

V. ALTERNATIVES

The *CEQA Guidelines* require analysis of a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the project's basic objectives and avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.¹

The primary purpose of the alternatives analysis in an EIR, as stated in Section 15126.6(a) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, is to "describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives." Further, Section 15126.6(b) of the *CEQA Guidelines* states that the "...the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly." The feasibility of an alternative may be determined based on a variety of factors, including but not limited to economic viability, availability of infrastructure, and other plans or regulatory limitations.²

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section provides a brief discussion of alternatives that were considered but rejected from further consideration. The second section briefly describes the principal characteristics of the alternatives considered in this section: the No Project (build-out of the 1983 General Plan) alternative, the Rural Sustainability alternative, and the Market Demand alternative and compares these alternatives to the Draft General Plan (the proposed project). The third section discusses the environmentally-superior alternative. The last section provides a comparison of the Draft General Plan project site alternatives identified in Clarksburg for three agricultural industrial sites and on I-505, for two commercial general sites.

The objectives developed for the project are an important part of the context for evaluating alternatives. The objectives are included in Chapter III, Project Description, and are restated here for reference. The overarching principles of the Draft General Plan are defined in Chapter 2 (Vision and Principles), and summarized below:

- Successful agriculture
- Protected open space and natural areas
- Distinct communities
- Safe and healthy communities
- Varied transportation alternatives

¹ *CEQA Guidelines*, 2009, Section 15126.6.

² *CEQA Guidelines*, 2009, Section 15126.6(f)(1).

- Enhanced information and communication technology
- Strong and sustainable economy
- Abundant and clean water supply
- Reduction of greenhouse gases and adaptation to climate change.

A. ALTERNATIVES THAT WERE CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

The following six alternatives to the Draft General Plan (the proposed project) were considered during the General Plan update process. Three of these alternatives, the City Focus Growth alternative, the Town Focused Growth alternative, and the New Town alternative, are outlined in background reports for the General Plan update.^{3,4} Two other alternatives, the Speculative Development alternative and the Planning Commission alternative, were developed subsequently during the planning process and were also considered by County decision-makers. These alternatives are described below and the reasons they were rejected from further consideration in this EIR are provided.

1. Existing Conditions (No Project)

The Existing Conditions (No Project) alternative assumes the continuation of existing conditions and development levels as they exist in approximately 2008, which includes 7,263 dwelling units, 23,265 residents, 20,818 jobs, 2,660.5 acres of developed residential uses, and 431.3 acres of developed commercial/industrial uses. Under this alternative, additional growth and development would not be allowed. This alternative would require a moratorium on growth which is not considered to be a feasible or reasonable scenario. In addition, under this alternative, the 1983 policy framework would still be in effect, which would constitute a business-as-usual approach to land use regulation in the County, as opposed to the policy framework proposed by the Draft General Plan that requires smart growth, a mix and balance of uses, and identification of very limited areas of development generally only in historic rural towns with the bulk of growth being directed to the incorporated cities. In addition, this alternative would not prevent all potential impacts associated with increased development, because other jurisdictions, including the incorporated cities and adjacent counties would continue to grow, potentially resulting in increased traffic, air quality, and noise impacts within Yolo County. This alternative would not assist the County in achieving its Regional Housing Needs Allocation and other State requirements pertaining to General Plan updates. Therefore, the Existing Conditions (No Project) alternative was rejected from further consideration as a CEQA alternative but is described in detail throughout the EIR as the “setting” against which future change and project impacts are measured.

2. City-Focused Growth Alternative

The City-Focused Growth alternative is one of the original alternatives considered in the background reports.⁵ This alternative assumes build-out of an additional 9,959 dwelling units, 30,733 residents,

³ Design, Community & Environment, 2006. Yolo County General Plan, Alternatives Overview and Analysis. September 8.

⁴ Design, Community & Environment, 2006. Yolo County General Plan, Alternatives Evaluation. December 6.

⁵ Design, Community & Environment, 2006. Yolo County General Plan Alternatives Overview and Analysis. September 8.

and 720 acres of commercial/industrial uses over existing conditions. This alternative would direct approximately 90 percent of new development to be located in the incorporated cities and approximately 10 percent of growth to occur in the unincorporated County, consistent with existing County policies. Of the growth within the unincorporated County, approximately 40 percent would occur in community areas and 60 percent would be rural development. Under this alternative the 1983 General Plan policy framework would continue to be in effect, which represents a business-as-usual approach to regulating land use in the County, as opposed to the policy framework proposed in the Draft General Plan that requires smart growth, a mix and balance of uses, and identification of very limited areas of development generally only in historic rural towns with the bulk of growth being directed to the incorporated cities (as discussed in Section IV.A, Land Use and Housing).

The City-Focused Growth alternative represents the continuation of existing trends and broadly represents build-out of the 1983 General Plan land use designations, densities, and policies, allowing for some new development in Esparto on lands that are currently designated for agricultural use. This alternative is considered to be substantially similar to the No Project alternative, analyzed below, and because the differences between these alternatives would be slight when compared to the proposed project, the City-Focused Growth alternative that was previously identified, was rejected from further analysis or consideration in this EIR.

3. Town-Focused Growth Alternative

The Town-Focused Growth alternative was also identified early in the General Plan update process. This alternative would allow growth in the unincorporated County communities, in order to support economic development and the provision of improved infrastructure. The Town-Focused Growth alternative assumes build-out of an additional 12,788 dwelling units, 38,569 residents, and 909 acres of commercial/industrial uses over existing conditions. This alternative would direct approximately 85 percent of new development to occur in the unincorporated County, concentrating the majority of this growth in Dunnigan, Esparto, Knights Landing, and Madison. Average residential densities would be increased, allowing for additional residential development in community areas. Additional restrictions would be placed on homes in the rural agricultural areas, further focusing growth in town areas and reducing the number of new scattered rural units. Under this alternative the 1983 General Plan policy framework would continue to be in effect, which represents a business-as-usual approach to regulating land use in the County, as opposed to the smart growth policy framework proposed by the Draft General Plan.

Because the Town Focused Growth Alternative is similar to the Rural Sustainability alternative, which is analyzed in this EIR, this alternative was rejected from further analysis or consideration in this EIR.

4. New Town Alternative

The New Town alternative was also identified early in the General Plan update process. This alternative assumes build-out of an additional 16,786 dwelling units, 49,644 residents, and 1,148 acres of commercial/industrial uses over existing conditions. Under this alternative, growth would be focused in Dunnigan, with approximately 70 percent of all new housing units in the unincorporated County constructed in Dunnigan. The mix and types of commercial, industrial, and job producing

land uses would also increase in Dunnigan. This alternative is intended to protect larger and more productive farmland in the south and central areas of the County from development, to create a more balanced geographic distribution of population, and to create additional opportunities for growth within the regional economy. The remainder of the growth would occur as scattered rural residential development.

Under this alternative the 1983 policy framework would stay in effect, however, the land uses reflect more of a strategic, smart growth approach that focuses development in Dunnigan in order to protect larger and more productive farmland elsewhere. The New Town alternative was rejected from further analysis or consideration because it would be duplicative of the proposed project and therefore would not be necessary to ensure a “reasoned choice” of alternatives.

5. Speculative Development Alternative

The Speculative Development alternative is based on 16 specific development proposals that would require General Plan amendments and that were known to City staff as of May 2006. Development of these proposals would result in scattered development throughout the County located in Dunnigan, Esparto, Madison, Monument Hills, and along I-505 and I-5. Additionally, approximately half of the proposals are for sites located at the edge of Davis or Woodland. Together, these 16 speculative proposals would result in the development of approximately 28,663 dwelling units, 1,559 acres of commercial/industrial uses, and a population of 85,898 over existing conditions.

Under this alternative the 1983 General Plan policy framework would continue to be in effect, which represents a business-as-usual approach to regulating land use in the County, as opposed to the more progressive smart growth policy framework proposed by the Draft General Plan.

This alternative was rejected because it would result in sprawl, scattering development across the County and along the edge of cities, and it would substantially exceed the projected market demand within the unincorporated area. Additionally, this alternative represents a significant departure from the County’s prior policy focus planning approach to a process driven by individual development proposals. For these reasons, this alternative was rejected from further analysis or consideration in this EIR.

6. Planning Commission Alternative (December 2006)

The Planning Commission alternative would result in build-out of an additional 15,659 dwelling units, 36,423 residents, and 2,345 acres of commercial/industrial uses over existing conditions. Under this alternative, land use would be regulated by generally the same proposed new policy framework included as a part of the Draft General Plan. This alternative falls generally between the City-Focused and Town-Focused growth alternatives in terms of residential land use. The two exceptions are the amount of growth shown for Dunnigan and for the northwest edge of Davis. The Planning Commission’s recommendation provides for a modest component of increased residential growth in the County’s historic rural communities, particularly in Dunnigan. The urban limit lines for each of the existing cities are respected as providing for a fair share of future growth, with the exception of the “northwest” quadrant at the edge of Davis. There the Planning Commission felt additional growth would be appropriate and it would be beneficial to the County. This alternative is generally similar to the New Town alternative in terms of economic development. Economic development is encouraged countywide in a manner supported by the County’s Economic Development Division with greater

emphasis on agricultural commercial/industrial and highway commercial opportunities throughout the unincorporated area. Because this alternative is similar to the Rural Sustainability alternative described below, it was excluded from further analysis.

B. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This section analyzes the following three alternatives to the proposed project:

- The CEQA-required **No Project alternative** assumes that the proposed project would not be adopted or implemented and that development would continue in accordance with the 1983 General Plan. This alternative assumes the full build-out of the development envisioned under the 1983 General Plan and would result in a total of approximately 34,505 persons, 11,277 dwelling units, 33,945 jobs, and 1,962 acres of commercial/industrial development within the unincorporated County by 2030, as shown in Table V-1. This alternative would result in approximately 47 percent fewer residents, 48 percent of the residential units, and 37 percent of the commercial/industrial acres of development allowed under the proposed project. In addition, under this alternative the 1983 General Plan policy framework would continue to be in effect, which represents a business-as-usual approach to regulating land use in the County.
- The **Rural Sustainability alternative** assumes that a moderate amount of growth would occur in several unincorporated communities, increasing the level of economic development and restricting housing in the rural agricultural areas. Additional density would be allowed in Monument Hills. By 2030, this alternative would result in a total of approximately 44,926 persons, 14,241 dwelling units, 42,372 commercial/industrial jobs, and 2,345 acres of commercial/industrial development within the unincorporated County. This alternative could result in approximately 30 percent fewer persons, 65 percent of the residential units, and 14 percent of the commercial/industrial acres of development than allowed under the proposed project. In addition, under this alternative the smart growth framework proposed by the Draft General Plan would be in effect, but there would not be enough development to achieve sustainability within the communities in terms of issues such as achieving a jobs/housing balance within the community areas, lowering the vehicle miles traveled and thereby reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and providing basic levels of community-serving water, wastewater, and storm drainage, and public services.
- The **Market Demand alternative** assumes that the County's historic constraints on growth would be removed. By 2030, this alternative would result in 71,165 persons, 24,200 dwelling units, 61,945 commercial/industrial jobs, and 3,246 acres of commercial/industrial development within the unincorporated County. This alternative examines the effects of meeting residential market demand within the County and could result in an approximately 11 percent increase in population and 10 percent more dwelling units, and a 31 percent more commercial/industrial acres of development than the growth allowed under the proposed project. In addition, under this alternative the 1983 General Plan policy framework would continue to be in effect, which represents a business-as-usual approach to regulating land use in the County.

The following section provides a brief discussion of each alternative's principal characteristics followed by an analysis of the potential impacts of the alternative as compared to the Draft General Plan (proposed project) and a determination of whether or not the alternative would reduce, eliminate, or create new significant impacts is provided. Table V-2 provides a comparison of each alternative to the Draft General Plan. Table V-3 provides a summary of the relative environmental effects of the

project alternatives compared to the proposed project, and Table V-4 provides a summary of how well the alternative meets the project objectives.

