for mitigation.

Policy CO-2.16 should also encourage habitat restoration on private lands.

The Natural Resource Conservation Service places a 10 percent cap on the amount of land within a parcel that can be restored to habitat. The General Plan should also rely on that standard.

The railroad obstructs drainage and the proper control of storm water runoff.

Most food already comes from overseas – farming is “a goner”.

The type of soil should not be only criteria for mitigation; it should require like productivity for like. The existing agricultural mitigation regulations incorporate this idea. In addition, the County mitigates for the loss of all agricultural land, not just prime farmland. The proximity of mitigation to the development is another requirement. This is handled in the County Code and is not addressed in the General Plan.

There was a discussion of the Westlands Water District purchase of land in the Bypass.

There was a discussion of Action CC-A32, which would separate agricultural zoning from the Williamson Act.

Water supplies for farming should be guaranteed, with Dunnigan residential development being second priority.

Other items discussed included open space between cities and the potential expansion of the Wild Wings development.

Due to its rural location, the Cache Creek Parkway will be unsafe. People walking or biking the trails will be more at risk of crime.

**Winters City Council and City Planning Commission (Joint Meeting)(October 21, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

During Public Comment portion of meeting, a speaker discussed the agricultural districts. What are they and what will they do? Do districts include housing? The City Council should ask the County to eliminate the agricultural districts from the Draft General Plan. See text at top of page AG-18 and Figure AG-6 on page AG-19. See Policy AG-3.1 and Actions AG-A22, AG-A23, ED-1.13, ED 4.7, and ED-4.15. See also the Agricultural District Overlay (page LU-14).

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

With a few economic development exceptions, the Draft General Plan continues practice of directing growth to the cities and towns.

The Draft General Plan reinforces the concept of a hard urban edge. It specifically rejects a ring of rural residential development around cities and/or towns.

The General Plan includes policies to coordinate with the cities on mutually beneficial opportunities. See Action CC-A15 (I-505 and SR-128) regarding the 96 acres near I-505 and Russell Blvd designated for agricultural industrial or agricultural commercial. There is a need to add a map of the special study area in the General Plan. This area is the City's only hope for future commercial and industrial development. What is the benefit to the City? This will be determined through 2x2 meetings or other negotiations.

SR-128 is already a local scenic roadway (Policy CC-1.13). In addition, I-505 and SR-128 are designated as evacuation routes (Policy CI-1.10 and text on pages HS-29 and -30). The General Plan also proposes to prioritize targeted truck corridors (Table CI-1).

The General Plan also looks to provide a system of connected open space; voluntary completion of Blue Ridge Trail; consider the transfer of DQ University land to the County; expand Putah Creek public access, and protect opportunities for habitat and trails.

CR-32/Russell is an important agricultural, commerce, and commuter route. It is an old rural road that receives heavy use. The General Plan should support extending SR-128 designation onto this roadway.

The proposed development at I-505 and SR-128 should be in the City. The City would provide services anyway. The land should be within the City Sphere of Influence and under city land use control. This property is not currently within the City's SOI or the City planning area, but County General Plan policy supports a collaborative approach to development of the site.

There was a discussion about the County's promotion of agricultural processing facilities. If the City takes over the local rural fire district, it will inherit future responsibility for serving these facilities. There is a need to establish adequate impact fees. How will housing for workers at future agricultural processing facilities be provided? The General Plan encourages farm worker housing. How can the City best

affect the outcome of the General Plan? Submit comments and work through the 2x2 process.

**Yolo County 101 Land Use Class (October 22, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

County staff provided an overview of the General Plan process, the draft General Plan, and the schedule.

There were questions regarding policy changes to farming, particularly the agricultural districts and Williamson Act. Also questions regarding growth in Dunnigan.

**Airport-West Plainfield Community Advisory Committee (October 27, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary and review of relevant policies.

Existing rural homes near the airport get no different treatment in the Draft General Plan.

