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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR THE YOLO COUNTY SITING ELEMENT

The original countywide Siting Element was prepared in July 1995 and has remained unchanged since that time. In 2011, the University of California Davis Landfill (57-AA-0004) ceased accepting solid waste and final closure is scheduled for summer 2013. Because of this change in solid waste disposal facilities within Yolo County, a revision to the Siting Element is necessary.

The Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939, Sher) requires each county to prepare an Integrated Waste Management Plan. Plans must include a countywide Siting Element. The Yolo County Siting Element accomplishes the following five tasks:

- Identifies solid waste disposal goals and policies for Yolo County;
- Quantifies the remaining permitted disposal capacity in Yolo County;
- Identifies minimum siting criteria from federal and state sources and introduces avoidance and discretionary criteria to be considered in future disposal facility siting efforts;
- Identifies general areas of Yolo County that conform with the minimum siting criteria; and,
- Identifies a program for Yolo County to maintain long-term disposal capacity.

A summary of the findings for each of these tasks is provided below.

GOALS AND POLICIES

The Siting Element identifies ten goals and corresponding policies for the development and implementation of the Element. The goals and policies address disposal issues including the siting, operation, and management of disposal facilities, control of hazardous wastes, public review and input, regional planning, and conservation of disposal capacity.

DISPOSAL CAPACITY

The only permitted disposal facility in Yolo County is the Yolo County Central Landfill (57-AA-0001). As of July 1, 2011, the remaining municipal solid waste (MSW) disposal capacity of the Yolo County Central Landfill (YCCL) is 39,493,850 cubic yards\(^1\). Unitizing an in-place density (including cover soil) of 1,200 pounds per cubic yard the remaining capacity of the YCCL is 23,696,310 tons. Based on historical waste disposal and population projections, countywide permitted MSW disposal capacity is anticipated to expire in approximately 2090, or 79 years from 2011. This projection omits the 75 percent diversion requirement in Assembly Bill 341 and UCD’s zero waste plan, and is thus conservative. The disposal capacity calculation is included in Appendix A

CRITERIA FOR SITING DISPOSAL FACILITIES

The Siting Element identifies a set of minimum exclusionary criteria used to identify potentially suitable areas for new or expanded landfill search in Yolo County. These criteria are drawn from federal and state regulatory sources and include water protection, minimizing seismic risks, geologic stability, and airport safety. The Siting Element also introduces avoidance and discretionary criteria to be considered as part of future new or expanded landfill siting efforts in Yolo County. These criteria address environmental, social, legal, and other issues specific to

---

\(^1\) Closure and Postclosure Maintenance Fund and Corrective Action Fund for the Yolo County Central Landfill, Facility No 57-AA-001 – Year 2011 Annual Report, August 23, 2011
Yolo County. The Siting Element also identifies a landfill siting process that can be followed should permitted disposal capacity fall below the 15-year minimum requirement established by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) or should the county otherwise determine that a new facility is desired.

LOCATION OF GENERAL AREAS

The Siting Element applies the exclusionary criteria to identify general areas of Yolo County potentially suitable for more detailed landfill site search. Figure 3-1 illustrates the application process. In general, the majority of the remaining area after application of the exclusionary criteria includes western-most Yolo County, excluding much of the Capay Valley, and portions of the central county excluding certain airport zones and floodplain areas.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The Siting Element identifies no need for additional permitted MSW disposal capacity to meet the 15-year minimum requirement. Nonetheless, Yolo County recognizes the importance of maintaining long-term capacity assurance. The Siting Element identifies key elements of the county’s long-term disposal capacity maintenance strategy. The key elements include:

- Local adoption of this Siting Element and incorporation into the Yolo County Integrated Waste Management Plan;
- Ongoing use of the Yolo County Central Landfill by the four cities, county and University of California, Davis (UCD);
- Planning for future landfill siting studies;
- Ongoing dialogue with neighboring jurisdictions on potential regional programs; and,
- Consideration of expanded waste reduction and recovery programs as a contingency.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

The Yolo County Siting Element has been prepared in accordance with, and as required by, Public Resources Code (PRC) Division 30, Part 2, Chapter 4, §41700 et seq. and California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 9, §18755 through §18756.7. Upon local approval, this countywide Siting Element will be incorporated into the Yolo County Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) and submitted to CalRecycle for final approval.

The Yolo County Siting Element accomplishes the following five key tasks:

- Identifies solid waste disposal goals and objectives for Yolo County;
- Quantifies the remaining permitted disposal capacity in Yolo County;
- Identifies minimum siting criteria from federal and state sources and introduces avoidance and discretionary siting criteria to be considered for future disposal facility siting efforts in Yolo County;
- Identifies general areas of Yolo County that conform with the minimum siting criteria and,
- Identifies strategies for Yolo County to maintain long-term disposal capacity.

1.2 PLANNING CONTEXT

Yolo County is located in the Sacramento Valley. It is bordered by Sacramento and Sutter Counties to the east, Napa County to the west, Colusa and Lake Counties to the north, and Solano County to the south. The county is predominantly flat agricultural land comprising 1,035 square miles with a population of 200,849 (2010 census) or 194 people per square mile. The major land use in Yolo County is agriculture (including pasture and open space) accounting for about 92 percent of total acreage. Urban build-up and other uses account for about 8 percent1. The four crops with the highest economic yield for Yolo County are tomatoes, rice, wine grapes, and alfalfa hay. There are four incorporated cities in Yolo County: Davis (pop. 65,622), West Sacramento (pop. 48,744), Winters (pop. 6,624), and Woodland (pop. 55,468). Population of the unincorporated area is 24,391. The combined cities comprise about 88 percent of the total county population. Countywide population grew 19.1 percent between 2000 and 20102.

There is one operating municipal solid waste landfill in Yolo County. The YCCL is located in the unincorporated county at the intersection of County Roads 28H and Road 104, about two miles north of the City of Davis. The YCCL serves all of the cities, unincorporated Yolo County as well as UCD. The YCCL accepts imported waste primarily from Sacramento County totaling approximately 50,000 tons in 20103. The Esparto Convenience Center, located near the community of Esparto, is a transfer station and recycling center serving communities of western Yolo County and the Capay Valley. Solid waste is transferred to the YCCL for disposal. There is

1 County of Yolo, 2005. Background Report for the Yolo County General Plan Update, Woodland, California, pages 1-5 and 1-6.
2 Population information from US Census Bureau, http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06113.html
3 From the CalRecycle Edrs Facility Summary by Jurisdiction Report.
one transformation facility, the Woodland Biomass Plant, for the incineration of urban wood waste and agricultural wastes. There is also one major composting facility, the Northern Recycling Compost facility in Zamora.

