



County of Yolo

John Bencomo
DIRECTOR

PLANNING, RESOURCES AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

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

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

JUNE 10, 11, 12, 2009

Pursuant to Section 65354 of the California Government Code, provide a final written recommendation to the Board of Supervisors regarding adoption of the Draft 2030 Countywide General Plan.

APPLICANT: County of Yolo
Planning and Public Works Department
292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA. 95695

LOCATION: Countywide
SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT:
GENERAL PLAN: Various
ZONING: Various

FIRE HAZARD:
FLOODING: Various
SOILS: Various

REPORT PREPARED BY:

Heidi Tschudin, Project Manager

David Morrison, Assistant Director

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend the following actions to the Board of Supervisors:

1. **HOLD** a series of public hearings to receive public testimony and take final action on the Draft General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report;
2. **RECOMMEND** adoption of the Final Draft General Plan (dated June 10, 2009) including:
a) revision to Figure LU-4 and elsewhere throughout the General Plan to include appropriate references to the Covell Specific Plan; b) revision to Figure LU-7 and elsewhere throughout the General Plan to include appropriate references to the added residential component of the Elkhorn Specific Plan area; c) corrections to tables and text to reflect final land use acreages and other final numbers; and d) any other modifications directed by the Planning Commission during the hearings; and

AGENDA ITEM: 6.0

3. **RECOMMEND** certification of the Draft Environmental Impact Report including rejection of Mitigation Measure NOI-2 as duplicative of policies and actions already in the Draft General Plan, rejection of the alternative General Plan scenarios analyzed in the DEIR, and any other modifications identified by the Planning Commission.
4. **DIRECT** staff to transmit the Planning Commission's actions in writing to the Board of Supervisors pursuant to state law.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

Sections 65353 and 65354 of the California Government Code spell out the requirements and responsibilities of the Planning Commission with respect to adoption of the Draft General Plan. This final series of hearings before the Commission provide the opportunity to satisfy these regulations and culminate the County's General Plan update process.

STAFF PRESENTATION

At the first hearing, the staff will provide an oral presentation summarizing the staff report, the proposed final Draft General Plan, and the environmental review process. Following the presentation, the staff recommends that the Planning Commission work consecutively through each chapter of the Draft General Plan using the following format:

- Commissioner questions
- Public comment
- Commissioner comments
- Intent motion for each Chapter

Following discussion of all nine chapters the staff recommends that the Commission deliberate the Draft EIR and any other remaining aspect of the Draft General Plan that is of interest or concern to the Commission. At the conclusion of the Commission's deliberations final action in the form of recommendations to the Board of Supervisors is required.

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

- Judy Malamut of LSA Associates, Project Manager for the Draft EIR
- Luke McNeel-Caird of Fehr and Peers Associates, Project Manager for all circulation analysis

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is adoption of a new General Plan for the County of Yolo (2030 Countywide General Plan, Yolo County, Revised Public Review Draft, January 20, 2009, as modified by the Board of Supervisors January 21, 2009). The General Plan applies to the unincorporated areas of the County. It establishes County policy, and identifies planned land uses and infrastructure. California State law requires each jurisdiction to adopt a General Plan to guide physical growth within its jurisdictional boundaries.

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

Assuming full build-out of the General Plan by the horizon year of 2030, the unincorporated population would increase from 23,265 currently to 64,700; the number of dwelling units would increase from 7,263 to 22,061; and the number of jobs would increase from 20,818 to 53,154.

Currently, urban land uses exist on about 14,958 acres out of a total of about 621,224 acres that comprise the unincorporated County or about 2.4 percent). Build-out of the General Plan would result in conversion of about 9,908 additional acres to urban uses bringing the urbanized total to 24,866 acres or about 4.0 percent. This represents a net change of about 1.5 percent.

A comparison of land uses allowed under the 1983 General Plan and those proposed under the new General Plan are provided below. It should be noted that (as described in the DEIR) many of these changes represent corrections to the 1983 land use data base to rather than actual changes in land use.

The Draft General Plan is organized into nine chapters as follows: Introduction and Administration, Vision and Principles, Land Use and Community Character Element, Circulation Element, Public Facilities and Services Element, Agriculture and Economic Development Element, Conservation and Open Space Element, Health and Safety Element, Housing Element. Within each chapter the following information is generally provided: introduction and background information, regulatory framework, policy framework (consisting of goals and policies), and an implementation program with specific actions, responsible parties, and timing.

General Plan Summary Comparison of Designated Land Use

Land Use Categories	1983 GP	2030 GP	Difference
Open Space	2,722	51,421	+48,699
Agriculture	603,544	544,937	-58,607
Recreation	1,121	883	-238
Residential	3,237	3,104	-133
Residential Rural (1du/5ac to <1du/ac)	1,668	1,783	+115
Residential Low (1du/ac to <10du/ac)	1,342	1,150	-192
Residential Med (10du/ac to <20du/ac)	196	149	-47
Residential High (≥20 du/ac)	31	22	-9
Commercial	406	633	+227
Commercial General	263	515	+252
Commercial Local	143	118	-25
Industrial	1,195	739	-456
Public	694	7,246	+6,552
Specific Plan	145	3,669	+3,524
Other (roadways, railroads, highways)	8,160	8,592	+432
TOTAL (unincorporated county)	621,224	621,224	0

Note: In acres; corrected June 10, 2009.