Table V-1: Summary of CEQA Alternatives

General Plan Alternative Scenario	Population	Dwelling Units	Increase in Dwelling Units from Prior Scenario	Commercial/Industrial Acreage (Acres)	Increase in Acres from Prior Scenario
Setting: Existing Conditions (2007)	23,265	7,263	0	431	0
No Project (1983 General Plan)	34,505	11,277	4,014 55%	1,962	1,531 355%
Rural Sustainability	44,926	14,241	2,964 26%	2,345	475 25%
The Project: Draft General Plan	64,701	22,061	7,820 55%	2,947	602 26%
Market Demand ^a	71,165	24,200	2,139 10%	3,246	299 10%

^aBay Area Economics, 2006. *Market and Fiscal Considerations Report*. September. Assumes 4.5 percent annual increase in households and 5.0 percent annual vacancy for the 25-year period from 2005 through 2030. Source: County of Yolo, Planning and Public Works Department, 2009.

Table V-2: CEQA Alternatives Compared to Draft General Plan

General Plan Alternative Scenario	Population	Dwelling Units	Dwelling Units Compared to Draft General Plan	Jobs	Jobs Compared to Draft General Plan	Commercial/Industrial Acres	Acres Compared to Draft General Plan
The Project: Draft General Plan	64,701	22,061	--	53,154	--	2,947	--
Setting: Existing Conditions (2007)	23,265	7,263	14,798 less 33% of GP	20,818	32,336 less 39% of GP	431	2,516 less 15% of GP
No Project (1983 General Plan)	34,505	11,277	10,784 less 51% of GP	33,945	19,209 less 64% of GP	1,962	985 less 67% of GP
Rural Sustainability	44,926	14,241	7,820 less 65% of GP	42,372	10,782 less 79% of GP	2,345	602 less 80% of GP
Market Demand	71,165	24,200	2,139 more 10% more than GP	61,945	8,791 more 16% more	3,246	901 more 31% more

Source: County of Yolo, Planning and Public Works Department, 2009.

Table V-3: Alternatives Comparison of Impacts

Environmental Topics	Proposed Project		Relative Level of Impact Compared to the Proposed Project (without Mitigation)		
	Significant Impact	Level With Mitigation	No Project Alternative	Rural Sustainability Alternative	Market Demand Alternative
Land Use and Housing	LU-1 (divide/disrupt community)	LTS	< LU-1	< LU-1	= LU-1
	LU-2 (incompatible land uses)	SU	< LU-2	= LU-2	> LU-2
	LU-3 (alter type and intensity of use)	SU	= LU-3	= LU-3	> LU-3
	LU-4 (jobs/housing imbalance)	SU	> LU-4	> LU-4	> LU-4
	LU-5 (conflicts with other agency plans)	LTS	> LU-5	> LU-5	> LU-5
Agricultural Resources	AG-1 (loss of agricultural land)	SU	< AG-1	< AG-1	> AG-1
	AG-2 (loss of Williamson Act lands)	SU	< AG-2	< AG-2	> AG-2
	AG-3 (loss of agricultural soils)	SU	< AG-3	< AG-3	> AG-3
	AG-4 (land use conflicts with agricultural activities)	LTS	= AG-4	= AG-4	> AG-4
Transportation and Circulation	CI-1 (increase in VMT)	SU	< CI-1	< CI-1	> CI-1
	CI-2 (exceed County LOS threshold)	SU	< CI-2	< CI-2	> CI-2
	CI-3(exceed roadway capacity)	SU	< CI-3	< CI-3	> CI-3
	CI-4 (exceed CMP LOS thresholds)	SU	< CI-4	< CI-4	> CI-4
	CI-5 (exceed city LOS thresholds)	SU	< CI-5	< CI-5	> CI-5
	CI-6 (exceed Caltrans LOS thresholds)	SU	< CI-6	< CI-6	> CI-6
	CI-7 (increase travel on substandard roadways)	SU	< CI-7	< CI-7	> CI-7
	CI-8 (increase travel on substandard State facilities)	SU	< CI-8	< CI-8	> CI-8
	CI-9 (policy conflicts)	SU	< CI-9	< CI-9	> CI-9
Air Quality	AIR-1 (increase construction emissions)	SU	< AIR-1	< AIR-1	> AIR-1
	AIR-2 (increase operational emissions)	SU	= AIR-2	< AIR-2	> AIR-2
	AIR-3 (exposure to toxics)	LTS	= AIR-3	< AIR-3	> AIR-3
	AIR-4 (cumulative impacts)	SU	< AIR-4	< AIR-4	> AIR-4
	AIR-5 (conflicts with other agencies)	SU	< AIR-5	= AIR-5	> AIR-5
Noise	NOI-1 (increase traffic noise)	SU	< NOI-1	< NOI-1	> NOI-1
	NOI-2 (noise effects on sensitive uses)	LTS	< NOI-2	< NOI-2	> NOI-2
	NOI-3 (increase ambient noise)	SU	= NOI-3	< NOI-3	> NOI-3
	NOI-4 (exposure to groundborne vibration)	LTS	= NOI-4	= NOI-4	> NOI-4
Global Climate Change	GCC-1 (contribute to GCC)	SU	< GCC-1	= GCC-1	> GCC-1
	GCC-2 (adverse affects from GCC)	SU	< GCC-2	= GCC-2	> GCC-2
Public Services	PUB-1 (increase demand for fire services)	LTS	= PUB-1	> PUB-1	> PUB-1
	PUB-2 (increase demand for schools)	LTS	= PUB-2	> PUB-2	> PUB-2
	PUB-3 (increase demand for parks)	LTS	= PUB-3	> PUB-3	> PUB-3
Utilities and Energy	UTIL-1 (increase water demand)	SU	< UTIL-1	> UTIL-1	> UTIL-1
	UTIL-2 (increase demand groundwater resources)	SU	< UTIL-2	> UTIL-2	> UTIL-2
	UTIL-3 (greater wastewater flows)	LTS	< UTIL-3	> UTIL-3	> UTIL-3

Table V-3 Continued

Environmental Topics	Proposed Project		Relative Level of Impact Compared to the Proposed Project (without Mitigation)		
	Significant Impact	Level With Mitigation	No Project Alternative	Rural Sustainability Alternative	Market Demand Alternative
Cultural Resources	CULT-1 (loss of historical resources)	SU	< CULT-1	< CULT-1	> CULT-1
	CULT-2 (loss of archeological resources)	SU	< CULT-2	< CULT-2	> CULT-2
Biological Resources	BIO-1 (loss of riparian habitat)	SU	< BIO-1	< BIO-1	> BIO-1
	BIO-2 (loss of wetlands)	SU	< BIO-2	< BIO-2	> BIO-2
	BIO-3 (loss of oak woodlands)	SU	< BIO-3	< BIO-3	> BIO-3
	BIO-4 (disrupt movement corridors)	SU	< BIO-4	< BIO-4	> BIO-4
	BIO-5 (loss of special-status species)	SU	< BIO-5	< BIO-5	> BIO-5
	BIO-6 (loss of habitat)	SU	< BIO-6	< BIO-6	> BIO-6
Hydrology and Water Quality	HYD-1 (overdraft aquifers)	LTS	< HYD-1	= HYD-1	> HYD-1
	HYD-2 (flood hazards)	SU	< HYD-2	< HYD-2	> HYD-2
	HYD-3 (sea level rise)	SU	< HYD-3	< HYD-3	> HYD-3
Geology, Soils, Seismicity and Mineral Resources	GEO-1 (loss of unique feature)	LTS	= GEO-1	= GEO-1	= GEO-1
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	HAZ-1 (chemical residues)	LTS	< HAZ-1	< HAZ-1	> HAZ-1
	HAZ-2 (disrupt emergency response)	SU	< HAZ-2	< HAZ-2	> HAZ-2
	HAZ-3 (airstrip hazards)	LTS	< HAZ-3	= HAZ-3	= HAZ-3
Visual and Scenic Resources	VIS-1 (visual character)	SU	= VIS-1	< VIS-1	> VIS-1
	VIS-2 (light/glare)	SU	= VIS-2	= VIS-2	> VIS-2

Notes:

SU = Significant and Unavoidable impact(s)
LTS = Less Than Significant impact(s)

= the impact is similar to the proposed project
< the impact is less than proposed project
> the impact greater than proposed project

Source: LSA Associates, 2009.

Table V-4: Alternatives Comparison of Project Objectives Achievement

	Project	No Project Alternative	Rural Sustainability Alternative	Market Demand Alternative
Successful Agriculture	●	◐	●	◐
Protected Open Space and Natural Areas	●	◐	●	◐
Distinct Communities	●	◐	◐	○
Safe and Healthy Communities	●	○	◐	○
Varied Transportation Alternatives	●	○	◐	●
Enhanced Information and Communication Technology	●	○	◐	◐
Strong and Sustainable Economy	●	◐	◐	○
Abundant and Clean Water Supply	●	○	◐	○
Reduction of Greenhouse Gases and Adaptation to Climate Change	●	◐	●	○

Notes: ● = Meets the objective
◐ = Partially meets the objective
○ = Does not meet the objective

Source: LSA Associates, Inc., 2009.

1. No Project (1983 General Plan) Alternative

The following provides a brief description and analysis of the No Project alternative.

a. Principal Characteristics. Under the No Project alternative, the proposed project would not be adopted and the existing 1983 General Plan would remain in effect with no changes. This alternative assumes build-out of the 1983 General Plan.

Under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative, the County's population and job growth would increase as allowed under the 1983 General Plan. Build-out of the No Project alternative would result in development of approximately 624.3 acres of residential uses and 1,531 acres of commercial/industrial uses on land that is currently designated for such uses under the 1983 General Plan. This development would result in an increase of 11,240 persons, 13,127 jobs, and 4,014 housing units by 2030, compared to an increase of 41,435 persons, 32,336 jobs, and 14,798 housing units as a result of proposed project implementation.

Under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative, the Housing element would not be certified, and there would be no density ranges or land use intensities provided as in the Draft General Plan, all of which are requirements under State law. The lack of a certified Housing Element would continue to preclude the County from qualifying for community development block grant (CDBG) funding and would adversely impact the ability of the County to provide various housing assistance and infrastructure improvement programs.

The anticipated future conditions resulting from the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative are different from the analysis contained throughout Chapter IV of the EIR, which compares the proposed project to existing conditions.

Development under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would not include the progressive policy framework of the Draft General Plan. Growth could occur in a more dispersed pattern without the benefit of specific plans to comprehensively address infrastructure, financing, sustainability, community service levels, or design. The policies within the No Project alternative do not result in or require the development of sustainable towns and communities with a mix housing, jobs, and services that are similar to other mature communities in the County. Without a mix of land uses in proximity to one another, the No Project alternative would not achieve a jobs/housing balance within the historic towns or a reduction in energy use and greenhouse gas emissions. Growth under the business-as-usual framework generally does not allow for sufficient development to support the provision of community-serving utilities or public services in an efficient manner.

The Draft General Plan includes policies that are intended to create sustainable towns and communities with housing, jobs, and services that are balanced, phased, and matched with resulting VMT similar to other mature communities in the County. By creating full-service communities designed around sustainable principles, the Draft General Plan will help reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions, not just for new growth but for existing development as well.

b. Analysis of No Project Alternative. The No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative could result in the following environmental impacts:

(1) **Land Use and Housing.** Under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative, the County would continue to grow as allowed under the 1983 General Plan. By 2030, this alternative could result in approximately 53 percent fewer persons, 51 percent of the residential units, 64 percent of the jobs, and 67 percent of the commercial/industrial acres of development allowed under the proposed project. The distribution of growth would also change somewhat and would be spread between the nine towns and other community areas.