1.3 GOALS AND POLICIES

The goals and policies described in Table 1-1 are for the development and implementation of this countywide Siting Element. The Yolo County Waste Advisory Committee (WAC; the local task force for AB 939 compliance) has actively reviewed the described goals and policies and concurs. These goals and policies will be used to ensure that long-term disposal capacity is maintained in Yolo County, and that such capacity maximizes environmental protection and public safety. Additional local land use policies specifically relating to landfill operation in Yolo County are defined and described in the Yolo County General Plan, Applicable land use policies from the Yolo County General Plan are included in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Comply with regulatory requirements for the preparation and adoption of a countywide Siting Element.</td>
<td>A. Prepare a countywide Siting Element that meets all requirements of PRC §41700, et seq. and CCR Title 14 §18755 et seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ensure compliance with all state and federal standards for locating and operating solid waste disposal facilities.</td>
<td>A) Periodically review disposal standards and requirements and update county practices accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Operate and maintain solid waste facilities that ensure protection of public health and minimize environmental impacts and nuisances.</td>
<td>B. Incorporate minimum state and federal siting criteria/standards for any proposed new or expanded disposal facility in Yolo County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Eliminate the knowing disposal of household hazardous waste and other inappropriate wastes at solid waste facilities in Yolo County.</td>
<td>A) Maintain modern sanitary landfill practices and environmental monitoring in full compliance with current CalRecycle and Department of Water Resources (CCR Title 27) requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B) Maintain operations in full accord with Solid Waste Facility Permit and Conditional Land Use Permit as given by the appropriate governing jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C) Continue monitoring of environmental law and technology developments to ensure facilities remain environmentally sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A) Maintain hazardous waste exclusion program using trained technicians at disposal facilities for loads inspection and removal of inappropriate materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B) Maintain effective public education, household hazardous waste, and small quantity generator programs in the community to minimize disposal of inappropriate materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ensure availability of solid waste disposal facility capacity to meet Yolo County’s long-term needs.</td>
<td>A) Prepare a Siting Element identifying a minimum of 15 years solid waste disposal capacity for Yolo County. &lt;br&gt;B) Prepare a Siting Element identifying strategies for maintaining long-term disposal capacity for Yolo County residents. &lt;br&gt;C) It is the policy of Yolo County that all solid waste facilities be managed in a manner that maintains and enhances an appropriate balance between the fiscal, environmental, and capacity integrity of the facilities. &lt;br&gt;D) Continue to monitor the ability of the YCCL to provide safe and cost-effective disposal service to county residents. Execute process for new or expanded facility siting as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Manage solid waste disposal facilities to maximize cost-effectiveness and convenience to county residents.</td>
<td>A) Monitor disposal technologies and operations to provide for the most efficient management of solid waste disposal facilities. &lt;br&gt;B) Continue to develop and implement public participation and media outreach campaigns to inform residents on solid waste management issues. &lt;br&gt;C) Actively solicit participation of county residents in the consideration and evaluation of potential new or expanded disposal sites in Yolo County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Maintain decision and policy making processes that promote community awareness and participation.</td>
<td>A) Continue cooperative efforts among the four cities, UCD, and county and involvement of the Waste Advisory Committee in discussing waste management needs for county residents. &lt;br&gt;B) Continue to develop and implement public participation and media outreach campaigns to inform residents on solid waste management issues. &lt;br&gt;C) Actively solicit participation of county residents in the consideration and evaluation of potential new or expanded disposal sites in Yolo County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consider regional approaches to solid waste disposal that are mutually convenient and beneficial to those involved.</td>
<td>A) Maintain communication channels between solid waste managers of nearby landfills and neighboring jurisdictions for potential regional approaches to integrated waste management. &lt;br&gt;B) Adjoining and additional on-site land uses which may interfere with the use and operation of solid waste facilities will not be approved. &lt;br&gt;A) New and existing facilities will be regularly evaluated for enhanced waste diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Prevent the development of new or expanded solid waste facilities in incompatible land use areas. Protect existing facilities from encroachment of incompatible land uses.</td>
<td>A) Ensure land use compatibility through Conditional Land Use Permit requirements and findings of General Plan consistency. &lt;br&gt;B) Adjoining and additional on-site land uses which may interfere with the use and operation of solid waste facilities will not be approved. &lt;br&gt;A) New and existing facilities will be regularly evaluated for enhanced waste diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Maintain an integrated waste management system for Yolo County</td>
<td>A) New and existing facilities will be regularly evaluated for enhanced waste diversion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1-1
Goals and Policies for the Yolo County Siting Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>based on the waste management hierarchy and optimizing the use of economically feasible source reduction, recycling, and composting to conserve existing landfill capacity at the YCCL.</td>
<td>activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Implement programs selected in the county’s and cities’ Source Reduction and Recycling Elements and UCD’s zero waste Plan to minimize the amount of wastes requiring disposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These goals and policies were used as a framework in preparing the Yolo County Siting Element. Table 1-2 briefly outlines the actions and schedule to meet the ten goals and corresponding policies. A detailed implementation program, schedule, and responsible parties for long-term capacity maintenance are presented in Section 5.

Table 1-2
Programs to Meet Siting Element Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Program/Action</th>
<th>Approximate Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2 Regulatory Compliance</td>
<td>Ongoing Yolo County Public Works review of YCCL practices. LEA oversight and enforcement.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3 Environmental Protection and Public Safety</td>
<td>New or expanded landfill siting efforts</td>
<td>As new/expanded facility siting is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4 HHW Management</td>
<td>Facilities review and monitoring per regulatory requirements. Ongoing oversight by Yolo County Planning Department for land use issues, and LEA for solid waste facility permit compliance.</td>
<td>Ongoing and per Title 27 requirements. Ongoing agencies oversight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5 Long-term Disposal Capacity</td>
<td>Implement load checking program at YCCL. Develop and conduct countywide HHW and small quantity generator programs.</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locally adopt and incorporate countywide Siting Element into the Yolo County Integrated Waste Management Plan</td>
<td>Ongoing, Friday and Saturday every week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing facilities monitoring; new or expanded landfill siting efforts.</td>
<td>Ongoing; as new/expanded facility siting is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 6 Cost-effectiveness</td>
<td>Yolo County Planning and Public Works review of operational practices; LEA oversight.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 7</td>
<td>Ongoing cooperation and coordination with</td>
<td>Ongoing; approx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Program/Action</td>
<td>Approximate Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td>Jurisdictions; regular meetings of the WAC.</td>
<td>monthly meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement jurisdictions’ selected SRRE-public education programs.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include a public participation/relations component as part of any future facility</td>
<td>As new/expanded facility siting is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>siting project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 8 Regional Approaches</td>
<td>Conduct regular information exchange among solid waste managers. Participate</td>
<td>Ongoing and as organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in appropriate regional forums on solid waste issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular meetings of the WAC for discussion of potential countywide and</td>
<td>Approx. monthly WAC meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regional solid waste programs coordination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 9 Land Use</td>
<td>Existing General Plan policy.</td>
<td>2030 General Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 10 Waste Management</td>
<td>Implement new or expanded source reduction, recycling, composting and special</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>waste programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 STRUCTURE OF THE SITING ELEMENT

The Yolo County Siting Element is structured according to the requirements of CCR, Title 14, §18755, et seq., and according to the needs of the county for a useful, long-term planning tool. The document structure is summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Title 14 Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Introduction Project background; goals and policies</td>
<td>§18755.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-year disposal capacity needs for Yolo County; existing facilities</td>
<td>§18755.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>description</td>
<td>§18755.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Criteria and Process for Siting Solid Waste Disposal Facilities</td>
<td>§18756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role of Siting Element criteria; description of criteria; process for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>siting facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Location and Description of General Areas</td>
<td>§18756.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application of exclusionary criteria; identification of general areas;</td>
<td>§18756.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siting Element amendment process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program for long-term disposal capacity maintenance; tasks; schedule;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsible parties; revenue sources</td>
<td>§18756.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 EXISTING FACILITIES AND DISPOSAL CAPACITY

Solid waste generation, diversion, growth estimates, and current permitted disposal capacity will all affect Yolo County's disposal needs over the next 15 years. This section includes a brief description of the one permitted solid waste disposal facility in Yolo County. The information is updated and aggregated to describe the existing permitted disposal capacity and the anticipated disposal capacity needs over the next 15-year period for Yolo County as a whole.