The final Draft General Plan (dated June 10, 2009) is available for review or purchase at the public counter of the Planning and Public Works Department at 292 West Beamer Street, Woodland, California 95696. The document is also available online at the County's General Plan website located at www.yolocountygeneralplan.org and at all of the public libraries within the County. Copies of the land use map are available online or can be purchased separately.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED

Since the Board of Supervisor hearings held on January 21, 2009, on the Draft General Plan, staff has received several written comments. The Planning Commission also heard comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report on May 14, 2009. Each of these comments are summarized as follows:

- A. City of Davis (06-02-09): The City supports the principle of directing development to the incorporated cities and unincorporated communities. We assume that any development on the edge of Davis will occur through the City's planning process, will be annexed into the city, will pay its fair share of cost to both the City and County for services including infrastructure, and will be approved only upon mutual consent of both the City and County. Similarly, the City also supports the policy to explore opportunities for mutual benefit. However, there have been no discussions between the City and County of any project proposals to date and consideration of any specific uses and/or locations is premature until appropriate discussions are conducted through the 2x2 process.

The City has the following comments regarding the EIR:

- The EIR should provide sufficient detail to evaluate traffic and noise impacts resulting from development of the Covell/Pole Line property, including analysis of the change from both its existing agricultural condition and its existing Industrial land use designation.
- Traffic impacts within the city can be mitigated through the payment of fees.
- Figure IV.G-1 should be modified to indicate that the City of Davis provides service to the Springlake Fire District south of County Road 29.
- The EIR should assume that the capacity of municipal water and wastewater systems for new development near Davis is limited and that development may not be permitted to connect to city services.
- The EIR's conclusion that there are no feasible mitigation measures to address an increase in traffic-related noise levels resulting from development of the Covell/Pole Line property is incorrect. Examples of mitigation include double-pane windows and additional insulation to existing residences.

Response: The comments regarding the City's assumptions regarding development near Davis are noted. The comments regarding the EIR will be addressed in the Response to Comments volume of the Final EIR for the Draft General Plan.

- B. Rudolfo Duenas (03-06-09): I request that the land use designation for property owned by my client, Mr. Sanchez, in Knights Landing (APN: 056-311-04) be changed from Commercial Local to Residential Medium.

Response: The requested change has been made in the recommended 2030 Draft General Plan.

- C. Esparto Citizens Advisory Committee (05-07-09): It has always been the ECAC's position that the 75 acres of land located south of State Route 16 should not be changed to Residential/Commercial mixed use. We again request that the Board of Supervisors retain the existing Industrial designation.

Response: Staff agrees. Policy CC-3.13, which would have established mixed use development on the 75 acres of existing industrially designated land south of State Route 16 and east of County Road 86A in Esparto has been deleted, per Mitigation Measure LU-1c.

- D. Federal Emergency Management Agency (05-04-09): Please review the current Flood Insurance Rate Maps for Yolo County and note that Yolo County is subject to National Flood Insurance Program floodplain building requirements.

Response: Comment noted and will be addressed in the Response to Comments volume of the Final EIR for the Draft General Plan.

- E. Hendrik Feenstra (02-23-09): I request that the land use designation for land that I own in Madison (APN: 049-440-07) be changed from Industrial to Commercial General.

Response: The requested change has been made in the recommended 2030 Draft General Plan.

- F. Justin Kudo (05-14-09): (Verbal comments to the Planning Commission during the workshop on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.) The Covell property would be a good site for in-fill development.

Response: Comment noted.

- G. Erich Linse (05-14-09): (Verbal comments to the Planning Commission during the workshop on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.) I support the requirement of a threshold for vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and jobs/housing balance in the Dunnigan Specific Plan. Achievement of these goals could include the development of artisan villages, agricultural villages, and senior housing. The Specific Plan should be monitored every two years to make sure that the VMT and jobs/housing balance requirements are maintained. The Specific Plan should also include trails to connect with the hills to the west, address flooding and drainage problems at County Road 8, and encourage transportation modes that don't rely on automobiles, including a port.

Response: Comment noted. Policy CC-3.3 has been proposed for modification to require monitoring of the jobs/housing relationship every five years and Policy CI-3.20 has been added to require the establishment and biennial monitoring of mode split goals. The Dunnigan Specific Plan process will provide the opportunity for consideration of the specific items the speaker has mentioned.

- H. Giacomo Moris (01-28-09): The existing 75 acres of land currently designated as Industrial, located south of State Route 16 should remain Industrial or Agricultural-Industrial. The property should not be changed to mixed use residential/commercial as currently proposed in the Draft General Plan.

Response: Staff agrees. Policy CC-3.13, which would have established mixed use development on the 75 acres of existing industrially designated land south of State Route 16 and east of County Road 86A in Esparto has been deleted, per Mitigation Measure LU-1c.

- I. James Nolan (02-17-09): The Elkhorn Fire Protection District recommends that the Elkhorn Specific Plan include requirements to fully satisfy fire protection impacts created by the proposed project, including consideration of a special district funded by development fees.

Response: Policy CC-3.11 requires that development within the Elkhorn Specific Plan satisfy needs for public services and facilities and protect against exposure to hazards. In addition, Policy PF-5.9 has been added to require that applicants provide a will serve letter from the appropriate fire district confirming their ability to provide service and any terms of service, prior to implementation. No additional changes to the 2030 Draft General Plan are recommended.

- J. North Davis Land Company (02-03-09): We request that Policy LU-6.11 be changed to read: "Innovative housing and mixed use opportunities with an emphasis on seniors that meets internal demand at Covell Blvd./Pole Line Road and coordinated planning with the Hunt-Wesson site."

Response: Policy CC-3.1 has been added to the 2030 Draft General Plan to require that the Covell property (APN: 035-970-33) be developed through the Specific Plan process. As a result, the specific uses and standards related to development of this property will be determined through the Specific Plan process, which will be subject to the jobs/housing balance, community benefits, capital improvements, and climate change measures required in the 2030 Draft General Plan. No additional changes to the 2030 Draft General Plan are recommended.