There was a discussion of commercial development allowed at the airport. The Public/Quasi-Public (PQ) designation includes “related visitor services” and other uses related to aviation activities at public airports.

There was a discussion of UC-Davis (UCD). The developed portions will be designated PQ. The County has no land use authority over either University or Tribal land.

There was a discussion of the re-entry facility. Are there land use changes to allow it? No. Until specific direction is received from the Board of Supervisors, it is assumed to fall within the growth area for Madison as already depicted on Figure LU-6. Policy PF-4.6 is the only mention of the re-entry facility in the General Plan.

The re-entry facility is a State project and the State can site it anywhere whether the land use is consistent or not. The same holds true for UCD and proposed university facilities (e.g. equestrian center).

Is DQ University identified for the re-entry facility? No. The land is owned by the Federal government and is not current available.

The Airport and adjoining rural residential uses will have a growth boundary in the General Plan. Otherwise, the General Plan includes few changes for the West Plainfield area.

Will minimum agricultural lot sizes be changed? The minimum is currently 80 acres within the Williamson Act and 20 acres for non-contracted land. Policy LU-2.4 discourages subdivisions within agricultural areas. Also see Policies AG-1.2, AG-1.3, AG-1.4, and AG-1.13.

There is a difference between policies and actions. Policies are more general, while actions are more specific. However, both are legally binding.

CR-95 is identified as a trucking corridor. See Table CI-1 (page CI-28). Gravel trucks are already a problem on CR-95.

There was a discussion about truck corridors and the need to widen paved shoulders for bicycling.

**Yolo County Habitat Conservation Joint Powers Agency Board (October 27, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

There was a discussion of the Conservation Element. The policies have too many “shoulds” and not enough “shalls”.

There was a discussion of integration between the General Plan and the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The Natural Heritage Overlay land use designation (page LU-14) will be placed on future identified conservation/preserve areas.

The HCP will not protect all important habitats and areas (e.g. fisheries). Those that fall outside of adopted HCP will still need protections. How will this be addressed? Through the CEQA process.

**Yolo County Transportation District (October 27, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

The District is generally pleased with the proposed community design requirements, densities, transit accommodations, etc.

There is a need to ensure that the General Plan requires new growth to create funding for transit capital and operations/maintenance. Otherwise a determination of “unmet need reasonable to meet” can cause transportation funds to go to transit instead of roads.

The District has two main functions: transit operator and congestion management agency.

District would like to see a transit transfer station placed in Madison.

There is a need to confirm a location for the park and ride lot being built by the Tribe.

The Tribe provides a significant operating subsidy to the bus system for the transport of casino employees to and from work.



Due to safety concerns, the District will not serve Wildwings until Caltrans builds a signal there.

Regarding Esparto, the decision of whether SR-16 will go around the town as part of a new bypass or will continue to go through the downtown may affect how the District serves the area.

Expect comments from the District on both the Draft General Plan and the Notice of Preparation.

**Sutter County Planning Department (October 29, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

Only real point of land use interface between the two counties is at Knights Landing. The retail facility on the Sutter side (Sting Rays) wants to connect under the river to Knights Landing services. Sutter County has told him no. He is a grandfathered use in their AG designation.

The School District serves both sides of county line.

Sutter County is just starting their General Plan update.

Sutter Pointe at the Sacramento County line was approved for consideration by the voters (Measure M). It will be a specific plan process parallel to the General Plan update. This development was already included in the SACOG Blueprint.

Sutter is interested in joint opportunities for agricultural economic development between the two Counties.

Sutter is starting to be concerned about the extent of out-of-county mitigation (primarily from Sacramento) in their unincorporated area. They require rezoning to open space or a Development Agreement for the conversion of agriculture to permanent wildlife. So far, this has primarily captured entities like Wildlands that want to sell mitigation credits.