2.1 EXISTING DISPOSAL FACILITY

There is one permitted solid waste disposal facility in Yolo County: the Yolo County Central Landfill (YCCL). The YCCL currently serves the four cities, the unincorporated county, and UCD. The YCCL also accepts waste from other jurisdictions with the top three being Sacramento City, Sacramento County, and out-of-country (Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation) totaling about 50,000 tons in 2010. Table 2-1 summarizes YCCL in terms of owner/operator, permit number, date of last permit, remaining permitted disposal capacity, maximum permitted daily disposal, average rate of daily waste receipt, permitted waste types, and expected land use after closure.

2.2 EXISTING PERMITTED DISPOSAL CAPACITY AND ANTICIPATED NEEDS

The landfill disposal requirements for Yolo County for the 15-year period beginning in 2012 are included in Appendix A. The estimated disposal requirement for the next 15 years is 3.13 million tons. As presented in Table 2-1, the remaining capacity of the YCCL far exceeds this minimum requirement.

Table 2-1
Existing Permitted Solid Waste Disposal Facilities in Yolo County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Information</th>
<th>Yolo County Central Landfill (YCCL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Operator</td>
<td>Yolo County Department of Planning and Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>44090 County Road 28H, Woodland 95776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit No. and Expiration Date</td>
<td>57-AA-0001 No. exp. date in permit Next permit review April 30, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Last Permit</td>
<td>04/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Permitted Disposal Capacity (as of July 2011)</td>
<td>39,493,850 cubic yards (23,696,300 tons) 79 years (estimate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Permitted Disposal Daily</td>
<td>1800 tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Waste Receipt</td>
<td>450 tons (7 day average) MSW, C&amp;D, industrial process, leaves/clippings, dewatered sludge/screenings/grit, inerts, treated medical waste, 3x-rinsed &amp; approved pesticide containers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Waste Types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Source: CalRecycle Disposal Reporting System
To estimate the 15-year disposal requirement, an average per capita disposal was calculated using the annual disposal at the YCCL for the years 2008 to 2011. It should be noted that this annual disposal includes some out-of-county waste and it is assumed that this proportion of out-of-county waste will remain consistent for the remaining life of the landfill. Based on this estimate, the average per capita disposal in Yolo County is 0.9442 tons. To this, UCD’s 2012 actual disposal per capita of 0.031 tons was added for a total annual disposal per capita of 0.9748 tons. Population projections were obtained from the California Department of Finance\(^1\). To provide a more conservative estimate of the disposal requirement, the additional diversion requirements of AB341 were ignored as well as UCD’s zero waste plan. A summary table of the annual disposal in Yolo County is included in Appendix A.

Based on these results, Yolo County requires no additional permitted disposal capacity for solid waste to reach the minimum 15-year capacity requirement.

3 CRITERIA AND PROCESS FOR SITING SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES

This section describes the development of certain solid waste disposal facility siting criteria for Yolo County. Also described is an overview of how the county will use these criteria at such time that a new or expanded disposal facility is required. The county and four cities have addressed the development of non-disposal facilities (e.g., materials recovery and processing operations, composting facilities) through the Non-disposal Facility Elements.

3.1 ROLE OF CRITERIA IN THE SITING PROCESS

Criteria are standards on which a judgment or decision may be based. Therefore, landfill siting criteria are standards that can be applied to areas or parcels of land to judge their suitability for landfill development. Siting criteria should have the following qualities:

- Quantifiable - the degree to which an area or parcel of land meets the criteria can be reasonably and clearly measured.
- Objective - the criteria should impartially measure the suitability of land areas or parcels without bias toward a particular area or site.
- Address community concerns - the criteria can meet the needs and concerns of both the regulatory community and local community members.

Siting criteria are often divided into three types: those that exclude portions of the study area from further consideration (often called "exclusionary" criteria); those that assist decision-makers in identifying specific candidate landfill sites (often called "avoidance" criteria); and those that compare and evaluate the degree of conformity of various candidate sites to local parameters (often called "discretionary" criteria). Figure 3-1 illustrates how these criteria are typically used to select a landfill site.
Figure 3-1
Landfill Siting Criteria and Process

1. Identify candidate sites within the general areas using avoidance criteria and other tools
2. Collect data on sites based on discretionary criteria
3. Apply broad exclusionary criteria
4. Overlay exclusionary criteria to identify general areas
5. Score and rank sites based on discretionary criteria
6. Fatal flaw analysis
7. Select preferred site; initiate development

Exclusionary Criteria
Avoidance Criteria, Engineering and Planning principles
Discretionary criteria and public input

1. Site B
2. Site C
3. Site A
This Siting Element develops exclusionary criteria and introduces avoidance and discretionary criteria.

1. Exclusionary Criteria -- Yolo County has elected to develop a Siting Element that identifies a set of exclusionary criteria supplied by federal and state regulators that must be considered as part of any new or expanded landfill siting effort. They are used to identify and screen out general regions or areas of the county least suited to new or expanded facility search. This mapping process is documented in Section 4 of this Siting Element.

2. Avoidance Criteria -- The avoidance criteria introduced in this section are intended to be used as a guideline by decision-makers to review and further reduce general areas toward defining specific sites. They differ from exclusionary criteria in that they are not absolute; rather, they indicate areas that should be avoided to the extent possible. The result of avoidance criteria application (and detailed field investigation) is the identification of specific candidate landfill sites. The application of avoidance criteria is not conducted as part of this Siting Element.

3. Discretionary Criteria -- The discretionary criteria introduced in this section are intended to be used to measure and rank the relative preference of a set of candidate landfill sites. These criteria are often expressed using the terms "minimize" or "maximize". The greater the conformity of a site to the criterion, the greater the score that site receives. The result of discretionary criteria application is a relative scoring and ranking of the candidate sites from most to least preferred. The application of discretionary criteria is not conducted as part of this Siting Element.

Section 4 applies the exclusionary criteria to define general areas of Yolo County potentially suitable for a more detailed landfill site search. The Element does not; however, apply the avoidance nor discretionary criteria at this time, given Yolo County's extensive remaining permitted disposal capacity. Section 3.4 describes how new sites may be identified and evaluated using avoidance and discretionary criteria should Yolo County's permitted capacity fall below the minimum requirements or the county otherwise determine that new or expanded capacity is desired.