- K. Mark and Vicki Pruner (04-26-09): On behalf of our property and our neighbors', we request that the land use designation for our three parcels (APNs: 043-271-01, 043-271-02, and 043-271-15) be changed from Residential Low to Commercial Local.

Response: The requested change has been made in the recommended 2030 Draft General Plan.

- L. Eileen Samitz (05-14-09, 05-31-09): (Verbal comments to the Planning Commission during the workshop on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.) The land use designation for the Covell property (APN: 035-970-33) should be changed from Industrial to Agriculture, due to the extensive floodplain, traffic, air quality, safety problems, infrastructure costs, and housing affordability. Designating the site as Agriculture would protect valuable prime farmland, and maintain the existing land use compatibility with adjoining properties. It would be a good site for the location of organic farming.

For these reasons, development of the site has been strongly opposed by a majority of Davis residents. If development is allowed at the site, the upper two-thirds of the property should be preserved, to protect the floodplain and provide a buffer. In addition, Policy LU-6.11 should be deleted, as it may inhibit development of the Hunt-Wesson site

by linking it to the Covell property, which is subject to a Measure J vote with regards to annexation. The Sierra Club does not support the Draft General Plan.

Response: The Covell property has been identified for urban (industrial) development for at least 26 years and likely longer. It is the County's largest industrial property and as such is a significant County land use asset in line with our economic development goals. This property alone represents almost 37 percent of the County's industrial land and 50 percent of the County's vacant industrial land. The Board of Supervisors unanimously voted to retain it for future industrial development as part of the Preferred Land Alternative. It was supported by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for this use throughout the entire General Plan update process.

Policy CC-3.1 has been added to the 2030 Draft General Plan to require that the Covell/Pole Line property be developed through the Specific Plan process. This not only allows for a greater discussion about the land uses and intensity most suitable for the site, but will ensure a broad and comprehensive public review process that is not required under the existing Industrial designation. The site is bordered on four sides by urban uses and its agricultural feasibility is constrained. Environmental impacts such as those described by the commenter can be mitigated or avoided, as part of the public development review process. No changes to the 2030 Draft General Plan are recommended.

- M. Sierra Club – Yolano Group (02-20-09): We support the comments of Chad Roberts regarding the Biological Resources Section of the 2030 Draft General Plan. The current draft is an improvement over existing policies and appears to provide sufficient flexibility to permit everyone to meet the challenges associated with climate change.

We oppose Policy AG-2.9, as it would place constraints on important conservation efforts and would discourage habitat creation or enhancement. We also support not requiring a 300 foot buffer between new habitat areas and existing adjoining agricultural lands. Such a requirement would stifle the creation of habitat areas in many instances.

Response: The comments regarding the Biological Resources section are noted. Staff does not agree with the deletion of Policy AG-2.9. The issue of converting agricultural lands to permanent habitat and the subsequent impacts on adjoining farms continues to be a strong concern for the Board of Supervisors. The proposed policy is advisory, not mandatory, and provides several options to address potential land use incompatibilities. Policy AG-2.9 does encourage the use of buffers within habitat areas to reduce the impact to adjoining agricultural operations, but does not specify a minimum width. No changes to the 2030 Draft General Plan are recommended.

- N. University of California at Davis (05-12-09): We are working with CSU-Chico, the Sacramento Coroner's Office, Transformatix LLC, Richard Kirkwood, and Sheffield Real Estate, with support from law enforcement agencies in Butte, Lake, Sacramento, and Yolo Counties, to locate a Forensic Outdoor Research Training (FORT) facility in unincorporated Yolo County.

Include language in the Draft General Plan as follows: "Work with Federal, State, local, UC Davis, and other agencies to develop and pursue public and private partnerships to

site facilities that benefit and expand training opportunities for forensic sciences.” Also, we request that Policy AG-1.5 be modified as follows:

Strongly discourage the conversion of agricultural land for other uses. No lands shall be considered for redesignation from Agricultural or Open Space to another land use designation unless all of the following findings can be made:

- a. There is a public need or net community benefit derived from the conversion of the land that outweighs the need to protect the land for long-term agricultural use.
- b. There are no feasible alternative locations for the proposed project that are either designated for non-agricultural land uses or are less productive agricultural lands.
- c. The use would not have a significant adverse effect on existing or potential agricultural production on surrounding lands designated Agriculture.
- d. The use would benefit National Security interests and/or promote the extension of the sciences through UC Davis.

Response: Policy LU-6.14 has been added to include the language suggested above. However, the proposed change to Policy AG-1.5 is not recommended. Staff believes that the existing policy is sufficient to allow consideration of a FORT facility, should this project move forward. As recommended, the proposed addition to Policy AG-1.5 is broadly written and would potentially weaken agricultural protections.

- O. Yolo-Zamora Advisory Committee (05-27-09): We unanimously oppose the development of the Dunnigan Specific Plan. The only basis for new jobs in Dunnigan is Interstate 5 and agriculture. It will be problematic to ensure that sufficient numbers of jobs are attracted to Dunnigan, because employers will more likely go to incorporated cities where there is available infrastructure and supply networks. The number of new jobs will not be enough to justify developing a reliable water supply and sewage treatment plant. Instead, Dunnigan will likely become a commuter town. Growth should instead be directed to West Sacramento.