While the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would result in fewer dwelling units and commercial/industrial acreage than the Draft General, the growth allowed under the 1983 General Plan would be substantial compared to existing conditions. Because less development is proposed and it does not involve placing housing south of State Route 16 in Esparto, this alternative would be less likely to disrupt or divide established communities. Build-out of the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative could result in substantial incompatibilities between land uses (e.g., between residential and agricultural uses; or residential and commercial or industrial uses) and substantially alter the type or intensity of land use within an area (e.g., in Dunnigan, Esparto, Knights Landing, Davis Area, Woodland Area or County Airport where the majority of remaining land designated for residential or commercial uses under the 1983 General Plan is located). This alternative would not displace people or housing, nor disrupt or physically divide as established community.

The pressure for conversion of agricultural land to housing would likely be greater under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative than under the proposed project because there is no strategic relief provided to offset the pressure for new growth in the County. Under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative, growth would continue to be pushed to the incorporated cities; however, the cities are not accommodating as much growth as is demanded. As a result, the pressure for new growth will remain, but there would not be a systematic smart growth policy framework in place to provide it under this alternative.

In addition, the distribution and amount of allowed uses would not substantially improve the County's existing jobs/housing imbalance. Development under this alternative would exacerbate the overall unincorporated County jobs and housing ratio imbalance (currently at 2.8 jobs per dwelling unit) by increasing it to 3 jobs/dwelling unit compared to the proposed project which would reduce it to 2.4 overall. Additionally, policies requiring that a jobs/housing balance be attained in the areas where the greatest development would occur (i.e., Dunnigan) would not be in place under this alternative.

Although affordable units would continue to be built as required by the County's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, this alternative would not allow the County to achieve SACOG's Regional Housing Needs Allocation for the distribution of housing across all income levels. Additionally, there is no certified Housing Element under the 1983 General Plan, and the lack of a certified Housing Element would continue to preclude the County from qualifying for federal Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) funding and would adversely affect the County's ability to provide various housing assistance and infrastructure improvement programs to meet the housing needs allocation.

The type and distribution of growth under this alternative would not support SACOG's Blueprint principles to the same degree as the Draft General Plan because land use would continue to be regulated under the policy framework of the 1983 General Plan. The No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative does not include the policy framework and land use mix that would promote mixed-use,

compact development within the growth boundaries of community areas. For instance, the 1983 General Plan only includes one small area of “mixed use” development, whereas the Draft General Plan includes four Specific Plan areas, within which mixed uses are allowed. In addition, by not embracing smart growth and Blueprint principles, the 1983 General Plan could result in policy conflicts with other County and agency plans in the region that do adopt this policy focus. As such, this alternative would result in a greater number of significant land use and housing impacts than the proposed project.

(2) Agriculture. Because the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would restrict additional development to the level still allowed under the 1983 General Plan, the total amount of acreage converted to non-agricultural development would be less than the level proposed under the proposed project. However, under this alternative, growth would not be confined to growth boundaries and as a result, could result in more pressure to develop agricultural areas. The Draft General Plan is more likely to result in successful agricultural land preservation than under the No Project alternative because of the Draft General Plan’s emphasis on agricultural economic development and the inclusion of goals to remove regulatory hurdles, targeted sites, marketing, and policies for processing sites. As such, while there would be a slightly higher loss of agricultural acreage overall due to more development allowed under the Draft General Plan, it is likely that the No Project alternative would be less successful in promoting the overall success of agriculture including infrastructure necessary to ensure economic success. Without a successful agricultural economy, attempts to preserve agricultural land alone may be inadequate to avoid urbanization pressures and/or conversion to rural residential estates. Although the total level of development allowed under this alternative would be less than that allowed under the Draft General Plan, this development would result in greater impacts to agriculture over the long-term countywide.

(3) Transportation and Circulation. This section summarizes the transportation evaluation of the proposed alternatives. The evaluation includes a comparison of regional transportation performance measures for each alternative and a more detailed analysis of individual roadway segments for the No Project alternative so a direct comparison could be made to Draft General Plan.

Similar to the regional performance measures developed for the Draft General Plan (in Section IV.C), the County used an alternative method to estimate unincorporated Yolo County vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for the General Plan alternatives. The new SACOG travel demand model, called SACSIM, was selected, which is a state of the art activity-based travel demand model. This new type of model simulates people and their activity patterns (i.e., why they travel) to estimate regional travel performance measures. The SACSIM model includes greater detail that recognizes local factors, such as local street connectivity and mixing of land uses, which influences the availability of walking, bicycling, and transit choices to reduce VMT.

Estimates of VMT for the unincorporated area of Yolo County under each alternative were developed based on SACSIM VMT estimates for 2005 and 2035 conditions based on modeling that was conducted for the SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). While this modeling did not include separate model runs for each alternative, sufficient information was available to differentiate the VMT between households in different development settings (i.e., developed area with full services versus single use areas with no services). Table V-5 summarizes the VMT estimates based on VMT generation rates that reflect the different type of developed area expected with each alternative.

Based on the SACSIM model, the VMT for the unincorporated area of Yolo County is estimated to be 83 miles generated per household per weekday under 2005 conditions. The unincorporated areas of Yolo County are rural and have limited services and employment for residents in each town and community. Given these conditions in the unincorporated areas, residents need to travel to the cities for work, shopping, recreation, and other services or activities.

Under a business-as-usual scenario, VMT for new development in the unincorporated area of the County is anticipated to be similar to the existing 83 miles generated per household per weekday. As shown in Table V-5, the No Project alternative would continue the current 1983 General Plan policies resulting in VMT generated per household occurring in a manner similar to existing conditions.

Table V-5: Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) based on SACSIM Travel Demand Model

Scenario	Households in Unincorporated Area ^a		Average Weekday VMT Generated Per Household ^b		Average Weekday VMT
	Proposed Specific Plan Areas	Other Areas	Proposed Specific Plan Areas	Other Areas	
Existing (2005) Conditions	-	6,900	-	83	572,700
No Project (1983 General Plan) Conditions	-	10,713	-	83	889,200
Rural Sustainability Alternative Conditions	-	13,529	-	77	1,041,700
Draft General Plan (Proposed Project) Conditions	10,631 ^c	10,327	44	77	1,263,000
Market Demand Alternative Conditions	-	22,990	-	83	1,908,200

^a Households based on 5 percent vacancy of dwelling units.

^b VMT generated per household per weekday based on SACSIM model estimates for 2005 and 2035.

^c Includes all households under the Draft General Plan in the communities of Dunnigan (7,867 households), Knights Landing (1,342 households), and Madison (1,421 households).

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2009 and SACOG, 2009.

The Draft General Plan includes policies that are intended to create sustainable towns and communities with housing, jobs, and services that are similar to other mature communities in the County. By creating full-service communities designed around sustainable principles, the Draft General Plan will help reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions, not just for new growth but for existing development as well. Instead of the estimated VMT of 83 miles generated per household per day for the unincorporated County under a business-as-usual scenario by Year 2035, the Draft General Plan is expected to result in communities that can achieve much lower levels of VMT.

Based on the SACSIM model, the mature communities of Woodland and Davis are estimated to have a VMT of 44 miles generated per household per weekday by 2035. As discussed in Chapter IV-C, the revised Draft General Plan would include a new 44 VMT generated per household threshold policy that would apply to the Specific Plan areas as identified in Table V-5.

Assuming the remaining unincorporated area of Yolo County under the Draft General Plan continues to develop with some influence due to increased emphasis on smart growth land use patterns occurring in the SACOG region, the SACSIM model estimated that weekday VMT generated per

household in unincorporated Yolo County would decrease to about 77 by 2035. The reduction is due to some additional employment and services being provided in the unincorporated towns and communities. Therefore, the remaining unincorporated areas outside of the Specific Plan communities were assumed to have a VMT of 77 generated per household per weekday (consistent with the SACSIM model estimate by 2035). The 77 VMT generated per household estimate for other areas may not capture the effect of some Draft General Plan policies such as striving for a minimum jobs/housing balance (Policy CC-2.10) and requiring sustainable design standards as appropriate, including maximum block lengths of 600 feet and incorporation of a grid street network that provides travel for all modes (Policy CC-2.16), in each unincorporated community. Therefore, the actual VMT generated from these areas could be lower.

The No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative contemplates lower levels of development in the unincorporated areas of the County including the communities of Dunnigan, Elkhorn, and Madison. As shown in Table V-5, total VMT under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative is approximately 30 percent less than the Draft General Plan; however, VMT per household (including existing households) would be 83 per weekday under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative versus an average of 60 per weekday under the Draft General Plan. This is a result of the Draft General Plan providing additional employment and services in the unincorporated communities, which reduces the need for some longer distance trips.

The Draft General Plan includes many policies that further support transit, bicycle, pedestrian, aviation, and goods movement compared to the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative. As an example, the Draft General Plan requires development of a transit plan as part of each Specific Plan (Action CI-A6) and the consideration of all users, including agricultural equipment, transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians, when constructing or modifying roadways (Policy CI-2.1).

(4) Air Quality. Development of the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would result in significant levels of construction-related emissions, but less than anticipated under the proposed project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1 would reduce the impact of construction-related emissions to less than significant.

The No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would generate substantially fewer vehicle trips than the proposed project. However, as shown in Table V-6 the resulting regional emissions (ROG, NOx and PM₁₀) from motor vehicles would still exceed the YSAQMD's significance criteria and result in a significant and unavoidable (SU) impact (see Appendix D for model results).

Table V-6: No Project (1983 General Plan) Alternative - Motor Vehicle Emissions

	Reactive Organic Gases	Nitrogen Oxides	PM₁₀
Operational Emissions	69.4	116.8	100.0
YSAQMD Significance Threshold	10.0 tons/year	10.0 tons/year	80.0 pounds/day
Exceed?	Yes	Yes	Yes

Source: LSA Associates, Inc., 2009.

The No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would not substantially contribute to or lead to potential violations of carbon monoxide (CO) standards. The No Project alternative could expose sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-3 to revise

Draft General Plan Action CO-A106 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level for the project, but not for the No Project alternative as the policy framework to address and reduce air quality emissions is not in place in the 1983 General Plan. The No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative includes assurances that controls will be placed on odor emissions and other nuisances and would be anticipated to have a similar impact as the proposed project. The amount of growth under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would not exceed what was assumed in the 2035 MTP, and therefore would not conflict with the air quality attainment plans. Therefore, the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would result in slightly lower air quality impacts compared to the proposed project; however, the impacts would still be considered significant and unavoidable.

(5) Noise. Under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative, average daily traffic volumes would not increase as much as predicted under the proposed project and therefore this alternative would result in less of an increase in traffic noise levels on highway and roadway segments throughout the County than expected under the Draft General Plan. It is expected that permanent increases in ambient noise levels from traffic would be less-than-significant. However, build-out of the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would result in the exposure of new noise sensitive land use development to excessive traffic noise levels along roadway segments throughout the County. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impacts from aircraft, railroad, mining, and farming noise sources would remain less-than-significant under build-out of the No Project alternative. Also this alternative would result in significant and unavoidable construction noise impacts because construction activity associated with build-out of this alternative would expose noise sensitive receptors to excessive short-term noise levels. This would be a significant and unavoidable impact.

(6) Global Climate Change. Development of the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would result in significant levels of construction-related emissions, but less than anticipated under the proposed project. The No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would generate less overall GHG emissions (1.9 million metric tons) with fewer energy and vehicle-related GHG emissions (184,080 metric tons per year) than the proposed project. However, on a per-capita basis emissions would be higher because this alternative does not include the same progressive policy framework as the Draft General Plan. Global climate change impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

(7) Public Services. Build-out of the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would result in less development than build-out of the proposed project and, therefore, would result in less demand for law enforcement, fire protection, schools, libraries, parks and recreations, and other social services. New development would continue to be subject to review and mitigation under existing regulations. However, the 1983 General Plan does not establish minimum staffing ratio policies for law enforcement services, response time recommendations for fire protection services, or other service thresholds for schools, resources parks, community parks, or libraries. Under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative, the public service providers would not be required to provide increased services to meet increased demand. In addition, without the added growth identified in the Draft General Plan, other necessary community infrastructure improvements and services would not be provided. Under the 1983 General Plan, without a specific plan and enough additional growth in the communities of Dunnigan, Knights Landing, and Madison to ensure the development of new services. Therefore, for the communities of Dunnigan, Madison, and Knights Landing the No Project

(1983 General Plan) alternative would result in similar significant and unavoidable impacts to public services.