### 3.2 EXCLUSIONARY CRITERIA

Three regulatory sources were identified as requiring the consideration of specific exclusionary siting criteria for any new or expanded solid waste landfill in Yolo County:

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency-Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Subtitle D;
- California Department of Water Resources and California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery -California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 27.

Table 3-1 defines the federal and state criteria that must be considered as part of any siting effort and are used to identify general areas potentially suitable for new or expanded landfill siting. Readers should note that Resource Recovery and Conservation Act (RCRA) Subtitle D siting restrictions have been incorporated into Title 27 by CalRecycle and adopted as a policy by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to augment Title 27. Therefore, Table 3-1 describes only CCR, Title27 as the criteria source.
In many cases, these required criteria are not "absolute" in that they do allow for possible engineering alternatives that offset or mitigate the hazard addressed by the criteria. Examples include wetlands, unstable areas, and floodplains. Recognizing this, Table 3-1 includes a column indicating whether each criterion is potentially mitigable from a regulatory standpoint. It must be noted; however, that mitigating such hazards is often very costly and very difficult to conclusively demonstrate to a regulator. Section 4 of this Element documents the data sources used to apply these criteria to Yolo County.

### Table 3-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Mitigable?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title 27 CCR §20270</td>
<td><strong>Airport Safety:</strong> Do not site a landfill within 10,000 feet of any airport runway end receiving turbojets or 5,000 feet of any airport receiving piston-type aircraft unless demonstrated that it does not pose a bird hazard to aircraft. Must notify FAA if landfill is sited within these limits.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title 27 CCR §20260, Under SWRCB Resolution No. 93-62</td>
<td><strong>Floodplain:</strong> New Class III and existing Class II-2 landfills shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100 year return period. MSW landfills are also subject to any more-stringent flood plain and wetland siting requirements referenced in SWRCB Resolution No.93-62 (i.e., see Sections 258.11, 258.12, and 258.16 of 40CFR258).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Title 27 CCR, under SWRCB Resolution No. 93-62 | **Wetlands:** Do not locate a new landfill within a wetland unless all of the following can be demonstrated:  
- There is no practicable alternative which does not involve a wetland  
- Through construction and engineering, will not: violate state water quality standards, violate toxic effluent standards, or jeopardize threatened or endangered species or their habitats  
- Will not cause or contribute to significant degradation of the wetland  
- Steps are taken to achieve no net loss of wetlands | Yes |
| Title 27 CCR, §20240(c) | **Depth to Groundwater:** Do not locate a new landfill in an area where it cannot be sited, designed, constructed, and operated to ensure that wastes will be a minimum of 5 feet above the highest anticipated elevation of underlying groundwater | Yes |
| Title 27 CCR, Under SWRCB Resolution No. 93-62 | **Unstable Areas:** Do not locate a landfill in an unstable area (e.g., landslide and liquefaction prone areas) unless demonstrated that engineered measures have been incorporated to ensure the landfill's structural integrity. | Yes |
Ground Rupture: Landfills shall not be located on a known Holocene fault

Rapid Geologic Change: Do not locate a landfill within areas of potential rapid geologic change unless containment structures are designed, constructed, and maintained to preclude failure.

Fault Areas: Do not locate a new landfill within 200 feet of a Holocene fault unless demonstrated that alternative setback distance of less than 200 feet will prevent damage to the structural integrity of the landfill and protect human health and the environment.

3.3 AVOIDANCE AND DISCRETIONARY CRITERIA

The purpose of avoidance and discretionary criteria will be to assist county decision-makers to identify and evaluate candidate landfill sites in the future. This list is introductory only and is intended to be used as a guideline. This list will be expanded or reduced over time as physical and social conditions change in Yolo County. This list will be revisited as part of 5-year plan reviews and at such time that the county determines that a new or expanded facility is desired.

Sources for the avoidance and discretionary criteria include the Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan (General Plan), County Hazardous Waste Management Plan, and good planning and engineering principles. The Yolo County General Plan is organized into various elements with one or more goals falling in each of the regulatory mandated headings. Each element utilizes the following acronyms:

LU – Land Use Element
CC – Community Character Element
CI – Circulation Element
PF – Public Services and Facilities Element
AG – Agriculture Element
ED – Economic Development Element
CO – Conservation and Open Space Element
HS – Health and Safety Element
HO – Housing Element

Avoidance and Discretionary criteria are organized under four regulatory-mandated headings: environmental considerations; environmental impacts; socioeconomic impacts; and legal issues. The regulatory description of each criterion is as follows:

(1) Environmental Considerations (for example: geology and soils including faulting and seismicity, ground settlement, surface hydrology and ground water, quantity and quality of ground water, surface water, surface water contamination, drainage patterns, etc.);

(2) Environmental Impacts (for example: air quality including climatic and meteorological conditions and emissions, visibility, cultural resources including regional setting, inventory and
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1 Source: Title 14, California Code of Regulations Section 18756(a)
significance, paleontological resources including inventory and significance, vegetation, and wildlife, etc.);

(3) Socioeconomic considerations (for example: transportation including local and regional transportation systems, highways and major roadway corridors, rail transportation and corridors, land use including regional and local land uses such as military use, mineral extraction, agriculture, recreation/tourism, compatibility with existing and future land uses, consistency with county general plan(s) and future post-closure uses, economic factors including estimates of development costs and operational costs, etc.);

(4) Legal considerations (for example: federal, state, and local minimum standards and permits, liabilities, and monitoring, etc.);

Under each major heading, the criteria are organized under the Yolo County General Plan goal(s) the criteria are intended to support or address. A complete listing of each referenced Yolo County General Plan policy is included in Appendix B.

3.3.1 Environmental Considerations

**Goal AG-2. Natural Resources for Agriculture.**
Protect the natural resources needed to ensure that agriculture remains an essential part of Yolo County’s future.

**Avoidance:**
Avoid sites that could threaten the quality of underlying aquifers or reduce their ability to recharge.
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan, Policy AG-2.1)
Avoid waterways and channels to the extent possible.
Data Sources: USGS topographic maps; field reconnaissance

**Discretionary:**
Prefer candidate sites with greatest depth to highest anticipated groundwater.
Data Source: Yolo County Department of Environmental Health well logs
Prefer candidate sites with the fewest seasonal and perennial (“blue line”) streams onsite.
Data Sources: USGS topographic maps; field reconnaissance
Prefer sites with the lowest average annual rainfall at the landfill site.
Data Sources: Weather station data; Department of Water Resources, California Irrigation Management Information System
Maximize distance from community water supply/extraction sites.
Data Sources: Yolo County Department of Health; Department of Health Services

**Goal CO-5 Water Resources.**
*Ensure an abundant, safe, and sustainable water supply to support the needs of existing and future generations.*

**Avoidance:**
Avoid waterways and channels to the extent possible.
Data Sources: USGS topographic maps; field reconnaissance
Discretionary:
Sites within the Delta Primary Zone should not conflict with the water policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CO-5.9)

Candidate sites will demonstrate that groundwater recharge will not be significantly diminished when land use is converted from agriculture, open space, or habitat
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CO-5.14).