Response: The Dunnigan Specific Plan was accepted by the Board of Supervisors as part of the Preferred Land Alternative. It continued to be supported by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors during the initial review of the Draft General Plan. There are numerous policies that strictly require a balance between the number of jobs and the number of houses, the wages of jobs and the price of houses, and the phasing of construction between jobs and housing in Dunnigan. In addition, new policies limit the number of vehicle miles travelled within the Dunnigan Specific Plan, further reducing the potential for it to become a commuter town. No changes to the 2030 Draft General Plan are recommended.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR STAFF RECOMMENDED CHANGES

Introduction and Administration –Chapter 1

1. Table IN-2 has been adjusted to ensure that employer numbers are consistent with the traffic model used in the EIR.

2. The 1989 County Waste Management Plan and 1993 Household Hazardous Waste Element have been added to the list of County plans that must be consistent with the General Plan.
3. Text has been added to reflect that the 20-year planning period for the General Plan is not a target or goal for build-out.
4. Text has been added to indicate that the Implementation Program will be considered subsequent to the adoption of the General Plan, as part of the County's annual budget process, subject to economic and fiscal realities.

Vision and Principles – Chapter 2

No recommended changes.

Land Use and Community Character Element – Chapter 3

1. Table LU-3 has been clarified to indicate that acreages of the existing 1983 General Plan land use designations are current as of 2007.
2. Section 5 has been corrected to indicate that the Spheres of Influence for each of the four cities are identified in the General Plan as that city's growth boundary.
3. Text has been added to Policy LU-1.1 and to Table LU-4 to indicate that detention basins are compatible uses within the Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Public/Quasi-Public land use designations.
4. Policy LU-2.1 has been revised to indicate that the minimum agricultural buffer width shall be 100 feet, per Mitigation Measure AG-4.
5. Policy LU-2.5 has been added to require that where planned growth would occur on lands under Williamson Act contract, development would be phased where feasible to avoid the need for contract cancellation, per Mitigation Measure AG-2.
6. Table LU-9 has been revised to correct the amount of remaining allowable industrial and commercial growth in the 1983 General Plan.
7. Policy LU-6.12 has been added to encourage the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians to adopt a long-range tribal general plan for trust lands, including a threshold of 44 Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) per day per household, per Mitigation Measure LU-4g.
8. Policy LU-6.13 has been added to encourage DQ University and the University of California at Davis to provide a mix of land uses on their lands that meet or exceed a threshold of 44 Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) per day per household, per Mitigation Measure LU-4h.
9. Policy LU-6.14 has been added to encourage a private-public partnership to develop and pursue the location of a federal forensic training facility in Yolo County.
10. Policies CC-2.10, CC-2.11, and CC-3.3 related to required jobs/housing relationships have been strengthened per Mitigation Measures LU-4a, b, and c.

11. Policy CC-2.13 has been expanded to ensure that the provision of neighborhood parks is phased concurrently with residential development to maintain a threshold of five acres of neighborhood parks per 1,000 residents, per Mitigation Measure PUB-3a.
12. Policy CC-2.16 has been expanded to include paragraph HH, which requires multiple connections for all modes to ensure that transportation is integrated throughout each community, per Mitigation Measure LU-1a.
13. Policy CC-2.17 has been added to require buffers for residential development along the various Interstates, to reduce the impact of particulate and emissions from traffic on future residents.
14. Policy CC-3.1 has been expanded to include the following:
 - a. Update the Community Plan to rebalance the land use designations within Esparto to achieve a jobs/housing ratio of 1.2, per Mitigation Measure LU-1c.
 - b. Prepare a Specific Plan for the Covell/Pole Line Road property, per Mitigation Measure LU-2a. (Note: This will necessitate a revision to Figure LU-4 and elsewhere throughout the General Plan to include appropriate references to the Covell Property Specific Plan.)
 - c. Require that land uses and development capacities identified in each Specific Plan area be modified to meet the community park threshold of 5 acres/1,000 population, per Mitigation Measure LU-2a.
15. Policy CC-3.3 has been expanded to require that the amount of land designated for residential and job-generating uses be evaluated during the Specific Plan process to achieve a balance of 1.2 jobs per household. Each Specific Plan shall include a monitoring program to review the jobs/housing balance every five years. Where there is an imbalance, a moratorium shall be created for the over-built land use type until a new balance is achieved, to the greatest extent feasible (per Mitigation Measure LU-4c).
16. Policy CC-3.5 has been revised to make corrections to Table LU-11. Also, paragraph H has been modified to require multi-modal access between communities separated by Interstate 5, per Mitigation Measure LU-1b. In addition, paragraph L has been added pursuant to Mitigation Measure UTIL-1a, to establish maximum daily water use thresholds (e.g. on a “per-dwelling unit equivalent” (DUE) basis within the Dunnigan Specific Plan, and to use those thresholds for purposes of sizing infrastructure..
17. Policy CC-3.7 has added paragraph E to encourage the Knights Landing Community Services District to consider the use of Sacramento River water for domestic consumption, per Mitigation Measure UTIL-2b.
18. Policy CC-3.9 has been expanded to include paragraph G to require that the need for State Route 16 improvements be identified within the Madison Specific Plan. In addition, paragraph H has been added to encourage the Esparto Community Services District to consider the use of Cache Creek water for domestic consumption.