(8) Utilities and Energy. The No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative assumes additional growth in certain unincorporated communities of Yolo County as allowed under the 1983 General Plan. In general, compared to the proposed project, this alternative would result in less growth and less of a demand for water, wastewater, stormwater, solid waste, energy infrastructure, and services in the unincorporated areas of the County. In particular, in Dunnigan, growth allowed under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would continue to receive water, wastewater, and stormwater services through private wells, septic systems, and roadside ditches, and would not be served by new community water, wastewater, or storm drainage systems, as would be required by the proposed project. In Knights Landing and Madison, development allowed under this alternative would require the same upgrades to the existing community water, wastewater, and storm drainage systems as under the proposed project. While the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would result in similar impacts related to exceedance of available capacities in Knights Landing, Madison, and Esparto, the need for additional infrastructure would be slightly less than under the proposed project.

The No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would generate less solid waste and consume less energy than the proposed project. However, this alternative would not result in a significantly different impact than the proposed project despite the lower population growth because it would not benefit from the aggressive solid waste reduction and energy conservation policies within the proposed project. Therefore, the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would have slightly lesser impacts on water, wastewater, and stormwater services and infrastructure, but would result in the same level of impact as the proposed project in terms of solid waste generation and energy consumption.

(9) Cultural Resources. The No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative could result in fewer impacts to cultural resources than the proposed project based on the fact that fewer acres would be disturbed by construction and less development overall would result. However, under this alternative, there is still a chance for unknown resources to be impacted. In addition, the Draft General Plan provides a benefit by requiring updates to cultural resource inventories and a map of sensitive areas for use throughout project review. Therefore, while the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would result in less development than the proposed project, like the Draft General Plan, it could result in significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural resources.

(10) Biological Resources. As previously stated, because the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would restrict additional development to only that level allowed under the 1983 General Plan, the total amount of acreage converted to non-agricultural development would be less than the level proposed under the Draft General Plan. Agricultural areas within the County provide important habitat for wildlife including: oak woodlands that provide nesting and foraging habitat for numerous birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians; rice fields used by ducks, shorebirds and other water birds; and grazing lands that support foraging raptors and California tiger salamanders. Although the total level of development allowed under this alternative would be less than under the proposed project, this development would not be restricted to urban growth boundaries. Without limits to growth, greater fragmentation of habitats could occur throughout the County than under the Draft General Plan.

In addition, since growth would not be confined to growth boundaries under this alternative, less systematic agricultural and open space preservation than would occur under the proposed project. The Draft General Plan is more likely to result in successful agricultural land preservation than under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative because of the emphasis on economic development and the inclusion of goals to remove regulatory hurdles, targeted sites, marketing, and policies for processing sites. As such, while there would be a slightly higher loss of agricultural land due to more development allowed under the proposed project, it is likely that the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would be less successful in preserving agricultural land and biological resources over the life of the General Plan. Therefore, the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would result in similar level of impacts to biological resources as the Draft General Plan.

(11) Hydrology and Water Quality. The potential for adverse impacts related to hydrology and water quality for the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would generally be less than those of the proposed project because less development would take place; however, development that would occur under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative may be more susceptible to regional flood hazards because of a lack of levee improvement. Risk in the County from coastal hazards, such as extreme high tides, tsunamis, or sea level rise would be similar to those under the Draft General Plan. Unlike the Draft General Plan, this alternative would not regulate land using a smart growth framework and policies that address climate change issues. The No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would result in similar minimal impacts to regional groundwater aquifer recharge, dam inundation risks, and erosion and sedimentation impacts as the proposed project. Overall, the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would result in similar impacts than the proposed project.

(12) Geology, Soils, Seismicity and Mineral Resources. The potential adverse effects related to geology, soils, seismicity and mineral resources under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would similar to the proposed project. Geohazards and active faults are located in the vicinity of the County and seismic shaking is a potential risk to residents. Building construction and seismic safety are primarily regulated through State programs such as the California Building Code; however, the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would not benefit from the additional protection provided by the policies and actions of the proposed project which would reduce risks related to geohazards. County programs, separate from the proposed project, manage mineral resources in the County and mineral resource impacts would be similar under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative. Overall, the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would result in similar impacts as the proposed project.

(13) Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Existing regulations and 1983 General Plan policies related to hazardous materials, emergency response, aviation hazards, and wildfire prevention would serve to reduce many hazardous materials, and public health and safety impacts, to a less-than-significant level. As discussed in Section IV.M, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, development on former agricultural properties could expose future workers and residents to health risks from agricultural chemical residues in soils. As the area developed would be smaller under this alternative, the potential for exposure to agricultural chemical residues would affect fewer future workers and residents. However, the impact would remain significant. In addition, the net beneficial effects of the proposed project identified in Section IV.M would not occur under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative. For example, proposed project policy Action HS-46, which would require environmental assessment of former commercial and industrial properties proposed for

redevelopment, would not be implemented, which could expose future workers and residents to contamination from these former land uses. Overall public health and safety under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative are expected to be similar to those analyzed under the Draft General Plan.

(14) Visual and Scenic Resources. Under the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative, the total level of development allowed would be less than that allowed under the Draft General Plan, but would not benefit from the Draft General Plan policies that preserve and enhance the County's visual quality and scenic character and limit poorly-designed or located new development. As a result, although the total amount of development would be less than under the proposed project, the impacts of new development could result in a greater overall reduction in the visual quality throughout the County. Significant and unavoidable impact from new sources of light and glare would also occur under this alternative. As a result, build-out of this alternative would have similar overall impacts to visual and scenic resources as those anticipated to occur under the Draft General Plan.

c. Achievement of Project Objectives. This section provides a discussion concerning whether, in comparison to the Draft General Plan, the No Project alternative achieves the project objectives, as listed previously.

- **Successful Agriculture.** The No Project alternative would allow for successful agriculture, and the total amount of acreage converted to non-agricultural uses would be less than under the proposed project. However, the Draft General Plan is more likely to result in successful agricultural land preservation than under the No Project alternative because of the Draft General Plan's emphasis on agricultural economic development and the inclusion of goals to remove regulatory hurdles, targeted sites, marketing, and policies for processing sites. The 1983 General Plan does a good job of protecting the land, but the Draft General Plan takes the approach of protecting the land, the farm, and the farmer.
- **Protected Open Space and Natural Areas.** While fewer acres would be developed under this alternative, the No Project alternative would not achieve the objective of protected strategic open space and natural areas as well as the project. Under this alternative, future development would not be confined by adopted growth boundaries and greater fragmentation of habitat could occur; additionally, the Draft General Plan contains policies that emphasize protecting strategic natural resource areas and their interconnectedness which are not in place in the No Project alternative (1983 General Plan). The project also identifies and sets thresholds for providing community and resource parks which are not a part of this alternative.
- **Distinct Communities.** This alternative does not contain the extensive policy framework included as a part of the Draft General Plan that establishes growth boundaries which contain community growth and a host of other policies to encourage agriculture and open space between the rural towns. While the Draft General Plan allows more growth, the growth is strategic in that it is intended primarily to improve the sustainability of the small towns and ensure their future health. Because under the project additional growth is targeted to the historic rural towns and within defined growth boundary areas, the No Project alternative would not meet the objective of distinct communities as well as the project.
- **Safe and Healthy Communities.** The No Project alternative would not meet the objective of safe and healthy communities as well as the project. The Draft General Plan provides policies that identify and establish service thresholds for public services concerning health and safety

including government services, law enforcement, fire protection, and parks and trails (to promote a healthy lifestyle), etc. that are not contained in the No Project alternative (1983 General Plan). Additionally, this alternative does not propose enough community growth to support overall community improvements to infrastructure and services. Under the Draft General Plan, the towns of Dunnigan, Madison and Knights Landing in particular have been sized and balanced to ensure long-term sustainability.

- **Varied Transportation Alternatives.** The No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative would allow growth at a density that would not sustain regular bus service. It also does not include a comprehensive trail and bikeway system that could provide both recreational and commuter alternatives to vehicular travel. Additionally, the Draft General Plan includes many policies that further support transit, bicycle, pedestrian, aviation, and goods movement compared to the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative. Therefore, the alternative would not achieve this objective.
- **Enhanced Information and Communication Technology.** The No Project alternative would generally not meet the objective of enhanced information and communication technology. While communication infrastructure may be extended to new development if it is adjacent to existing served communities; the low level of development identified under this alternative makes that outcome unlikely. Additionally, the technological advances concerning communication, connectivity and ensuring improved public access to information technology to allow for the provision of government services were not envisioned or incorporated into the No Project (1983 General Plan), as they are in the proposed project.
- **Strong and Sustainable Economy.** The No Project alternative does not meet the objective of a strong and sustainable economy as well as the project. The lower amount of commercial and industrial development identified for Dunnigan, Madison, and Elkhon under this alternative may not be sufficient to provide for the infrastructure and a sufficient amount of housing for workers that supports existing and attracts new businesses. The Agriculture and Economic Development Element of the Draft General Plan contains goals, policies and actions that would ensure that agricultural land is preserved and the agricultural economy is strengthened. Additionally, the project allows for and encourages agricultural commercial and industrial facilities to support and expand the agricultural economy.
- **Abundant and Clean Water Supply.** The No Project alternative (1983 General Plan) would generally meet the objective of securing an abundant and clean water supply as less urban growth than the proposed project is allowed to occur. However, the No Project alternative does not include the minimum infrastructure standards, as does the proposed project, for the Specific Plan areas of Dunnigan, Knights Landing and Madison where the majority of new growth (76 percent of residential units and 39 percent of commercial/industrial acres) would occur. Nor does the alternative provide a comprehensive framework of policies that address the conservation of water, the protection of groundwater and recharge areas, and the provision of an ample supply of water to serve new growth. Additionally, because growth under this alternative would occur in a less-concentrated, low-density development pattern, it could result in greater impacts to high and moderate groundwater recharge areas and so could inhibit the supply of water.
- **Reduction of Greenhouse Gases and Adaptation to Climate Change.** The No Project alternative would not meet the objective of reducing greenhouse gases and adaptation to climate change as well as the project. The development pattern allowed under the No Project alternative would not result in the smart growth sustainable development pattern that ultimately will allow

for successful adaptation to climate change. The overall amount of development is less under this alternative. There may be less overall energy use associated with this alternative however it does not include the policy framework and requirements to minimize overall energy use and ensure green construction and operation of all types of land uses. Therefore the per capita energy usage is expected to be higher than for build-out the Draft General Plan. This alternative will likely result in fewer vehicle miles traveled (VMT) overall which would result in lower emissions of greenhouse gases overall, however the Draft General Plan is anticipated to have lower per capita rates of VMT and GHG emissions due to both the policy framework and land use pattern,(as noted above, approximately 30 percent less VMT are expected under this alternative than the Draft General Plan). The Draft General Plan includes policies that are intended to create sustainable towns and communities with balanced housing, jobs, and services. By creating full-service communities designed around sustainable principles, the Draft General Plan will help reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions, not just for new growth but for existing development as well. The No Project alternative (1983 General Plan) does not contain any policies or programs that explicitly address greenhouse gas emissions or global climate change. The goals, policies and actions in the Draft General Plan would provide more stringent environmental protection and greater accountability in the regulation of activities that cause greenhouse gas emissions (such as the VMT threshold for the Specific Plan areas) than the No Project alternative (1983 General Plan).