Prefer candidate sites with greatest depth to highest anticipated groundwater.
Data Source: Yolo County Department of Environmental Health and California Department of Water Resources well logs

 Prefer candidate sites with the fewest seasonal and perennial (“blue line”) streams onsite.
Data Sources: USGS topographic maps; field reconnaissance

Prefer sites with the lowest average annual rainfall at the landfill site.
Data Sources: Weather station data; Department of Water Resources isohyetal maps

Maximize distance from community water supply/extraction sites.
Data Sources: Yolo County Department of Health; Department of Health Services

Goal HS-1 Geologic Hazards.
Protect the public and reduce damage to property from earthquakes and other geologic hazards.

Avoidance:
Avoid sites with unreasonable exposure to geologic hazards’
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-1.1)

Discretionary:
Candidate sites will prepare CEQA documentation to address seismic safety and provide adequate mitigation for existing and potential identified hazards.
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-1.3)

Goal HS-2 Flood Hazards.
Protect the public and reduce damage to property from flood hazards.

Avoidance:
Avoid sites adjacent to flood control levees.
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-2.2)

Discretionary:
Prefer sites with 200 year flood protection. Candidate sites within the 200-year floodplain shall adhere to state law and the Yolo County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.
Candidate sites shall be designed to retain the storm water from a 100-year storm.
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-2.1)

Candidate sites near flood control levees shall not have any permanent improvements within 50-feet of the toe of the flood control levee.
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-2.2, Action HS-A14)
Candidate sites near flood control levees shall not have any of the following within 500 feet of the toe of the flood control levee; unlined excavations, below grade septic leach systems, water, gas, or oil wells.

Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-2.2, Action HS-A15)

Sites within the Delta Primary Zone should not conflict with the flood control and protection policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.

Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-2.5)

3.3.2 Environmental Impacts

Goal CO-1 Natural Open Space.
Provide a diverse, connected and accessible network of open space, to enhance natural resources and their appropriate use.

Avoidance:
Avoid state and county parks, preserves and other designated scenic, natural or recreational areas to the extent possible.
Data Sources: Yolo County Parks Division; USGS topographic maps

Avoid designated threatened and endangered species habitat to the extent possible.
Data Source: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Discretionary:
Candidate sites should not conflict with recreational trails and open space corridors that link communities and parks throughout the county.
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CO-1.2)

Sites within the Delta Primary Zone should not conflict with the natural open space policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CO-1.13)

Prefer sites that maximize distance to state and county parks, preserves and other designated scenic, natural or recreational areas; maximize distance to threatened and endangered species habitat.
Data Sources: Yolo County Parks Division; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; USGS topographic maps

Goal CO-2 Biological Resources.
Protect and enhance biological resources through the conservation, maintenance, and restoration of key habitat areas and corresponding connections that represent the diverse geography, topography, biological communities, and ecological integrity of the landscape.

Avoidance:
Candidate sites should avoid high priority conservation areas.
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CO-2.2)
Candidate sites should avoid areas with blue oak and mixed oak woodlands, native grassland prairies, wetlands, riparian areas, aquatic habitat, agricultural lands, heritage valley oak trees, remnant valley oak groves, and roadside tree rows.  
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CO-2.3)

Candidate Sites should avoid areas that would cause adverse impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites.  
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CO-2.38)

**Discretionary:**  
Candidate sites should avoid areas within 2100 feet of California tiger salamander breeding ponds or apply mitigation measures.  
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy_CO-2.40)

Candidate sites should avoid areas to the greatest extent feasible that impact species listed under the State or federal Endangered Species Acts, or species identified as special-status by the resource agencies, or apply mitigation measures.  
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CO-2.41)

Candidate sites should avoid areas that impact Swainson hawk foraging habitat or apply mitigation measures.  
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CO-2.42)

**Goal CO-4 Cultural Resources.**  
Preserve and protect cultural resources within the County.

**Avoidance:**

Candidate sites will not interfere with important cultural resources  
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CO-4.1)

Candidate sites should not interfere with local tribal heritage sites.  
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CO-4.11)

Avoid designated state/county historical, cultural, and archeological sites to the extent possible.  
Data Source: Yolo County Planning Department maps

**Discretionary:**

Candidate should avoid area with Native American archaeological and cultural resources or apply mitigation measures to the maximum extent feasible.  
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CO-4.13)

Sites within the Delta Primary Zone should not conflict with the cultural resource policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.  
Data Source: Yolo County General plan (Policy CO-4.14)

Prefer sites with the greatest distance to designated historical, cultural, and archeological sites.  
Data Source: Yolo County Planning Department maps
Goal HS-7 Noise Compatibility.
Protect people from the harmful effects of excessive noise.

Discretionary:
Candidate sites will be compatible with the current and projected noise environment.
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-7.1)

Sites within the Delta Primary Zone should not conflict with the noise policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-7.2)

Candidate sites will have minimized transportation corridors leading to and from the site that impact sensitive land uses.
Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-7.5)

3.3.3 Socioeconomic Impacts

Preserve farm land and expand opportunities for related business and infrastructure to ensure a strong local agricultural economy.

Avoidance:
Avoid sites on prime agricultural land zoned A-P, A-E, A-1 and AGI.
Data Source: Yolo County Planning and Public Works

Discretionary:
Candidate sites that coincide with Williamson Act contract should phase development to avoid contract cancelation where feasible.
Data Source: Yolo County general Plan (Policy LU-2.5)

Candidate sites should allow interim agricultural use on undeveloped areas.
Data Source: Yolo County general Plan (Policy LU-2.6)

Prefer lands zoned industrial or Public/Quasi-Public.
Data Source: Yolo County Planning and Public Works

Manage growth to preserve and enhance Yolo County’s agriculture, environment, rural setting and small town character.

Discretionary:
Avoid sites that would result in conflicts and/or incompatibilities between land uses.
Data Source: Yolo County general Plan (Policy LU-3.5)

Goal LU-5. Equitable Land Use Decisions.
Ensure inclusion, fair treatment and equitable outcomes in local land use decisions and regulations.

Discretionary:
Candidate sites should minimize impact to any one group of residents because of age, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, socio-economic status, or other arbitrary factor.
Data Source Yolo County General Plan (Policy LU-5.1)
**Goal CC-1. Preservation of Rural Character.**
Ensure that the rural character of the County is protected and enhanced, including the unique and distinct character of the unincorporated communities.

**Avoidance:**
- Avoid sites that would visually disturb ridgelines and hillsides.
  Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CC-1.10)
- Avoid sites that would obscure, detract from, or negatively affect the quality of views from designated scenic roadways or scenic highways.
  Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CC-1.12)

**Discretionary:**
- Where possible, avoid sites with landmarks and icons that contribute to the identity and character of the rural area.
  Data Source: Yolo County general Plan (Policy CC-1.4)

**Goal CI-3. Service Thresholds.**
*Balance the preservation of community and rural values with a safe and efficient circulation system.*

**Avoidance:**
- Avoid sites that would result in worse than Level of Service (LOS) C for roadways and intersections in the unincorporated county except as described in the General Plan for specific roadways.
  Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy CI-3.1)

**Goal AG-1. Preservation of Agriculture.**
*Preserve and defend agriculture as fundamental to the identity of Yolo County,*

**Avoidance:**
- Avoid sites that would divide agricultural land.
  Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy AG-1.3)

**Discretionary:**
- Prefer sites that do not convert agricultural land or open space.
  Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy AG—1.5)

**Goal AG-6. Delta Agriculture.**
*Enhance agriculture in the Clarksburg area to complement the broader values of the Delta region.*

**Discretionary:**
- Sites within the Delta Primary Zone should not conflict with the agricultural policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.
  Data Source: Yolo County General plan (Policy AG-6.3)
**Goal ED-1. Economic Diversity.**

*Diversify the local economy to provide substantial and sustainable long-term growth that will benefit businesses, residents and local government.*

**Discretionary:**

Expansion of the existing YCCL should be evaluated instead of a new site.

Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy ED-1.12)

---

### 3.3.4 Legal Issues

**Goal HS-4 Hazardous Materials. Protect the community and the environment from hazardous materials and waste.**

**Avoidance:**

Avoid sites near areas of sensitive uses, residentially designated land uses; hospitals, nursing/convalescent homes, and similar board and care facilities; hotels and lodging; schools and day care centers; and neighborhood parks.

Data Source: Yolo county General Plan (Action HS-A46)

**Discretionary:**

Candidate sites will minimize exposure to the community and environment to the harmful effects of hazardous materials and waste.

Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-4.1)

---

**Goal HS-5 Airport Operations.**

*Protect the community from the risks associated with airport operations and protect airports from the economic impacts of encroachment from incompatible land uses.*

**Discretionary:**

Ensure sites within the vicinity of airports are compatible with airport restrictions and operations.

Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-5.1)

Ensure sites near commercial and public use airports are consistent with setbacks, height, and land use restrictions as determined by the Federal Aviation Administration and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Airport Land Use Commission. Ensure that sites proximate to private airstrips addresses compatibility issues.

Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-5.2)

Ensure sites are compatible with airport safety zones

Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-5.3)

Sites within the Delta Primary Zone should not conflict with the airport policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.

Data Source: Yolo County General Plan (Policy HS-5.4)

---

### 3.4 DISPOSAL FACILITY SITING PROCESS

Given the extensive permitted disposal capacity in Yolo County (approximately 70 years remaining as of 2012), the county will not seek any specific sites for new or expanded solid waste disposal facilities at this time. At such time that remaining permitted disposal capacity falls
below the minimum 15-year requirement, and/or Yolo County otherwise determines that the YCCL cannot meet the needs of the community, the county will plan for the identification and development of new or expanded disposal facilities using the general steps outlined below. A private sector disposal facility proponent may or may not choose to perform these steps; however, any proponent attempting to site a disposal facility in Yolo County must still prepare adequate CEQA documentation and obtain a Siting Element amendment (discussed further in Section 4), local land use permits, and solid waste facility permits.

1. Design and implement a public participation strategy that provides for regular public input throughout the siting process. Elements of a successful strategy may include: regular public forums to solicit input on siting criteria, the siting process, and specific site(s) information; a newsletter or other regular medium for reporting progress in the siting effort; news media coordination; and central clearinghouse for accurate and consistent information.


2. Update the exclusionary criteria to include new or revised siting requirements from federal and/or state regulators as they may be promulgated.

   Responsible party: Yolo County Department of Planning and Public Works, Integrated Waste Management Division.

3. Review the application of exclusionary criteria (see Section 4) to ensure that the most current data have been used to apply those criteria. Revise the general area maps as appropriate.

   Responsible party: Yolo County Department of Planning and Public Works, Integrated Waste Management Division. Support by the Yolo County Department of Planning and Public Works.

4. Identify candidate sites within the remaining general areas using avoidance criteria, good planning and solid waste engineering principles, and field reconnaissance.

   Responsible party: Yolo County Department of Planning and Public Works, Integrated Waste Management Division. Technical assistance as necessary.

5. With the input of county staff, the Waste Advisory Committee, and general public, update the discretionary criteria list to reflect any changes in local policies, planning guidelines, and/or community concerns.

   Responsible party: Yolo County Department of Planning and Public Works, Integrated Waste Management Division.

6. Assign weighting factors to the discretionary criteria and develop a numerical scoring and ranking process.


7. Apply the discretionary criteria to the candidate landfill sites, score and rank sites, and identify the site(s) that maximize(s) consistency with the discretionary criteria.

8. Perform a "fatal flaw" analysis on the top ranked sites to determine if there are any site-specific hydrologic, geologic, or environmental conditions that would preclude a site from further consideration.

   **Responsible party:** Yolo County Department of Planning and Public Works, Integrated Waste Management Division. Technical assistance as necessary.

9. If technically, economically, and politically feasible, initiate preliminary design, CEQA compliance, site acquisition, local land use and solid waste facility permitting, and final site design/development.

   **Responsible parties:** Board of Supervisors; Yolo County Department of Environmental Health (local enforcement agency); Yolo County Department of Planning and Public Works, Integrated Waste Management Division and Planning Division; Technical assistance as necessary.

Figure 3-1 illustrates the general flow of this landfill siting process.

Given recent experiences in other communities, the site selection process may take about one to two years; site acquisition, CEQA compliance, and permitting about three to five years; and initial site development about one year. Timing will depend largely on the level of public opposition, willingness of land owners, CEQA compliance requirements, and physical conditions of the selected landfill site.
4 LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF GENERAL AREAS

This section documents the application of the exclusionary criteria defined in Section 3 to identify general areas of Yolo County that are potentially suited for more detailed landfill site search. The procedure for future amendments to this Siting Element is also described.

4.1 APPLICATION OF EXCLUSIONARY CRITERIA

The exclusionary criteria described in Section 3 were applied to all of Yolo County to identify and screen out those areas least suited to new or expanded landfill site search. Mapping was performed using either the Yolo County geographic information system (GIS), Yolo County 2030 General Plan, or previously prepared maps from the 1995 Siting Element. Figures 4-1 through 46 illustrate the application of the exclusionary criteria. These remaining areas will become the primary search areas for new or expanded disposal sites and the application of avoidance and discretionary criteria at such time that a new or expanded site is required. Given limitations in available data and margins of error due to the large scale of source maps, it will be important to carefully reapply these exclusionary criteria to any future candidate sites to confirm that the sites meet regulators’ minimum requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>Airport safety zones</td>
<td>1995 Siting Element (USGS quadrangle maps, airport managers, Federal Aviation Administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>100-year floodplains</td>
<td>Yolo County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>Yolo County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>Holocene faults</td>
<td>Yolo County 2030 General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Seismic unstable areas</td>
<td>1995 Siting Element (Soil survey maps; Department of Water Resources well log data for 1973, 1977, and 1986)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1 Airport Safety Zones

All airports in Yolo County with the exception of the U.C. Davis Airport were found to accept jet aircraft on an infrequent basis; therefore, 10,000-foot buffers (per RCRA Subtitle D requirements) were applied around the runways. A 5,000-foot buffer was applied to the UCD Airport runway. The 10,000-foot buffer around the Sacramento Metropolitan Airport was found to impinge on the eastern boundary of Yolo County.