19. Policy CC-3.11 has been expanded to include paragraph D which would ensure that transit planning for commuting workers would be a key consideration in the Elkhorn Specific Plan. Also, paragraph E has been added to require that the Elkhorn Specific Plan include high density residential development to achieve a balance of 1.2 jobs per household. (Note: This will necessitate a revision to Figure LU-7 and elsewhere throughout the General Plan to include appropriate references to the added residential component of the Elkhorn Specific Plan area.) In addition, paragraph F has been included to identify the need for improvements to the County Road 22/ Interstate 5 interchange as a part of the Elkhorn Specific Plan, per Mitigation Measures LU-4d.
20. Policy CC-3.13 to establish mixed use development on the 75 acres of existing industrially designated land south of State Route 16 and east of County Road 86A in Esparto has been deleted, per Mitigation Measure LU-1c.
21. Policy CC-4.11 has been expanded to require that site-specific information be required for each new development application to ensure informed decision-making and consistency with the General Plan. Such information may include, but not be limited to: air quality, climate change, agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, fiscal impacts, flood risk, hydrology and water quality analysis, geotechnical study, land use compatibility, noise analysis, Phase One assessment, sewer service analysis, storm drain capacity, title report, traffic and circulation study, visual simulation, lighting study, and water supply assessment. Studies shall cover both on-site and off-site improvements and shall meet CEQA technical standards. Where appropriate, studies shall include recommendations to be implemented as part of the project, per Mitigation Measure LU-2b.
22. Action CC-A7 has been clarified to indicate that formal buffer areas shall be provided between all cities and unincorporated communities within the County.
23. Action CC-A34 has been modified to require that the review of development proposals evaluate the potential for land use incompatibility and incorporate design features to reduce such impacts, to the greatest extent feasible, per Mitigation Measure LU-2c.

Circulation Element – Chapter 4

1. Policy CI-1.12 has been reworded to require coordination with the Yolo County Transportation District on amending the Congestion Management Plan to ensure consistency with the 2030 County General Plan. Also, require the monitoring of roadways and the preparation of a deficiency plan, where needed. In addition, consider opting out of the Congestion Management Plan, if appropriate, per Mitigation Measure CI-4.
2. Policy CI-3.1 has been modified and expanded to establish a Level of Service “D” for segments of County Roads 24, 27, 31, and 98. Also, adds a new criterion of right-of-way constraints to the list of factors to consider when allowing exceptions to the LOS levels listed, per Mitigation Measure CI-2.
3. Policy CI-3.18 has been added to require that the Dunnigan Specific Plan incorporate a maximum threshold of 44 vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per household per day. VMT performance shall be monitored with each phase of development. Achievement shall be

determined using a travel demand forecasting model that is sensitive to built environmental variables, including density, diversity, design, and destination. If the threshold is exceeded, additional measures shall be implemented to reduce the VMT levels.

4. Policy CI-3.19 has been added to require that the Knights Landing, Madison, Elkhorn, and Covell Specific Plans strive to achieve the 44 VMT threshold per household per day, to the extent feasible, per Mitigation Measure CI-1b.
5. Policy CI-3.20 and Action CI-A6 have been revised to require that each Specific Plan establish mode split goals for walking, bicycling, and transit. Also, requires monitoring every two years to ensure that these goals are being achieved.
6. Action CI-A29 has been added to establish a regional funding mechanism to fund identified roadway expansion projects, per Mitigation Measure CI-3a.
7. Action CI-A30 has been added to amend the County Facilities Services Assessment (FSA) fee to fund identified roadway expansion projects, per Mitigation Measure CI-3b.

Public Facilities and Services Element – Chapter 5

1. Action PF-A20 has been modified to emphasize the use of special districts to provide funding for operation and maintenance of community parks, per Mitigation Measure PUB-3c.
2. Policy PF-5.9 has been added to require that applicants provide a willserve letter from the appropriate fire district confirming their ability to provide service and any terms of service, per Mitigation Measure PUB-1.
3. Policy PF-6.7 has been added to require coordination with school districts during the preparation of Specific Plans to ensure that new school sites are identified and located within the residential neighborhoods they will serve, per Mitigation Measure PUB-2a.
4. Policy PF-6.8 has been added to require the environmental review for Specific Plans to include the design and siting of new school and education facilities to the greatest feasible extent, to provide environmental clearance for new school construction, per Mitigation Measure PUB-2b.
5. Policy PF-6.9 has been added to encourage the use of Development Agreements to pay the costs of infrastructure and fees to reduce the cost of new school construction, per Mitigation Measure PUB-2c.

Agriculture and Economic Development Element – Chapter 6

1. Policy ED-3.3 relating to jobs/housing relationships has been strengthened, per Mitigation Measure LU-4e.
2. Policy ED-5.6 has been modified to encourage employers to hire locally and assist workers to find homes within the community, and to achieve a balance of 1.2 jobs per household, to the greatest feasible extent, per Mitigation Measure LU-4f.

Conservation and Open Space Element – Chapter 7

1. The Sacramento Valley Conservancy and Putah Creek Coordinating Council have been added to the list of groups involved in open space and conservation efforts within Yolo County.
2. Additional language has been added to describe the organization and efforts of the Blue Ridge Berryessa Natural Area Conservation Partnership.
3. Policy CO-2.14 has been modified to clarify that the limited loss of blue oak woodland and grasslands is acceptable, where the fragmentation of large forests exceeding 10 acres is avoided and losses are offset, per Mitigation Measure BIO-3a.
4. Policy CO-2.22 has been revised to indicate that recreational trails and other features allowed within the 100 foot setback from the top of bank for all lakes, ponds, rivers, creeks, sloughs, and streams should be unpaved and located outside of the riparian corridor wherever possible, per Mitigation Measure BIO-1b.
5. Policy CO-2.37 has been added to ensure that any mitigation preserves habitat in perpetuity, and provides a secure ongoing funding source for operation and maintenance, per Mitigation Measure BIO-1c.
6. Policy CO-2.38 has been added to require that State and Federal approvals be submitted to the County prior to the implementation of projects within riparian areas, per Mitigation Measure BIO-1d.
7. Policy CO-2.39 has been added to require that wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites be preserved to the greatest extent feasible or fully mitigated. Movement corridors shall not become fragmented and isolated from one another, and nursery sites should be avoided when actively used and/or repeatedly used, per Mitigation Measure BIO-4a.
8. Policy CO-2.40 has been added to require that new or retrofitted bridges, and new or expanded roads, to incorporate design and construction measures to maintain wildlife movement corridors, per Mitigation Measure BIO-4b.
9. Policy CO-2.41 has been added to preserve grassland habitat within 2,100 feet of California tiger salamander breeding ponds, per Mitigation Measure BIO-4c.
10. Policy CO-2.42 has been added to require that impacts to State/Federal endangered and/or special-status species be avoided to the greatest extent feasible, or fully mitigated, per Mitigation Measure BIO-5a.
11. Policy CO-2.43 has been added to protect Swainson's hawk foraging habitat by requiring applicants to participate in the Agreement between the California Department of Fish and Game, Yolo County, and the Natural Heritage Joint Powers Authority; or to fully mitigate the impacts subject to State and Federal requirements, per Mitigation Measure BIO-5b.
12. Policy CO-2.44 has been added to require that development projects within 1.3 miles of a known or potential California tiger salamander breeding site perform a site-specific