They direct growth to their two cities (Yuba City and Live Oak). There are no agreements in place that require this, but this has been their land use tradition. They have a tax exchange formula in place with the cities that works well.

Sutter's top crops are rice, walnuts, prunes, and peaches.

They have created a food and farm focus group to guide their General Plan update effort.

They are losing farmworker housing. There hasn't been any real success in creating new farm worker housing. They have mostly day laborers. There are few seasonal or permanent farmworkers anymore.

Sewage disposal is a real issue for them. Much of their land consists of clay soils that do not drain. This constraint discourages small housing development opportunities. Soils are mostly non-prime.

They are interested in agricultural districts and watching how to see how it works out in Yolo and Solano Counties.

Sutter is looking to increase its minimum agricultural lot sizes to address rural residential development. They are also considered not allowing housing at all on agricultural land.

To have a buildable lot in Sutter County you must have a legal lot AND frontage of a County maintained roadway. If the road is not on the maintained mileage list, you can not pull a building permit for any purpose, not even a shed or a barn. Sutter staff provided a definition of "lot" in their zoning code.

They are interested in how we handle climate change. There aren't any real examples or expertise out there to determine the impacts and effects on agricultural areas.

**Colusa County Planning Department (October 31, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

Staff summary. Review of schedule and relevant policies.

The proposed development in Colusa at the County line has been withdrawn. Colusa staff have already been contacted by new project representatives, however and expect it to come back.

There was a discussion of Dunnigan and three jobs/housing thresholds – balance, match, phasing.

Colusa has two cities (Colusa and Williams) and 6-8 small unincorporated communities. The total County population is around 21,000, with half of that total located within the two cities and the rest unincorporated. Colusa County is very small and very challenged economically. A new PG&E power plant is under construction (660 megawatts) north of Maxwell and is expected to be operational in the Spring of 2010.

Colusa is starting the General Plan update process. A Request for Proposals is going out next week.

They recently increased the minimum parcel size for agriculture. It was 10 acres, now it is 40 acres.

Colusa recently established specific criteria regarding what is and is not agriculture in order to deny a recent subdivision on agricultural land proposed at the County line.

**West Sacramento City Council (November 12, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

City staff introduced the item. County staff provided a correction to the City staff report regarding the LAFCO MSR Report. County staff provided a review of the General Plan Update history, schedule, and summary of relevant policies.

There was discussion regarding the status of levees in Clarksburg and whether they can be feasibly reinforced if necessary. The SB 5 requirements apply to large towns, and cities, not to rural areas.

There was discussion about the land use designation for Conaway Ranch (AG). There is a policy addressing regulation of groundwater.(CO A-69 and CO-A78).

There was discussion of whether the Elkhorn growth area embodies smart growth principles. County staff explained that not every growth opportunity allowed for mixed uses. The Elkhorn area is a unique opportunity – major interstate, proximity to regional airport, close to two cities. Smart growth issues will get further attention in the required specific plan. This is one of the County's identified economic development opportunities and it will require creative strategies. The Council expressed concern that the River Road would be adversely by increased traffic because all the employees would likely live in West Sacramento, thus impacting its scenic qualities. They asked for coordination regarding development of the area.

Council directed that city bike paths be integrated with County paths to make them seamless for users.

The Council discussed that the City will be the principal urban gateway to the Clarksburg agricultural district and that they should look at how to benefit from that.

**Woodland City Council (November 18, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

City staff introduced the item and identified areas of concern. A draft comment letter was provided to Council. County staff provided a review of the General Plan Update history, schedule, and summary of relevant policies.

There was considerable discussion regarding competition from economic development project envisioned in the General Plan Update. Council expressed that proposed County growth is inconsistent with preservation of agricultural land and that the cities have plenty of land to accommodate growth needs.

City opposition to the proposed regulation of groundwater was discussed.. City staff was directed to rewrite the comment letter to express opposition to the County economic development projects – primarily Spreckels and Elkhorn.