4.1.2 100-Year Floodplain

The 100-year floodplain map includes areas where base flood elevations and flood hazard factors both have and have not been determined (i.e., flood zone designations A, AO, AE, and AH). Levee-protected areas are not included in the floodplain map.
4.1.3 Wetlands
The data source for wetlands mapping is from the Yolo County Natural Heritage Program JPA. As illustrated, Yolo County wetlands also correspond with areas subject to flooding.

4.1.4 Holocene Faults
The data source for Holocene faults on Figure 4-4 is from the Yolo County 2030 General Plan and is considered approximate. Given the very large scale of this map, precise translation for the Siting Element maps was not possible. As candidate landfill sites are reconnoitered in the future, they will need to be carefully scrutinized for the presence of Holocene faulting. It must also be noted that the Geology Department at UCD, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the California Division of Mines and Geology continue to research the existence of certain blind thrust faults on the west side of the Sacramento Valley including western Yolo County. Because active blind thrust faults are potentially capable of significant seismic events, any candidate landfill site identified in the western county will require careful analysis of the design for protection from possible blind thrust fault activity.

4.1.5 Unstable Areas
The data source for unstable areas is the 1995 Siting Element. The county has defined this criterion specifically as those areas prone to liquefaction. For the purposes of this Siting Element, liquefaction-prone areas were defined as locations with sandy subsurface soils (i.e., subsurface soil texture code 1 (gravels), 2 (sand, loamy sand), 3 (coarse sandy loam, and 4 (soil codes Tb, Tc,Td, and Tf only; sandy loams)) and depth to groundwater less than five feet. Sandy gravel and gravel deposits along Putah and Cache Creeks were also included as liquefaction-prone areas regardless of depth to groundwater. Figure 4-5 illustrates the location of sandy subsurface soils and occurrence of shallow groundwater. This approach should only be considered a rough approximation of liquefaction-prone areas in Yolo County. As candidate landfill sites are reconnoitered in the future, they will need to be carefully scrutinized for susceptibility to liquefaction and other forms of geologic instability. See Shallow Groundwater Areas, below, for a discussion on the limitations of groundwater data.

Areas susceptible to landsliding have not been eliminated at this point. The areas most susceptible to slides in Yolo County are shale and mudstone (e.g., Franciscan formations) and weathered ultramafic rocks that have been uplifted and tilted in the western county. These landslide-prone areas tend to be of a shallow-seated nature, that is, primarily surface features rather than large-scale, mass movements. Shallow-seated landslides are not necessarily a fatal flaw for identifying landfill sites. In fact, they can be desirable because they may be easily excavated and provide a good source of low permeability liner and cover material for the landfill. The ability to excavate or engineer such landslides will be very site-specific. For these reasons, landslide-prone areas of the western county are not excluded at this time will be reconsidered at the point of candidate landfill sites identification.

4.1.6 Shallow Groundwater Areas
The data source for the shallow groundwater areas is the 1995 Siting Element. Shallow groundwater areas in Yolo County were identified using historical well log data from the Department of Water Resources. Due to data management limitations, three particularly high
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1 It is believed a blind thrust fault located west of Davis was responsible for the destruction of Winters in 1892.
groundwater years were selected: 1973, 1977, and 1986. The months of typically highest groundwater (February, March, and April) were then selected within those three years. This method provides a reasonable approximation of "highest anticipated elevation of underlying groundwater" consistent with CCR Title 27 requirements. Figure 4-6 illustrates the location of those wells exhibiting groundwater depths of five feet or less within the reference months/years. Groundwater contour data were not available at the time of Siting Element preparation; therefore, these well locations provide only a rough indication of general areas susceptible to shallow groundwater conditions. It should also be noted that areas west of the Capay Valley and Winters and the area between Dunnigan and the Capay Valley have few groundwater monitoring wells. Given these limitations, on-site groundwater conditions will require careful measurement at the point where candidate landfill sites are being evaluated.

4.2 AMENDMENTS TO THE SITING ELEMENT

PRC section 41721.5 specifies the process by which the Yolo County Siting Element may be amended to consider and incorporate new, expanded, or modified disposal facilities as they may be proposed in the future. In summary, the proponent for development of a disposal facility in Yolo County may initiate the process by submitting a site identification and description (proposal for amendment) to the Yolo County Board of Supervisors. If the description is deemed complete by the Board, the county will then submit the description to the four incorporated cities of Yolo County within 20 days. Each jurisdiction must then act to approve or disapprove the proposed amendment to the Siting Element within 90 days provided that there is sufficient information and documentation to meet the requirements of CEQA and it does not violate any other state or local requirement. To amend the Element, approval is needed by the county and a majority of the cities containing a majority of the population of the incorporated area. A jurisdiction may only move to disapprove the Siting Element if there is substantial evidence in the record that the amendment to the Element would cause one or more significant adverse impacts.

Upon majority approval, the project will then be forwarded to the host jurisdiction to initiate the local planning requirements of that community and initiate the Solid Waste Facility Permit process.
5 PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

CalRecycle requires each county to provide for a minimum of 15 years of permitted solid waste disposal capacity (CCR, Title 14, §18755(a)). As documented in Section 2, Yolo County far exceeds this minimum requirement with an estimated 70 years remaining capacity. Nonetheless, Yolo County recognizes the importance of identifying a diversified disposal strategy to maintain long-term capacity. This section describes the county’s disposal capacity maintenance program.

5.1 PROGRAM FOR LONG-TERM CAPACITY MAINTENANCE

The long-term disposal capacity maintenance program for Yolo County is a diversified one. The county maintains several approaches so if one option becomes unworkable, the county will have back-up programs to draw upon. The six facets of the long-term capacity maintenance program are described below. Section 5.2 presents the schedule for executing this program.

5.1.1 Local Adoption and CalRecycle Approval of the Siting Element

Upon completion, this Element will be incorporated into the Yolo County Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP). The CIWMP will serve as the primary solid waste planning document for Yolo County. As such, the Siting Element of the CIWMP identifies policies, criteria for consideration, and the basic process for new or expanded disposal facility siting in Yolo County.

5.1.2 Continued Use of the Yolo County Central Landfill

Yolo County currently relies on the Yolo County Central Landfill for providing MSW disposal capacity. The Yolo County Department of Planning and Public Works, Division of Integrated Waste Management will continue to operate the facility as the principal disposal site for county solid wastes that cannot otherwise be economically reduced, reused, recycled, or composted. The county will continue to monitor changes in remaining permitted capacity and explore options to expand Yolo County Central Landfill or explore development of new disposal sites as necessary and permissible.

5.1.3 Planning for Future New Landfill Siting

Should the remaining permitted disposal capacity fall below the minimum 15-year requirement, and should the county determine that expansion of the Yolo County Central Landfill is not feasible or desirable, the county will plan for the identification and potential development of a new disposal site. The basic steps of this process are outlined in Section 3.

5.1.4 Dialogue with Neighboring Jurisdictions on Potential Regional Solutions

Yolo County will participate in discussions regarding potential regional solid waste management programs that are mutually convenient and beneficial.