2. Rural Sustainability Alternative

The following provides a brief description and comparison of the Rural Sustainability alternative to the proposed project.

a. Principal Characteristics. The Rural Sustainability alternative was one of the original alternatives considered.⁶ This alternative would result in a modest amount of growth which would be less than the Draft General Plan but greater than the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative as shown in Tables V-1 and V-2. This alternative assumes build-out of the 1983 General Plan plus additional growth, which would be distributed among several unincorporated communities. This alternative seeks to increase the level of economic development and restrict rural residential suburban growth.

Under the Rural Sustainability alternative, the County would result in a total of 44,926 residents, 14,241 housing units, and 2,345 acres of commercial/industrial development by 2030. This growth represents approximately 31 percent fewer persons, 65 percent of the residential units, and 80 percent of the commercial/industrial acres of development as the proposed project.

Residential growth under the Rural Sustainability alternative would be distributed somewhat differently than under the proposed project. The majority of the growth would occur in Dunnigan, with 2,500 dwelling units and similar non-residential as allowed under the proposed project. In Madison, all of the same non-residential growth would be allowed as under the Draft General Plan. No added residential growth would be included. In Esparto, there would be no change to the property

⁶ Design, Community & Environment, 2006. Yolo County General Plan Alternatives Overview and Analysis. September 8.

Design, Community & Environment, 2006. Yolo County General Plan Alternatives Evaluation. December 6.

south of SR16, and additional residential units would be added in town. The commercial/industrial development in Elkhorn would be reduced to 280 acres.

This alternative includes the smart growth policy framework proposed by the Draft General Plan. However, since this alternative proposes less development than the Draft General Plan, there would not be a high enough level of development to achieve sustainability within the communities in terms of issues such as the provision of adequate infrastructure.

b. Analysis of Rural Sustainability Alternative. The Rural Sustainability alternative is compared to the proposed project for each environmental topics below:

(1) Land Use and Housing. The Rural Sustainability alternative would result in less residential (7,820 fewer units) and fewer acres of commercial/industrial development and resulting jobs (10,782 less jobs) overall than the Draft General Plan. This alternative would focus residential growth primarily in Dunnigan. This alternative contemplates less growth overall (both as infill and adjacent to existing community areas), and therefore the potential for division and disruption to an existing community is less likely to occur. The Rural Sustainability alternative could create substantial incompatibilities between land uses (e.g., between residential and agricultural uses; or residential and commercial or industrial uses) especially where new growth is adjacent to agricultural land. In particular, incompatibilities and alterations in the type or intensity of land use within an area may occur under this alternative with the addition and increase in density of new housing in Dunnigan, Knights Landing and Monument Hills; the additional highway service commercial in Yolo, and the industrial parks proposed for the Spreckels site and Elkhorn. Although less growth is proposed under this alternative, it would not be limited to growth boundary areas as it would under the proposed project, and therefore the potential for impacts related to land use incompatibilities and changes in intensity are likely to be similar to the proposed project.

Development under this alternative could result in the displacement of people or housing through the conversion of agricultural land to other uses, and the potential loss of existing farm dwellings on agricultural lands. Housing in rural agricultural areas is more restricted under this alternative than under the proposed project. The distribution and amount of allowed uses would not substantially improve the County's existing jobs/housing imbalance. Development under this alternative would exacerbate the overall unincorporated County jobs and housing ratio imbalance (currently at 2.8 jobs per housing unit) by increasing it to 2.9 jobs/housing compared to the proposed project which would reduce it to 2.4 overall.

The type and distribution of growth under this alternative would generally support SACOG's Blueprint principles, but to a lesser degree than the Draft General Plan, as growth is designated as infill and spread among several existing unincorporated communities to promote compact development and conserve agriculture and natural resources. However, it would not necessarily require quality design and mixed-use development, or allow for a sufficient amount of development to support alternative transportation choices or housing choice and diversity. This alternative would not provide a sufficient level of growth within the communities to support and pay for needed services and infrastructure as does the proposed project. The Rural Sustainability alternative would generally not conflict with the plans and policies of other jurisdictions. Overall, the Rural Sustainability alternative would result in similar, but slightly less, land use impacts compared to the proposed project.

(2) **Agriculture.** Under the Rural Sustainability Alternative, approximately 65 percent less housing and 80 percent commercial/industrial acreage would result than those amounts proposed under the proposed project. Additionally, new development would be restricted to fewer areas, further reducing the potential negative impacts on agricultural resources from new development. Because less acreage would be required for new housing and commercial or industrial development, the amount of acreage removed from agricultural use for these non-agricultural uses would be less than that proposed under the Draft General Plan. Significant and unavoidable impacts occurring under the proposed project would also occur under this alternative, although to a lesser extent than those anticipated under the proposed project. Overall, this alternative would result in less impact to agricultural resources than the proposed project.

(3) **Transportation and Circulation.** The Rural Sustainability alternative includes concentration of development in the unincorporated communities such as Esparto, Elkhorn, and Dunnigan; but at significantly less development levels than contemplated in the Draft General Plan. The additional residential development identified in Dunnigan under the Rural Sustainability alternative does not include the prescriptive jobs to housing match under the Draft General Plan. In addition, the revised Draft General Plan would include a new VMT threshold policy. Therefore, there is no assurance that the Rural Sustainability alternative would achieve a VMT generated per household of less than 77 as estimated by the SACSIM model for the unincorporated area by 2035.

As shown in Table V-5, total VMT under the Rural Sustainability alternative is approximately 18 percent less than the Draft General Plan for the unincorporated area; however, VMT generated per household (including existing households) would be 77 per weekday under the Rural Sustainability alternative versus an average of 60 per weekday under the Draft General Plan. The growth under the Rural Sustainability alternative is substantially less than under the Draft General Plan; however, the Rural Sustainability alternative does not have enough development to support full commercial, school, medical, and recreational services in the growth areas, which will result in longer overall trip lengths.

The potential impacts to transit, bicycle, pedestrian, aviation, and goods movement under this alternative would be similar to the Draft General Plan. However, higher residential densities and supporting commercial and other services in each community under the Draft General Plan could encourage more transit, bicycling, and walking trips and less long distance vehicle trips than the Rural Sustainability alternative. Under the Rural Sustainability alternative, less development would be available to create demand for and capitalize the costs of desired intraregional trails as contemplated by the Draft General Plan (Policy CI-5.6).

(4) **Air Quality.** Development of the Rural Sustainability alternative would result in significant amounts of construction-related emissions, but less than anticipated under the proposed project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1 would reduce the impact of construction-related emissions, but not to a less-than-significant level.

The Rural Sustainability alternative would generate substantially fewer vehicle trips than the proposed project. However, as shown in Table V-7, the resulting regional emissions (ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀) from motor vehicles would still exceed the YSAQMD’s significance criteria and result in a significant and unavoidable (SU) impact. The model results are provided in Appendix D.

Table V-7: Rural Sustainability Alternative - Motor Vehicle Emissions

	Reactive Organic Gases	Nitrogen Oxides	PM₁₀
Operational Emissions	80.3	135.1	100.0
YSAQMD Significance Threshold	10.0 tons/year	10.0 tons/year	80.0 pounds/day
Exceed?	Yes	Yes	Yes

Source: LSA Associates, Inc., 2009.

The Rural Sustainability alternative would not substantially contribute to or lead to potential violations of carbon monoxide (CO) standards, nor would it result in significant odor impacts. The increase in residential units, population, and employment includes development not assumed in the most recently adopted 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan forecast, and therefore, the proposed air quality plan. Therefore, the Rural Sustainability alternative would not be consistent with the air quality attainment plans and would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

(5) Noise. Under build-out of this alternative, overall average daily traffic volumes would not increase as significantly as they would under the proposed project, thus resulting in overall smaller increases in traffic noise levels on highway and roadway segments throughout the County. It is expected that traffic noise levels under this alternative would result in a less than significant permanent increase in traffic noise levels without mitigation. However, build-out of this alternative would result in the exposure of new noise sensitive land use development to excessive traffic noise levels along roadway segments throughout the County. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impacts from aircraft, railroad, mining, and farming noise sources would remain less-than-significant under build-out of this alternative. It is expected that build-out under this alternative would result in significant and unavoidable construction noise impacts. Construction activity associated with build-out of this alternative would expose noise sensitive receptors to excessive interior noise levels. Project-related construction noise impacts on sensitive receptors throughout the County would remain significant and unavoidable.

(6) Global Climate Change. Development of the Rural Sustainability alternative would result in significant amounts of construction-related emissions, but less than anticipated under the proposed project. The Rural Sustainability alternative would generate less overall GHG emissions (slightly over 1.9 million metric tons) with fewer energy and vehicle-related GHG emissions than the proposed project. However, the Rural Sustainability alternative does not guarantee low VMT, since the towns may not reach a sustainable and balanced (i.e., jobs close to housing and community-serving utilities and services) as the Draft General Plan. The Rural Sustainability alternative would result in slightly less climate change impacts compared to the proposed project; however, the significant unavoidable impacts identified for the proposed project would also occur under the Rural Sustainability alternative.

(7) **Public Services.** The Rural Sustainability alternative assumes less growth than the proposed project and more growth than the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative in unincorporated Yolo County. The decreased intensity of development would result in less demand for law enforcement, fire protection, schools, library, parks, and social services, particularly in Dunnigan, Knights Landing, Madison, and Esparto than under the proposed project. However, under this alternative there would not be enough development allowed to trigger service levels established by the policy framework, or to fund additional public services in the community areas. For example, the satellite government center would likely be infeasible since the government service level would be lower. As such, residents would have to travel farther to reach government services that cannot be administered electronically or remotely. As such, the Rural Sustainability alternative would result in greater significant impacts than the proposed project.

(8) **Utilities and Energy.** Compared to the proposed project, the Rural Sustainability alternative would result in less development in the unincorporated areas of Yolo County. This alternative assumes less development in Dunnigan, Knights Landing, and Madison than allowed under the proposed project. While build-out of the Rural Sustainability alternative would result in less demand for water, wastewater, storm drainage, solid waste, and energy services than the proposed project, the additional growth in Dunnigan would still require new community water, wastewater, and storm drainage facilities, and the upgrade of these facilities in Esparto. However, under the Rural Sustainability alternative, upgrades and improvements would not be feasible because there would be lower levels of growth that would not trigger service thresholds established in the policy framework, or generate enough revenues to support improved infrastructure in existing and new development areas. The additional development proposed by this alternative could also have a significant impact on future water supplies.

Build-out of the Rural Sustainability alternative may result in the generation of less solid waste and consumption of less energy than the proposed project due to the decreased levels of development. However, it is possible the consumption of energy would be around the same levels as the Draft General Plan since development under this alternative would not be high enough that energy improvements to the existing homes could be provided by developers, as is possible under the Draft General Plan.

Even if all of the policies related to utilities from the proposed project are implemented, it would not be able to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The Rural Sustainability alternative would result in significant and unavoidable impacts.

(9) **Cultural Resources.** The Rural Sustainability alternative would result in growth which would be less than the proposed project but greater than the No Project (1983 General Plan) alternative. This alternative would result in fewer people and developed acreage in unincorporated Yolo County than the proposed project. Most development would be directed to unincorporated community areas, places in which a high percentage of the proposed project area's architectural resources occur. The potential for impacts to cultural resources would be slightly less than under the Draft General Plan because fewer acres would be subjected to ground-disturbing construction. Although development would be directed to unincorporated communities, it is anticipated that fewer historical buildings and structures may be demolished or altered to accommodate changes in land use intensity.

(10) Biological Resources. Under the Rural Sustainability alternative, approximately 65 percent of the housing and 80 percent of the commercial/industrial acreage allowed under the Draft General Plan would be developed. In addition, new development would be restricted to fewer areas, further reducing the potential negative impacts on agricultural and biological resources from new development. Because less acreage would be required for new housing and commercial/industrial development, the amount of acreage removed from agricultural use for these non-agricultural uses would be less than under the proposed project. Significant and unavoidable impacts occurring under the proposed project would also occur under this alternative, though to a lesser extent than those anticipated under the proposed project. Overall, this alternative would result in slightly less impacts to biological resources than the proposed project.