biological assessment. Potential impacts shall be addressed by either preserving and enhancing existing habitat located within 2,100 feet of an occupied habitat, including a suitable breeding pond; or shall be fully mitigated at a 3:1 ratio, per Mitigation Measure BIO-5c.

13. Policy CO-3.5 has been added to preserve and protect the County's unique geologic and physical features, per Mitigation Measure GEO-1a.
14. Action CO-A52.1 has been added to inventory and map the County's unique geologic and physical features, including special soils and outcrops, per Mitigation Measure GEO-1b.
15. Policy CO-5.3 has been revised to require management of the County's groundwater resources on a sustainable yield basis, per Mitigation Measure HYD-1a.
16. Policy CO-5.16 has been modified to require that all new development have an adequate water supply and to require consultation with appropriate water agencies regarding water supply assessments on all new significant development applications.
17. Policy CO-5.31 has been added to encourage the Esparto Community Services District to consider the use of Cache Creek for domestic consumption, per Mitigation Measure UTIL-2b.
18. Policy CO-5.32 has been added to establish a threshold of no net new water demand, for development within water districts where there is an insufficient water supply, per Mitigation Measure UTIL-2c.
19. Policy CO-5.33 has been added to encourage the increased recharge of aquifers with surplus surface water supplies, per Mitigation Measure HYD-1b.
20. Action CO-A100.1 has been added to create guidelines for local water providers to promote sustainable practices such as recycled and gray water, as well as additional water rights, per Mitigation Measure UTIL-2a.
21. Policy CO-6.6 has been expanded to include a list of Best Management Practices to control dust during construction activities, per Mitigation Measure AIR-1.
22. Action CO-A106 has been revised to require that new development site new sensitive land uses consistent with the recommendations of the California Air Resources Board, per Mitigation Measure AIR-3.
23. Text has been added to indicate that hydroflouorocarbons (HFCs), perflouorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) are greenhouse gasses of concern. In addition, language has been clarified regarding Assembly Bill 32.
24. Action CO-A115 has been modified to use the 1982 County Energy Plan as the basis for the preparation of the Climate Action Plan. Also, the 2030 General Plan would be amended to include the Climate Action Plan upon its adoption.

Health and Safety Element – Chapter 8

1. Action HS-A47 has been modified to require a shallow soil investigation, where any Phase I report has identified agricultural activities prior to 1980, in accordance with the Department of Toxic Substances guidelines, per Mitigation Measure HAZ-1.
2. Policy HS-5.2 has been revised to ensure that development near private and public airports complies with the requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Airport Land Use Commission. In addition, development proposed near existing private landing strips shall be reviewed for potential compatibility issues, per Mitigation Measure HAZ-3.
3. Tables HS-3 and HS-4 regarding existing highway and County road traffic noise levels have been revised. Table HS-5 concerning existing train noise levels has also been updated, as have Tables HS-10 and HS-11 regarding future highway and County Road noise levels.
4. Action HS-A61 has been modified to require that the future Noise Ordinance include standards regarding “quiet” pile driving technology, where feasible, per Mitigation Measure NOI-4.
5. Action HS-A66 has been clarified consistent with Policy CC-2.16S to require that sound walls be avoided to the greatest possible extent.

Housing Element – Chapter 9

1. Language has been added describing the public outreach efforts made by the County over the past several years in developing the updated Housing Element.
2. Appendix A has been added, which provides a review of the status and effectiveness of housing programs used to implement the existing Housing Element.
3. Text modified to be consistent with Table HO-12 regarding jobs and housing.
4. For Table HO-20, text has been added to indicate that according to the California Housing and Community Development Department, up to one-half of the 142 units affordable to very low-income families that are expected to be built between 2008 and 2013, can be assumed to be affordable to extremely low households.
5. Table HO-21 has been revised to accurately reflect the distribution of family income levels as they relate to housing affordability.
6. Analysis has been added indicating that up to 31 percent of households in the unincorporated area are paying too much for their housing, including 17 percent of owners and 14 percent of renters.
7. Text has been added to indicate that overcrowding is generally three times higher among families that rent their home, compared to families that own their home.