There was discussion about the flood standard applicable to Elkhorn – 100 year.

County staff was asked whether the General Plan Update is consistent with the Blueprint? With the policies affecting jobs and housing, the answer is yes. Council disagreed.

Council directed a comment be added that if the County proceeds with Spreckels or Elkhorn despite their objection, then the City should be a partner in the planning process.

**Farm Bureau Real Estate Seminar (November 19, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

County staff provided an overview of the General Plan process, the draft General Plan, and the schedule.

There were questions regarding how policy changes would affect the County's administration of the Williamson Act, the regulation of rural housing, and the division of agriculture designated property.

Several participants expressed opposition to the proposed groundwater ordinance.

**State Department of Housing and Redevelopment (November 20, 2008):** County staff arranged a conference call with Brett Arriaga, Housing Policy Analyst for HCD to discuss his review of the County's Draft Housing Element. Staff clarified the extensive public outreach process conducted to date.

Staff answered questions about CDBG grants used to provide planning and technical support for the Dunnigan Master Water Plan.

The State representative indicated that additional information of the "extremely low income" segment of the population would need to be added, including assignment of a portion of the RHNA allocation (50% of low income), and analysis of over-payment of rent.

Staff pointed out energy efficiency policies on pages LU-40 and CO-64.

Staff clarified that the County has only one small apartment building and five mobile home parks. All other housing of this type is located in the cities by policy.

Staff explained that the minimum lot size under existing R-3 zoning is around 2,000 square feet (22 du/ac).

Staff confirmed that group homes for six or fewer residents (transitional housing) do not require a conditional use permit.

The State representative confirmed a letter would be sent by the statutory deadline (11/25) and that it would contain primarily technical comments. He encouraged the staff to contact him after receipt of the letter to discuss further.

**Delta Protection Commission (November 20, 2008):** There was discussion of the following:

County staff provided a review of the schedule and summary of relevant policies.

The Commission suggested the County should reconsider Policy CO-9.15 regarding support for legislative changes to clarify that property within the Clarksburg growth boundary is in the Secondary Zone of the Delta.

The commission suggested a separate regulatory code for farm worker housing.

There was discussion regarding how to successfully retain and recruit agricultural industrial uses.

There was one public comment that Clarksburg does not qualify as a Delta gateway town because of lack of infrastructure and so West Sacramento has instead been so identified in the Delta Vision effort.

**Attorney General's Office (December 11, 2008):** County staff met with four representatives of the Attorney General's office: three attorneys and a contract land use planner. Staff provided copies of the Draft General Plan and a review of the document, including proposed new growth and approach for climate change. In general the AG staff seemed very supportive of the County's approach.

Among the Yolo issues discussed were: economic development focus of the plan; infrastructure issues for small towns; pass-through agreements and relationships with the cities; the jobs/housing requirements (match, balance, phasing); the new Specific Plan designation and how it will be applied; net gains concept; parcel size thresholds; and minimum and maximum densities.

The AG staff indicated that the CEQA analysis should account for full build-out, including growth in the cities, an approach the EIR consultant is already contracted to take in the cumulative analysis. They encouraged the County to refer to policies for complete streets and complete neighborhoods as part of the County's "good planning" focus even though this is not necessarily a traditional CEQA topic. They expect the County to find climate change impacts as "significant" and then point to our strategy for addressing it and reducing greenhouse gases, an approach we have already committed to taking.

They encourage the climate action plan (CAP) to set specific reduction targets and specific strategies to achieve them. They expect the CAP to include adaptive management strategies as related to farming practices (acknowledging that that is an emerging area of study).

The AG staff mentioned a report to be released in February from the Pacific Institute on impacts of climate change. They also mentioned a Farmland Trust report addressing agricultural research on carbon sinks. They mentioned a natural capital model called INVEST developed by Stanford that shows the economic benefits of pro-ecological land use choices. They recommended we consider the value of these analyses for our deliberations.