(11) Hydrology and Water Quality. The potential adverse effects related to hydrology and water quality would generally be less than the proposed project because comparatively less population growth and development would take place, while implementing the same policies and actions as the proposed project.

(12) Geology, Soils, Seismicity and Mineral Resources. Under this alternative, the potential impacts related to geology, soils, seismicity and mineral resources would generally be similar to the proposed project due to the implementation of similar policies and actions. Even with the reduction and changed distribution in total population and development within the County, this alternative would result in the same potential for impacts to people and structures at risk from geohazards as the proposed project.

(13) Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Build-out of the Rural Sustainability alternative would result in similar impacts to those of the proposed project. As discussed in Section IV.M, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, development on former agricultural properties could expose future workers and residents to health risks from agricultural chemical residues in soils. As the area developed would be less than under the proposed project, the potential impact of exposure to agricultural chemical residues would affect fewer future workers and residents under the Rural Sustainability alternative. However, the impact would remain significant. The mitigation measure identified for the proposed project, requiring testing of soils on former agricultural properties, would reduce the potential impact under this alternative to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this alternative would result in similar impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as the proposed project.

(14) Visual and Scenic Resources. Under the Rural Sustainability alternative, approximately 65 percent of the housing and 80 percent of the commercial/industrial acreage allowed under the Draft General Plan would be developed. Housing development in rural areas would be restricted, and housing development would be concentrated in fewer community areas than that proposed under the proposed project. Because housing would be concentrated in existing community areas and not within rural areas, and because the overall level of development would be less than that proposed under the proposed project, impacts to visual and scenic resources from this development would occur to a lesser extent than that anticipated under the proposed project. The significant and unavoidable impact resulting from additional light and glare would still occur, but all other potential impacts would be reduced, as development would occur in existing communities and not atop ridgelines, between scenic vistas and public viewpoints, or along scenic corridors.

c. Achievement of Project Objectives. This section provides a discussion concerning whether, in comparison to the Draft General Plan, the Rural Sustainability alternative achieves the project objectives, as listed previously.

- **Successful Agriculture.** The Rural Sustainability alternative would meet the objective of allowing for successful agriculture, as the total amount of acreage converted to non-agricultural uses would be less than under the proposed project. This alternative would also restrict further development of housing in rural agricultural areas and would increase economic development.
- **Protected Open Space and Natural Areas.** The Rural Sustainability alternative would achieve the objective of protected open space and natural areas as there would be less development than under the Draft General Plan (approximately 65 percent less housing and 80 percent less commercial/industrial acreage). In addition, new development would be restricted to fewer areas, further reducing the potential negative impacts on open space and natural areas from new development.
- **Distinct Communities.** The Rural Sustainability alternative supports distinct communities but not as well as the Draft General Plan. This alternative does not include enough growth to allow the rural towns to become self-sufficient and sustainable, nor would it support improved infrastructure and public services.
- **Safe and Healthy Communities.** The Rural Sustainability alternative would not meet the objective of safe and healthy communities as well as the project because this alternative proposes less development overall than the Draft General Plan. There would not be a sufficient amount of new development within the towns of Dunnigan, Esparto and Knights Landing to achieve sustainability within the communities in terms of issues such as the provision of adequate public services including those related to health and safety.
- **Varied Transportation Alternatives.** The Rural Sustainability alternative contemplates fewer acres of development in the unincorporated areas of the County including the communities of Dunnigan, Esparto and Knights Landing, and no development in Madison. Because this alternative would generally focus urban growth within existing communities, it does support biking and walking. However, because the amount of development is lower than the Draft General Plan, there would not be a sufficient concentration of homes and jobs within the communities to support increased bus transit opportunities or to create demand for and capitalize the costs of desired intraregional trails. In general, this alternative would not meet the objective of varied transportation alternatives as well as the project.
- **Enhanced Information and Communication Technology.** The Rural Sustainability alternative could potentially meet the objective of enhanced information and communication technology as communication infrastructure services may be extended to new development that occurs as infill or adjacent to existing communities where services exist. However, this alternative does not contain enough growth to support the construction of new technologies and infrastructure for existing communities, and therefore does not achieve this objective as well as the Draft General Plan.
- **Strong and Sustainable Economy.** The Rural Sustainability alternative does not meet the objective of a strong and sustainable economy as well as the project because fewer acres of commercial and industrial development are identified for development and may not be sufficient to provide for the infrastructure and a sufficient amount of housing for workers that supports existing and attracts new businesses.

- **Abundant and Clean Water Supply.** The Rural Sustainability alternative would generally meet the objective of securing an abundant and clean water supply as less urban growth than the proposed project would be allowed to occur. However, because this alternative proposes less development than the Draft General Plan within the communities targeted for sufficient growth (i.e., Dunnigan, Madison, and Knights Landing) to capitalize the costs of the provision of needed services and infrastructure, including water, this alternative may not meet this objective as well as the project.
- **Reduction of Greenhouse Gases and Adaptation to Climate Change.** The Rural Sustainability alternative would generally meet the objective of reducing greenhouse gases and adaptation to climate change as the overall amount of development is less than the project, and the proposed development would generally occur as infill and adjacent to existing communities. However, the jobs/housing relationship in the Specific Plan areas would not be balanced and would not support achievement of the low per capita VMT attainable under the Draft General Plan.

3. Market Demand Alternative

The following provides a brief description of the Market Demand alternative and a comparison to the proposed project.

- a. **Principal Characteristics.** The Market Demand alternative would allow growth to occur throughout the County based on market demand. New development would likely be located on the periphery of existing cities instead of within the city limits. Growth would also occur along corridors in proximity to existing freeways, services, and amenities. Potential areas of growth would include: the Davis area (northwest quadrant and Covell/Pole Line Road); the West Sacramento area (Vina del Lago); the Woodland area (southwest quadrant); and the Winters area (north area). Growth that would occur outside city limits would most likely occur either under County regulations or under a cooperative annexation agreement between the city and County.

The growth allowed under this alternative is similar to SACOG's Blueprint Transportation/Land Use Study base case scenario for the region. The base case scenario is a projection of how the area would grow if current local trends continue. Build-out of the Market Demand alternative would result in a population of 71,165 persons, 24,200 dwelling units, 61,945 jobs, and 3,246 acres of commercial/industrial development within the unincorporated County by 2030. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would result in a population and number of residential units that is approximately 10 percent larger than the proposed project and in approximately 31 percent more commercial/industrial acres of development.

The policy framework under the Market Demand alternative would be similar to the existing 1983 General Plan policy framework and would not incorporate the smart growth policy framework proposed by the Draft General Plan.

- b. **Market Demand Alternative.** The Market Demand alternative is compared to the proposed project for each environmental topics below:

- (1) **Land Use and Housing.** The Market Demand alternative would result in an approximately 10 percent increase in population and dwelling units, and a 31 percent increase in commercial/industrial acres of development, compared to growth that could occur under the proposed

project. New development would be spread throughout the County along transportation corridors and proximate to amenities, as determined by the market, and the greatest growth would occur on the periphery of cities. Increased development at the periphery of cities is contrary to what the cities support, and would be inconsistent with the goal of small, compact, distinct cities and towns. In particular, the area between Woodland and Davis would likely experience development pressure to grow in order to meet demand from UC Davis and Davis. In addition, this alternative could adversely skew the market for infill development within cities by allowing competing greenfield site development opportunities at the borders.

This alternative would result in a similar potential to divide and disrupt existing communities as there will be more growth than under the Draft General Plan and it may be more likely to “jump” current constraining corridors and roadways. More acres of agriculture and natural areas are likely to convert to lower-density urban uses increasing the potential for conflicts between land uses, especially residential and agricultural uses. Development of this alternative would substantially alter the type and intensity of land uses on more acres of land in the unincorporated County to support the increase in housing units (2,139 more) and 901 more acres of commercial development. Because more agricultural land would be converted to urban uses, this alternative has a greater potential to displace people or housing, and the potential loss of existing farm dwellings on agricultural lands.

The total number of jobs and units identified under this alternative does improve the overall unincorporated County jobs and housing ratio imbalance (currently at 2.8 jobs per housing unit) by decreasing it to 2.5 jobs/housing. However, this alternative would not assist in targeting growth to existing towns to allow for a job/housing balance within the communities and the attendant benefits of fewer vehicle miles travelled, improved air quality, more potential for use of alternative transportation modes, etc.

The type and distribution of growth under this alternative does not support SACOG’s Blueprint principles as this alternative would develop under a “business-as-usual” policy framework. This alternative does not promote mixed-use, compact development that supports a choice of transportation modes, housing choice and diversity, and quality design. Development under this alternative would not support and conserve agricultural and natural resource areas. In addition, by not following Blueprint principals, the Market Demand alternative could result in policy conflicts with other County and agency plans in the region that do adopt the Blueprint principals and smart growth policies. As such, this alternative would result in a greater number of significant land use and housing impacts than the proposed project.

(2) Agriculture. Under the Market Demand alternative, future development in the County would include 10 percent more housing and 31 percent more commercial/industrial acreage than that proposed under the proposed project. New development would be located on the periphery of existing communities. As a result, greater amounts of agricultural acreage would be converted to non-agricultural uses as additional land is needed to meet housing and industrial/commercial needs. Where this added development occurs, additional impacts would result from the absence of buffers between development and agriculture. Significant and unavoidable impacts occurring under the proposed project would also occur under this alternative, although to a greater extent than those anticipated under the proposed project. Agricultural industry and commerce would also be negatively impacted by increased traffic along transportation routes and the loss of acreage available for both crop production as well as processing, distribution, and storage facilities. The resulting impacts from

this alternative on agricultural resources would therefore be greater than those resulting from build-out of the proposed project.

(3) Transportation and Circulation. The Market Demand alternative assumes a higher amount of residential and non-residential development would occur in the unincorporated areas compared to the Draft General Plan. The SACOG “business-as-usual” trend scenario for 2050 was used to distribute the expected development under this alternative in the unincorporated areas. This resulted in development occurring mostly around the existing cities and some around the unincorporated communities. The Market Demand alternative is anticipated to have a similar VMT to the business-as-usual VMT of 83 generated per household as estimated by the SACSIM under existing conditions.

As shown in Table V-5, total VMT under the Market Demand alternative is approximately 51 percent greater than the Draft General Plan for the unincorporated area. In addition, VMT generated per household (including existing households) would be 83 per weekday under the Market Demand alternative versus 60 per weekday under the Draft General Plan, which is an increase of 38 percent. The Market Demand alternative includes lower density land uses that are not concentrated in specific areas, while the Draft General Plan includes concentrated growth within existing communities including required sustainable design standards that focus on reducing VMT by striving to achieve a minimum jobs to housing balance and a match between housing and jobs.

Although the Market Demand alternative would locate development near existing cities, it would be at lower residential densities than under the Draft General Plan, which would result in less transit, bicycling, and walking trips. The concentration of higher density residential and supporting services in each community under the Draft General Plan could result in a better mode split in favor of transit, bicycling, and walking.

(4) Air Quality. Development of the Market Demand alternative would result in significant and higher levels of construction-related emissions compared to the proposed project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1 would reduce the impact of construction-related emissions, but not to a less-than-significant level.

As shown in Table V-8, the resulting regional emissions (ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀) from motor vehicles for the Market Demand alternative would still exceed the YSAQMD’s significance criteria and result in a significant and unavoidable (SU) impact. The model results are provided in Appendix D.

Table V-8: Market Demand Alternative - Motor Vehicle Emissions

	Reactive Organic Gases	Nitrogen Oxides	PM₁₀
Operational Emissions	146	248.2	200.0
YSAQMD Significance Threshold	10.0 tons/year	10.0 tons/year	80.0 pounds/day
Exceed?	Yes	Yes	Yes

Source: LSA Associates, Inc., 2009.