8. An extensive discussion has been included describing potential constraints to expand the supply of housing for persons with disabilities, as well as the programs in the Housing Element proposed to remove those constraints. Such programs include: the use of Development Agreements to require new home builders to create “visitable” housing units; new provisions for disabled parking requirements; promoting group housing; and prohibiting discrimination at the time of sale towards persons with disabilities.
9. Language has been added to provide a more detailed explanation of the assumptions used in quantifying seasonal and/or part-time farm employment trends.
10. Text has been included to indicate that affordable housing can be built on properties zoned RS (Residential Suburban), R-1 (Residential One Family), R-2 (Residential One Family or Duplex).
11. A paragraph has been added describing the County’s Planned Development ordinance process and how it can be used to lower regulatory barriers that discourage the provision of affordable housing.
12. An extensive discussion has been included that describes the potential constraints represented by County requirements for on- and off-site improvements related to new development.
13. Additional language has been added to describe the assumptions regarding affordability of new homes built on parcels designated as Agriculture.
14. Yolo County Housing has been added to the list of sources available to provide financial assistance in the preservation of existing affordable housing.
15. Table HO-38 has been updated with more accurate information regarding the contribution of housing projects currently under construction and pending towards the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) established by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) for 2008-2013.
16. Text has been included to provide a more detailed discussion of the assumptions used to estimate the number of various levels of affordable homes on agricultural parcels counted towards fulfilling the County’s RHNA for 2008-2013.
17. Figure HO-4 has been added to illustrate where vacant residentially zoned parcels are located within the unincorporated area.
18. An extensive discussion has been added analyzing the development potential of vacant residentially zoned parcels.
19. Additional language has been included correcting information about infrastructure capacity and its constraint on new housing within the various unincorporated communities.
20. Table HO-42 has been revised to provide accurate numbers regarding how the County meets the RHNA requirements for 2008-2013.

21. Policy HO-1.1 has been revised to include emergency shelters and transitional housing in the list of diverse housing types to be encouraged.
22. Policy HO-4.5 has been clarified to define “visitability” as access for people who have trouble with steps and/or use wheelchairs or walkers.
23. Policy HO-7.2 has been amended to clarify that Clarksburg has additional governmental requirements placed on it by the Delta Protection Commission that constrain the provision of new housing.
24. Table HO-43 has been updated to provide accurate numbers regarding quantifiable housing objectives for the 2006-2013 time period.
25. Action HO-A1 has been clarified to indicate that establishing target ratios of apartments to for-sale housing within each community shall not be used to deny proposed new multiple-family residential development.
26. Action HO-A6 has been added to amend the Zoning Code to designate transitional and supportive housing as a residential use, regardless of the number of residents, and subject to the same conditions as other residential uses in the same zone.
27. Action HO-A7 has been added to require that County regulations be amended, where appropriate, to encourage the development of single-room occupancy units.
28. Action HO-A10 has been revised to require the development of a mobile home park resident ownership program, to provide renters with information about how they can convert their rental units into affordable homeownership properties.
29. Action HO-A16 has been added to support extremely low-income housing by providing and maintaining supportive housing and single-room occupancy units through public and private funding.
30. Action HO-A17 has been added to ensure that ten percent of all low-income units are affordable to extremely low-income households, through Development Agreements, and other mechanisms.
31. Action HO-A18 has been added to coordinate with Yolo County Housing to market the Section 8 housing program and prioritize vouchers to expand opportunities for extremely low-income households.
32. Action HO-A19 has been added to encourage non-profit service providers to refer clients who qualify as extremely low-income households to the Section 8 housing program.
33. Action HO-A22 has been added to create development incentives for the provision of farm worker housing.
34. Action HO-A23 has been added expedite the permitting process for the development of farm worker housing.

35. Action HO-A24 has been added to defer development fees for projects that provide farm worker housing.
36. Action HO-A25 has been added to provide staff assistance to developers who are interested in providing farm worker housing.
37. Action HO-A58 has been deleted, as it is duplicative of Action HO-A21.
38. Action HO-A83 has been added to pursue grants to assist families suffering financial hardship to remain in their homes and to continue the Fair Housing Program.

LAND USE DESIGNATION CHANGES

Staff is recommending a number of changes to the Land Use map for the 2030 Draft General Plan. (Note: As a result of these changes the tables and text of the General Plan will require corrections to reflect the final land use acreages and other numbers.) Several of these changes are at the request of the property owner. Others are in response to specific Mitigation Measures. The remaining changes are to correct errors in the January, 2009 version of the Land Use Diagram and/or to include properties that were inadvertently overlooked previously.

APN	ACREAGE	CURRENT LU DESIGNATION	PROPOSED LU DESIGNATION
CENTRAL LANDFILL			
042-140-11	3.2	Agriculture	Public/Quasi-Public
042-140-13	217.6		
CHILES ROAD (EAST DAVIS)			
033-290-45	14.0	Agriculture	Parks and Recreation
033-290-94	13.6	Agriculture	Public/Quasi-Public
CLARKSBURG			
040-020-22	14.7	Agriculture	Public/Quasi-Public
043-240-08	0.2	Specific Plan	Industrial
043-271-01	0.4	Residential Low	Commercial Local
043-271-02	0.3		
043-271-15	0.2		
043-240-33	0.3	Residential Low/ Residential High	Residential Low
COVELL/POLE LINE			
035-970-33	382.8	Industrial	Specific Plan
ESPARTO			
049-110-01	1.8	Commercial General	Industrial
049-110-18	20.3	Commercial General/ Residential High/ Open Space	Industrial
049-110-19	26.0	Residential Medium/ Open Space	Industrial
049-110-20	24.8		
049-130-42	3.2	Residential Low	Residential Low/ Open Space/ Public/Quasi-Public

APN	ACREAGE	CURRENT LU DESIGNATION	PROPOSED LU DESIGNATION
ESPARTO (continued)			
049-110-02	1.9	Commercial General	Industrial
049-110-03	2.4		
049-150-40	46.4	Residential Low/ Agriculture	Residential Low/ Open Space/ Parks and Recreation/ Agriculture/ Public/Quasi-Public
049-160-15	18.4	Residential Low	Residential Low/ Open Space
049-250-09	16.9		
I-505			
054-180-18 (partial)	15.0	Commercial General	Agriculture
KNIGHTS LANDING			
056-311-04	0.4	Commercial Local	Residential Medium
056-371-10	3.2	Residential Low	Open Space
056-381-17	4.4		
056-381-12	1.2		
056-291-07	0.2	Commercial Local	Public/Quasi-Public
056-293-02	0.4		
MADISON			
049-440-02	2.3	Industrial	Commercial General
049-440-07	1.2		
MONUMENT HILLS			
040-040-40	59.8	Open Space	Residential Rural
NORTH DAVIS MEADOWS			
041-170-16	0.6	Residential Low	Parks and Recreation
041-180-09	0.5		
041-190-11	1.2		
041-120-33	2.6	Parks and Recreation	Residential Low

HOUSING ELEMENT

Of the seven mandatory elements of the General Plan, the Housing Element is the only one that requires “approval” by the state. Pursuant to Section 65585 of the Government Code, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is required to review draft local Housing Elements for compliance with state law and report on their findings. The November 25, 2008 comment letter from HCD concluded that additional work is needed in order for the draft element to be in compliance with the state requirements (Section 65585d). The state’s comments were primarily technical in nature, focusing on either clarification of information presented in the Draft Housing Element, the inclusion of additional data that was not sufficiently detailed, and/or expanded discussions of recommended actions.

The Final Draft General Plan contains revisions to the Housing Element that staff believes will fully satisfy HCD. After adoption of the General Plan (which is currently anticipated to occur in September), the County is then required to resubmit the Element to HCD at which point the

State has 90 days to complete their second review. If the State concludes that the final element satisfies the legal requirements, they will issue a final letter that finds the element “in compliance”. A compliant Housing Element is required in order to qualify for most housing loan and grant programs, is necessary in order to achieve the statutory presumption of legal adequacy afforded by Government Code Section 65589.3, and is necessary in order to take full advantage of opportunities presented under the federal “Stimulus” package.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

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

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

- Assign workload factors (estimated labor hours and staff positions) to each action item
- Establish a priority ranking for each action item
- Confirm the proposed timeframe for completion of each action item

However, as noted in new proposed text in Chapter One the current severe economic and fiscal crisis will affect the County’s ability to implement the General Plan in strict accordance with the targeted timeframes. Crippling budget cut-backs and extensive staff lay-offs face the County at this time. It is anticipated that this crisis will be resolved over time. In the meantime, implementation of the General Plan will be considered as part of the County’s annual budgetary process, subject to economic and fiscal realities.

This process will enable the Board of Supervisors, staff, and the public to better understand and consider the fiscal implications of General Plan implementation, and will allow for structured priority-setting in the future. As currently drafted, the General Plan contains over 500 separate actions. This represents an ambitious vision over the next twenty years, the implementation of which will depend largely on available resources. Allocating resources by assigning priorities to these actions is a fundamental policy decision of the Board of Supervisors that will have significant impacts on the economy, the environment, and on the county budget. Funding for completion of the implementation plans will be an important part of that decision, whether through fees, grants, partnerships, or the General Fund. Public input during future workshops and hearings is encouraged to assist the Board of Supervisors in determining implementation priorities and balancing among factors such as the degree of benefit, cost to the County (including staff time), costs to property owners, and effects on other General Plan policies and actions.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

The County’s Economic Development Strategy (EDS) will be an important implementation tool for the General Plan. Though not a part of the General Plan, a draft of the EDS was circulated

in September 2008, along with the Draft General Plan, so that the public would have an opportunity to review both draft documents together. Several comments were received on the Draft EDS and those have been considered by the County Economic Development Manager. Minor revisions will be made to the Draft EDS to address these concerns and it will be brought forward to the Board of Supervisors for final action concurrent with or following approval of the General Plan.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Overview

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Draft General Plan was released April 28, 2009 for a 45-day review period that ends June 12, 2009. On May 14, 2009 the Planning Commission held a public hearing to receive oral comments on the DEIR. Three people provided comments – Eileen Samitz, Erich Linse, and Justin Kudo. A summary of the oral comments, all written comments received as of this writing, and staff responses are included in the earlier portion of this staff report.

Mitigation Measures

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

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

- Mitigation Measure CI-1e identifies a new policy that would require the establishment of mode split goals (including biennial household surveys to ensure performance) for walking, bicycling, and transit trips within Transit Plan required (per Action CI-A6) for each specific plan area.
- Mitigation Measure UTIL-1a identifies a new policy to establish maximum daily water use thresholds (e.g. on a “per-dwelling unit equivalent” (DUE) basis within the Dunnigan Specific Plan, and to use those thresholds for purposes of sizing infrastructure.
- Mitigation Measure UTIL-2c identifies a threshold of no net new water demand, for development within water districts where there is an insufficient water supply.

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

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

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

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

Significant Impacts

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

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

Alternatives

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

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

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

Findings of Fact

State law requires that the County make several types of CEQA “findings” at the time of final adoption of the General Plan. Findings describe the conclusions reached regarding particular issues, including specific evidence in support of those conclusions. These findings will be prepared for the final action by the Board of Supervisors in September. The required findings for adoption of the General Plan are as follows:

- Certification of the EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15090) – These findings support the adequacy of the EIR for decision-making purposes.
- Findings Regarding Significant Impacts and Project Alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091) – These findings explain how the Board of Supervisors chose to address each identified significant impact, including the mitigation measures adopted or an explanation of why such measures are infeasible. A discussion of the feasibility of project alternatives is also required by this section (see also Section 15126.6f).
- Project Approval (CEQA Guidelines Section 15092) – These findings support the Board of Supervisors’ action to adopt a specified final General Plan.
- Statement of Overriding Considerations (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093) – These findings document the Board of Supervisors’ decision to adopt a specific final General Plan, despite the fact that unavoidable impacts may result, due to other overriding benefits of the plan.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Final Draft 2030 Yolo County General Plan (distributed separately)
Attachment B – Comment Letters