The Market Demand alternative would result in an overall VMT that would be approximately 51 percent higher than the Draft General Plan, meaning this alternative will generate greater GHGs as compared to build-out under the Draft General Plan.

Also impacts related to odors would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the County's Draft General Plan Policies CO-6.1, LU-2.1, AG-1.8, and Action CO-A103, and the mining buffer requirements through the CCAP and mining ordinances. This alternative includes development not assumed in the adopted 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is the proposed air quality plan for the area. Therefore, similar to the project, this alternative would not be consistent with air quality attainment plans and would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

(5) Noise. Under build-out of this alternative, overall average daily traffic volumes would be higher than those under the proposed project. It is expected that traffic noise levels under this alternative would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels of 5 dBA or greater increase on County roadways above those without the project. Impacts from increases in traffic noise levels on County roadway segments throughout the County would be significant and unavoidable. Build-out of this alternative would likely result in the exposure of new noise sensitive land use development to excessive traffic noise levels along roadway segments throughout the County. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impacts from aircraft, railroad, mining, and farming noise sources would remain less-than-significant under build-out of this alternative. Build-out under this alternative would result in significant and unavoidable construction noise impacts. Construction activity associated with build-out of this alternative would expose noise sensitive receptors to excessive interior noise levels. Project-related construction noise impacts on sensitive receptors throughout the County would remain significant and unavoidable.

(6) Global Climate Change. Development of the Market Demand alternative would result in significant levels of construction-related emissions above those projected for the Draft General Plan. The Market Demand alternative would generate higher levels of overall GHG emissions (slightly over 2.3 million metric tons) with higher energy and vehicle-related GHG emissions than the proposed project. The Market Demand alternative would result in significant increases in vehicle trips and miles traveled over the Draft General Plan on both a total and per-capita basis. The increased amount of residential and commercial development would also generate higher demand for energy usage and associated GHG emissions. The Market Demand alternative would result in higher GHG emissions and greater climate change impacts compared to the proposed project. These impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

(7) Public Services. In total, the Market Demand alternative would result in more development and a higher residential population than the proposed project. Under this alternative, the majority of new growth would likely occur around Davis, West Sacramento, Woodland, and the Winters area, with relatively little growth occurring in the areas designated for growth under the proposed project. As such, this alternative would result in similar or greater impacts to law enforcement, fire protection, schools, library, parks, and social services in the areas designated for growth in the proposed project depending on whether these services are provided by the County or the cities. If annexation did not occur and this development remained under County jurisdiction, the County or service district may have to provide duplicative, parallel services and infrastructure resulting in added costs and less efficiency in service delivery overall. In addition, under this alternative, the overall net increase in demand for services would be more difficult to serve because the development patterns would not be as compact and dense as the Draft General Plan. Less

development in small towns in the unincorporated County could be detrimental since there would be no ability to leverage new development to improve service levels and quality of life for the existing community. Therefore, the Market Demand alternative would result in greater impacts than the proposed project.

(8) Utilities and Energy. Build-out of the Market Demand alternative would result in more development and residents than the proposed project, which would result in additional demand for water, wastewater, storm drainage, solid waste and energy services in the County. This EIR determined that the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable water and wastewater impacts, and while this alternative would focus growth around the unincorporated cities instead of the rural communities, the addition of more residents to the County would still require more water and wastewater services than the proposed project. In addition, build-out of the Market Demand alternative would result in the generation of more solid waste and consumption of more energy than the proposed project. Therefore, the Market Demand alternative would result in greater impacts related to utilities and energy than the proposed project.

(9) Cultural Resources. The Market Demand alternative would result in growth which would be greater than the proposed project, the No Project (1983 General Plan) Alternative, and the Rural Sustainability Alternative. This alternative would result in more people and developed acreage in unincorporated Yolo County than the proposed project. Most development would be directed to the periphery of incorporated areas. The potential for impacts to cultural resources would be greater under this alternative than under the Draft General Plan because more acres would be subjected to ground-disturbing construction and more development overall would result. Although development would be directed to the periphery of incorporated areas, where it is anticipated that there would be a lower occurrence of historical architecture, more historical buildings and structures could be demolished or altered due to the quantitative difference in development levels between this alternative and the proposed project.

(10) Biological Resources. Under the Market Demand alternative, future development in the County would include 10 percent more housing and 31 percent more commercial/industrial acreage than that allowed under the Draft General Plan. New development would be located on the periphery of existing communities. As a result, greater amounts of agricultural acreage would be converted to non-agricultural uses as additional land is needed to meet housing and commercial/industrial needs. Where this added development occurs, additional impacts would result from the absence of buffers between developments and biological resources. Significant and unavoidable impacts occurring under the proposed project would also occur under this alternative, although to a greater extent than those anticipated under the proposed project.

(11) Hydrology and Water Quality. The potential for adverse effects related to hydrology and water quality would be greater under the Market Demand alternative as compared to the proposed project, because total proposed development is greater than under the proposed project. However, the impacts resulting from build-out of the Market Demand alternative would still be reduced to a less-than-significant level by adoption of the policies and actions of the proposed project.

(12) Geology, Soils, Seismicity and Mineral Resources. Under this alternative, the potential for adverse effects related to geology and seismicity would be greater than the proposed project due to the increase in population and structures. However, the Market Demand alternative would include

the polices and actions of the proposed project, which would reduce these potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

(13) Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Build-out of the Market Demand alternative would result in similar impacts as those for the proposed project. As discussed in Section IV.M, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, development on former agricultural properties could expose future workers and residents to health risks from agricultural chemical residues in soils. As the area developed would be greater than under the proposed project, the potential impact of exposure to agricultural chemical residues would affect more future workers and residents under the Market Demand alternative. However, the mitigation measure identified for the proposed project, requiring testing of soils on former agricultural properties, would reduce the potential impact under this alternative to a less-than-significant level.

(14) Visual and Scenic Resources. Under the Market Demand alternative, new development within the County would increase, with 11 percent more housing and 31 percent more commercial/industrial acreage than that proposed under the proposed project. This development would occur at the periphery of existing communities and along major roadways and thoroughfares, which would impact public viewpoints and access to scenic vistas along major roadways. Development under this alternative would also likely impact the County's local scenic highways where these roads are conducive to development due to user access and their proximity to major residential and commercial areas. Additional commercial/industrial acreage would increase the significant and unavoidable impact from new sources of light and glare, and would expose greater numbers of residents and visitors to this impact. As a result, impacts to visual and scenic resources from this alternative would occur to a greater extent than those anticipated to occur under the proposed project.

c. Achievement of Project Objectives. This section provides a discussion concerning whether, in comparison to the Draft General Plan, the Market Demand alternative achieves the project objectives, as listed previously.

- **Successful Agriculture.** The Market Demand alternative would likely result in successful agriculture, however, there would be an overall net decrease in agricultural land and net increase in impacts to agriculture. The total amount of acreage converted to non-agricultural uses would increase under this alternative. Additionally, there would be more pressure to convert agricultural land as the decisions on where new development would occur are market driven, and lack the policy framework of the Draft General Plan that protects and supports agricultural and the agricultural economy of Yolo County. While most development under this alternative would take place at the edges of the existing cities, some development would occur in rural agricultural locations as "leap-frog" development that would further put pressure on converting additional agricultural land to urban uses. The Draft General Plan would be more successful in achieving this objective.
- **Protected Open Space and Natural Areas.** The Market Demand alternative would not be as successful in protecting open space and natural areas as the total amount of acreage to be developed would increase under this alternative. Furthermore, this alternative does not include the policy framework of the Draft General Plan, and therefore does not include the open space threshold of 20 acres per 1,000 residents or other polices and actions designed to protect,

preserve, and enhance open space and natural areas. Also, future development would not be confined within growth boundaries and greater loss and fragmentation of habitat would occur.

- **Distinct Communities.** Development under the Market Demand alternative would occur in a dispersed sprawling pattern and would generally be adjacent to the boundaries of existing incorporated cities with a smaller amount around the unincorporated communities. Growth would not be concentrated within the historic rural towns as infill, and therefore, this alternative would not meet the objective of achieving distinct communities in the unincorporated County.
- **Safe and Healthy Communities.** Although, the Market Demand alternative assumes a higher total amount of residential and non-residential development, there would be an insufficient number and intensity of housing units within the rural communities under this alternative to support the provision of public services or facilities such as trails to promote health. This alternative would not meet the objective of safe and healthy communities as
- **Varied Transportation Alternatives.** The Market Demand alternative assumes a higher amount of residential and non-residential development would occur at lower residential densities generally adjacent to existing cities in the unincorporated areas compared to the Draft General Plan. However, because residential densities would be lower, it would result in fewer opportunities for providing a variety of transportation alternatives (i.e., transit, bicycling, and walking trips). Meeting the objective of providing varied transportation alternatives would be less likely under this alternative.
- **Enhanced Information and Communication Technology.** The Market Demand alternative could potentially meet the objective of enhanced information and communication technology as communication infrastructure services may be extended to new development under this alternative as it occurs on the periphery of existing cities, however there is not enough growth assumed in the rural towns to ensure this occurs. Furthermore, the Draft General Plan includes policies and programs that address this issue directly.
- **Strong and Sustainable Economy.** The Market Demand alternative would not meet the objective of a strong and sustainable economy in Yolo County as most of the additional development that is proposed under this alternative is for residential uses. While 31 percent more housing units are proposed over the Draft General Plan, only 16 percent more jobs are proposed. This alternative does not focus on strengthening the agricultural economy, and the dispersed pattern of development would allow for more fragmentation and loss of agricultural land and the businesses and infrastructure that support a healthy agricultural economy. It is unlikely that the agricultural commercial and industrial uses that are identified under the proposed project would occur under this alternative.
- **Abundant and Clean Water Supply.** The Market Demand would not meet the objective of securing an abundant and clean water supply as more residential growth is proposed but without any framework for addressing the conservation of water, the protection of groundwater and recharge areas, and the provision of an ample supply of water to serve new growth. Growth under this alternative would generally not allow for sufficient development to be concentrated in a manner that would support the provision of community-serving utilities or public services in an efficient manner. Additionally, because more low-density growth covering a larger area would occur under this alternative, it may result in more high and moderate groundwater recharge areas being adversely affected and so could inhibit the supply of water.

- **Reduction of Greenhouse Gases and Adaptation to Climate Change.** The Market Demand alternative would not meet the objective of reducing greenhouse gases and adaptation to climate change. As stated above, the Market Demand alternative is anticipated to have a “business-as-usual” VMT of 83 per household and would result in higher levels of greenhouse gases. The growth under this alternative would occur at lower densities. The Market Demand alternative would not result in the development of sustainable towns and communities and does not include a balanced mix of housing, jobs, and services. Without a mix of land uses in proximity to one another, the Market Demand alternative would not achieve a jobs/housing balance within the historic towns or a reduction in energy use and greenhouse gas emissions. It would not meet the objective of a reduction in greenhouse gases and adaptation to climate change.

C. ENVIRONMENTALLY-SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires the identification of the environmentally superior alternative in an EIR from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated. *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(d)(2) states that if the environmentally superior alternative is the no project alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternative.

Table V-3 provides a summary of how the impacts of the alternatives evaluated in this section compare to the potential impacts of the proposed project, and Table V-4 provides a summary of how well the alternatives meet the project objectives. Based on the evaluation described in this section, the Rural Sustainability alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative because it would reduce impacts in the greatest number of topic areas compared to the Draft General Plan. As shown in Table V-3, the Rural Sustainability alternative is the only alternative that would not result in greater impacts than the proposed project, and instead would result in a greater number of lesser impacts than the other two alternatives. However, the overall level of remaining significant and unavoidable impacts is similar between the Rural Sustainability alternative and the Draft General Plan. Furthermore, none of the analyzed alternatives would achieve the entire list of general plan objectives, nor achieve them as well as the Draft General Plan, as shown in Table V-4. As compared to each of the alternatives, this analysis demonstrates that adoption of the Draft General Plan would be the superior choice when comparing and balancing land use, policy, economic viability, environmental impact, and community value.

D. COMPARISON OF DRAFT GENERAL PLAN PROJECT SITE ALTERNATIVES

As a part of the Draft General Plan, there are two locations where alternative sites for particular land uses are under consideration: the Clarksburg Agricultural Industrial Site (winery and grape crush facilities) and the I-505 Commercial General Site (highway commercial development). Both are described in Section III, Project Description and summarized below.

1. Clarksburg Agricultural Industrial Site Alternatives

Per Policy CC-3.14 of the Draft General Plan, three alternative sites have been identified in Clarksburg for development of a future winery-related agricultural industrial facility. Only one site is intended for the described development. The future project is intended to complement and assist in

establishing a successful critical mass of grape processing facilities to support emerging wineries. The three sites are described below and shown in Figure III-4:

- **Site A** is approximately 107 acres and is located south of Willow Point Road, on both the east and west sides of State Route 84 (Jefferson Boulevard), approximately 3 miles west of the town of Clarksburg and 5 miles south of the City of West Sacramento. This site is located in the Primary Zone of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan (LURMP) and future land uses are subject to the jurisdiction of the Delta Planning Commission.
- **Site B** is approximately 103 acres and located south of County Road 158 and west of SR 84 (Ryer Avenue), immediately adjoining the Port of West Sacramento Deep Ship Channel, approximately 2 miles north of the Sacramento County line and 8 miles southwest of the town of Clarksburg. This site is located in the Primary Zone of the LURMP and future land uses are subject to the jurisdiction of the Delta Planning Commission.
- **Site C** includes an area totaling approximately 1,783 acres bounded on the north by the City of West Sacramento, on the east by South River Road, on the south by Babel Slough and an unnamed water feature, and on the west by SR 84 (Jefferson Boulevard). However, only approximately 103 acres are assumed for a future facility. The area is approximately 4 miles northwest of the town of Clarksburg. The specific area shown as vacant is located east of SR 84, immediately south and adjoining the City of West Sacramento. This site is located in the Secondary Zone of the LURMP.

2. I-505 Commercial General Site Alternatives

Per Policy CC-3.15, there are two alternative sites that have been identified in the Draft General Plan for the location of approximately 15 acres of highway commercial or agricultural commercial uses at either I-505 and County Road 14 or at I-505 and County Road 12A. Only one site is intended to be developed. The two sites are described below.

- The I-505/County Road 14 site is located at the southwest corner of the I-505/County Road 14 interchange, approximately 4 miles west of the Town of Zamora and 5 miles south of the Town of Dunnigan.
- The I-505/County Road 12A site is located at the southeast corner of the I-505/ County Road 12A interchange, approximately 3 miles south of the Town of Dunnigan and 3 miles northwest of the Town of Zamora.

3. Comparative Analysis of Environmental Impacts

For each of these two areas, each alternative site has been comparatively analyzed for its potential environmental effects, within the impact areas analyzed for the Draft General Plan. A summary of the results of this analysis are provided in Table V-9 for the Clarksburg Agricultural Industrial Site Alternatives and in Table V-10 for the I-505 Commercial General Site Alternatives.

Table V-9: Clarksburg Agricultural Industrial Alternative Comparative Impact Analysis

Environmental Topics	Proposed Project		Relative Level of Impact Compared with Proposed Project		
	Significant Impact	Level With Mitigation	Site A (North of Babel Slough)	Site B (South of County Road 158)	Site C (South of Willow Point Road)
Land Use and Housing	LU-1 (divide/disrupt community)	LTS	=	=	=
	LU-2 (incompatible land uses)	SU	<	<	<
	LU-3 (alter type and intensity of use)	SU	<	<	<
	LU-4 (jobs/housing imbalance)	SU	<	<	<
	LU-5 (conflicts with other agency plans)	LTS	<	<	<
Agricultural Resources	AG-1 (loss of agricultural land)	SU	<	<	<
	AG-2 (loss of Williamson Act lands)	SU	=	=	=
	AG-3 (loss of agricultural soils)	SU	<	<	<
	AG-4 (land use conflicts with agricultural activities)	LTS	<	<	<
Transportation and Circulation	CI-1 (increase in VMT)	SU	<	<	<
	CI-2 (exceed County LOS threshold)	SU	<	<	<
	CI-3(exceed roadway capacity)	SU	<	<	<
	CI-4 (exceed CMP LOS thresholds)	SU	<	<	<
	CI-5 (exceed city LOS thresholds)	SU	<	<	<
	CI-6 (exceed Caltrans LOS thresholds)	SU	<	<	<
	CI-7 (increase travel on substandard roadways)	SU	<	<	<
	CI-8 (increase travel on substandard State facilities)	SU	<	<	<
	CI-9 (policy conflicts)	SU	<	<	<
Air Quality	AIR-1 (increase construction emissions)	SU	<	<	<
	AIR-2 (increase operational emissions)	SU	<	<	<
	AIR-3 (exposure to toxics)	LTS	=	=	=
	AIR-4 (cumulative impacts)	SU	=	=	=
	AIR-5 (conflicts with other agencies)	SU	=	=	=
Noise	NOI-1 (increase traffic noise)	SU	<	<	<
	NOI-2 (noise effects on sensitive uses)	LTS	=	=	=
	NOI-3 (increase ambient noise)	SU	<	<	<
	NOI-4 (exposure to groundborne vibration)	LTS	=	=	=
Global Climate Change	GCC-1 (contribute to GCC)	SU	<	<	<
	GCC-2 (adverse affects from GCC)	SU	=	<	<
Public Services	PUB-1 (increase demand for fire services)	LTS	<	<	<
	PUB-1 (increase demand for schools)	LTS	<	<	<
	PUB-2 (increase demand for parks)	LTS	<	<	<
Utilities and Energy	UTIL-1 (increase water demand)	SU	<	<	<
	UTIL-2 (increase demand groundwater resources)	SU	<	<	<
	UTIL-3 (greater wastewater flows)	LTS	=	=	=
Cultural Resources	CULT-1 (loss of historical resources)	SU	<	<	<
	CULT-2 (loss of archeological resources)	SU	<	<	<
Biological Resources	BIO-1 (loss of riparian habitat)	SU	<	<	<
	BIO-2 (loss of wetlands)	SU	<	<	<
	BIO-3 (loss of oak woodlands)	SU	<	<	<
	BIO-4 (disrupt movement corridors)	SU	<	<	<
	BIO-5 (loss of special-status species)	SU	<	<	<
	BIO-6 (loss of habitat)	SU	<	<	<
Hydrology and	HYD-1 (overdraft aquifers)	LTS	<	<	<

Table V-9 *Continued*

Environmental Topics	Proposed Project		Relative Level of Impact Compared with Proposed Project		
	Significant Impact	Level With Mitigation	Site A (North of Babel Slough)	Site B (South of County Road 158)	Site C (South of Willow Point Road)
Water Quality	HYD-2 (flood hazards)	SU	<	<	<
	HYD-3 (sea level rise)	SU	=	<	<
Geology, Soils, Seismicity and Mineral Resources	GEO-1 (loss of unique feature)	LTS	=	=	=
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	HAZ-1 (chemical residues)	LTS	=	=	=
	HAZ-2 (disrupt emergency response)	SU	<	<	<
	HAZ-3 (airstrip hazards)	LTS	=	=	=
Visual and Scenic Resources	VIS-1 (visual character)	SU	<	<	<
	VIS-2 (light/glare)	SU	<	<	<

Notes:

SU = Significant and Unavoidable impact(s) = the impact is similar to the proposed project
LTS = Less Than Significant impact(s) < the impact is less than proposed project
 > the impact is greater than proposed project

Source: Tschudin Consulting Group, 2009.

Table V-10: Interstate 505 Highway Commercial Alternative Comparative Impact Analysis

Environmental Topics	Proposed Project		Relative Level of Impact Compared with Proposed Project With Mitigation	
	Significant Impact	Level With Mitigation	SITE A (County Road 14)	SITE B (County Road 12A)
Land Use and Housing	LU-1 (divide/disrupt community)	LTS	=	=
	LU-2 (incompatible land uses)	SU	<	<
	LU-3 (alter type and intensity of use)	SU	=	=
	LU-4 (jobs/housing imbalance)	SU	=	=
	LU-5 (conflicts with other agency plans)	LTS	<	<
Agricultural Resources	AG-1 (loss of agricultural land)	SU	=	=
	AG-2 (loss of Williamson Act lands)	SU	=	=
	AG-3 (loss of agricultural soils)	SU	=	=
	AG-4 (land use conflicts with agricultural activities)	LTS	<	<
Transportation and Circulation	CI-1 (increase in VMT)	SU	<	<
	CI-2 (exceed County LOS threshold)	SU	<	<
	CI-3(exceed roadway capacity)	SU	<	<
	CI-4 (exceed CMP LOS thresholds)	SU	<	<
	CI-5 (exceed city LOS thresholds)	SU	<	<
	CI-6 (exceed Caltrans LOS thresholds)	SU	<	<
	CI-7 (increase travel on substandard roadways)	SU	<	<
	CI-8 (increase travel on substandard State facilities)	SU	<	<
	CI-9 (policy conflicts)	SU	<	<
Air Quality	AIR-1 (increase construction emissions)	SU	<	<
	AIR-2 (increase operational emissions)	SU	=	=
	AIR-3 (exposure to toxics)	LTS	=	=
	AIR-4 (cumulative impacts)	SU	=	=
	AIR-5 (conflicts with other agencies)	SU	=	=
Noise	NOI-1 (increase traffic noise)	SU	=	=
	NOI-2 (noise effects on sensitive uses)	LTS	=	=
	NOI-3 (increase ambient noise)	SU	<	<
	NOI-4 (exposure to groundborne vibration)	LTS	=	=
Global Climate Change	GCC-1 (contribute to GCC)	SU	<	<
	GCC-2 (adverse affects from GCC)	SU	<	<
Public Services	PUB-1 (increase demand for fire services)	LTS	<	<
	PUB-1 (increase demand for schools)	LTS	<	<
	PUB-2 (increase demand for parks)	LTS	<	<
Utilities and Energy	UTIL-1 (increase water demand)	SU	<	<
	UTIL-2 (increase demand groundwater resources)	SU	<	<
	UTIL-3 (greater wastewater flows)	LTS	=	=

Table V-10 *Continued*

Environmental Topics	Proposed Project		Relative Level of Impact Compared with Proposed Project With Mitigation	
	Significant Impact	Level With Mitigation	SITE A (County Road 14)	SITE B (County Road 12A)
Cultural Resources	CULT-1 (loss of historical resources)	SU	<	<
	CULT-2 (loss of archeological resources)	SU	<	<
Biological Resources	BIO-1 (loss of riparian habitat)	SU	<	<
	BIO-2 (loss of wetlands)	SU	<	<
	BIO-3 (loss of oak woodlands)	SU	<	<
	BIO-4 (disrupt movement corridors)	SU	<	<
	BIO-5 (loss of special-status species)	SU	<	<
	BIO-6 (loss of habitat)	SU	<	<
Hydrology and Water Quality	HYD-1 (overdraft aquifers)	LTS	<	<
	HYD-2 (flood hazards)	SU	<	<
	HYD-3 (sea level rise)	SU	<	<
Geology, Soils, Seismicity and Mineral Resources	GEO-1 (loss of unique feature)	LTS	=	=
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	HAZ-1(chemical residues)	LTS	=	=
	HAZ-2 (disrupt emergency response)	SU	<	<
	HAZ-3 (airstrip hazards)	LTS	=	=
Visual and Scenic Resources	VIS-1 (visual character)	SU	=	=
	VIS-2 (light/glare)	SU	<	<

Notes:

SU = Significant and Unavoidable impact(s)
LTS = Less Than Significant impact(s)

= the impact is similar to the proposed project
< the impact is less than proposed project
> the impact is greater than proposed project

Source: Tschudin Consulting Group, 2009.