5.1.5 Consideration of Expanded Waste Reduction and Recovery

Yolo County believes that waste reduction and recovery is ultimately the most effective means of assuring long-term disposal capacity for the county. Through the cities' and county's SRREs, Yolo County has identified aggressive waste diversion programs. The key elements of those programs are summarized in the Summary Plan. As part of the annual reporting process, the county and cities will assess their waste diversion plans for opportunities to improve waste diversion activities so as to minimize the amount of waste requiring disposal. Should other
disposal strategies be unable to provide the minimum 15-year capacity requirements, the county and cities will consider expanded waste reduction and recovery activities to conserve remaining capacity. These activities could include: accelerating implementation schedules for certain selected programs; expanding the capacity and/or types of materials to be handled through recycling programs; implementation of contingency programs (e.g., centralized materials recovery facility); or the addition of new programs to increase recovery.

5.2 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE
The maintenance of long-term disposal capacity is a high priority for Yolo County. The county has therefore developed a schedule that is as detailed as possible given information available at this time. Table 5-1 summarizes the required tasks, responsible parties, timing, and revenue sources for the implementation of the Yolo County disposal capacity maintenance program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Party(ies)</th>
<th>Approximate Timing</th>
<th>Revenue Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Siting Element</td>
<td>Prepare the Siting Element</td>
<td>County Integrated Waste Management Division, Waste Advisory Committee</td>
<td>3rd quarter 2012</td>
<td>County Sanitation Enterprise Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cities and county adopt the Siting Element</td>
<td>City Councils, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>3rd quarter 2012</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CalRecycle approval of the Element and CIWMP</td>
<td>CA Integrated Waste Management Board</td>
<td>4th quarter 2012</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual review of the Siting Element for adequacy</td>
<td>Integrated Waste Management Division, Waste Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Annually after state approval</td>
<td>County Sanitation Enterprise Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County Central Landfill</td>
<td>Ongoing use of YCCL</td>
<td>County Integrated Waste Management Division</td>
<td>As specified in closure/post-closure maintenance plan</td>
<td>Closure/post-closure maintenance funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor YCCL, remaining capacity</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>County Sanitation Enterprise Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate YCCL, expansion as necessary and permittable</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>As 15-year minimum requirement is approached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Close YCCL modules as capacity expires and additional expansion are</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>As specified in closure/post-closure maintenance plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>otherwise undesirable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* County Sanitation Enterprise Fund monies are derived from tipping fees collected at the Yolo County Central Landfill
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Party(ies)</th>
<th>Approximate Timing</th>
<th>Revenue Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Landfill Siting</td>
<td>Initiate new siting effort (tasks outlined in Section 3)</td>
<td>Project proponent</td>
<td>As 15-year min. requirement is approached and further expansions are unfeasible, or as otherwise proposed.</td>
<td>Enterprise Fund if county proponent; private sector funds if private proponent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select site</td>
<td>Project proponent</td>
<td>Years 1 – 2 from start</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amend Siting Element with cities and county approval</td>
<td>Project proponent, Board of Supervisors, City Councils</td>
<td>Years 1 – 2 from start</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA documentation, acquisition, design and permitting</td>
<td>Project proponent, land use regulator, LEA, CalRecycle</td>
<td>Years 4 – 7 from start</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsible Party(ies)</td>
<td>Approximate Timing</td>
<td>Revenue Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Landfill Siting (cont.)</strong></td>
<td>Final go/no-go decisions</td>
<td>Project proponent</td>
<td>Years 4 – 7 from start</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If go, initial site development</td>
<td>Project proponent</td>
<td>Years 5 – 8 from start</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue with Neighboring Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Ongoing participation in discussions for potential regional programs/facilities</td>
<td>Solid waste managers of participating jurisdictions</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Waste Reduction and Recovery</td>
<td>Annually assess diversion programs for maximum feasible diversion opportunities</td>
<td>County Integrated Waste Management Division, city agencies</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>County Sanitation Enterprise Fund, city funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor disposal capacity needs</td>
<td>County Integrated Waste Management Division, city agencies</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement additional/expanded programs as necessary</td>
<td>County Integrated Waste Management Division, city agencies</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Dependent on selected course of action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disposal Tonnage Projection for Yolo County Siting Element

Appendix A

Givens:
YCCI, historical disposal tonnage (from BOE reports)
2012 UCD disposal tonnage is representative and growth rate will match Yolo County population growth in future
Ignore UCD's zero waste plan (conservative)
Remaining capacity (fiscal year ending June 2011) = 23,696,310 tons
Use average annual per capita disposal and population projections to estimate landfill life
Ignore AB 341 recycling mandate (conservative)

Assumptions:
Currently YCCI receives some out-of-county waste, that proportion will continue until landfill closes
2012 UCD disposal tonnage is representative and growth rate will match Yolo County population growth in future

Assumptions - YCCL Historical Tonnage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year Ending in June of</th>
<th>Total Waste Disposed (tons)</th>
<th>Landfill Cap (tons)</th>
<th>Per Capita Disposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>175,315</td>
<td>194,734</td>
<td>0.942 tons/cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>197,239</td>
<td>200,963</td>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>200,963</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>0.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>197,239</td>
<td>200,963</td>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 0.942 tons/cap

Assumptions - UCY Tonnage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year Ending in June of</th>
<th>Tonnage (2012)</th>
<th>Landfill Cap (tons)</th>
<th>Per Capita Disposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>194,734</td>
<td>200,963</td>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>197,239</td>
<td>200,963</td>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>200,963</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>0.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>197,239</td>
<td>200,963</td>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per capita disposal for UCD Tonnage 0.31 tons/cap

Total Average Disposal Per Capita 0.9748 tons/cap

Calculations - Landfill Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year Ending in June of</th>
<th>Capacity Used (tons)</th>
<th>Capacity Used Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2042</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2043</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2044</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2046</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2047</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2049</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2051</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2052</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2053</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2054</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2055</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2056</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2057</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2058</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2059</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2061</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2063</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2064</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2065</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2066</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2067</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2068</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2069</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2070</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2071</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2072</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2073</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2074</td>
<td>203,050</td>
<td>197,924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2076</td>
<td>5,686,649</td>
<td>383,633</td>
<td>373,949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2077</td>
<td>5,312,699</td>
<td>387,470</td>
<td>377,689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2078</td>
<td>4,935,011</td>
<td>391,344</td>
<td>381,466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2079</td>
<td>4,553,545</td>
<td>395,258</td>
<td>385,280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2080</td>
<td>4,168,265</td>
<td>399,210</td>
<td>389,133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2081</td>
<td>3,779,132</td>
<td>403,203</td>
<td>393,024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2082</td>
<td>3,386,107</td>
<td>407,235</td>
<td>396,955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2083</td>
<td>2,989,153</td>
<td>411,307</td>
<td>401,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2084</td>
<td>2,598,220</td>
<td>415,420</td>
<td>404,933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2085</td>
<td>2,233,295</td>
<td>419,574</td>
<td>409,983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2086</td>
<td>1,774,312</td>
<td>423,770</td>
<td>413,073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2087</td>
<td>1,361,240</td>
<td>428,008</td>
<td>417,203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2088</td>
<td>944,037</td>
<td>432,288</td>
<td>421,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2089</td>
<td>522,861</td>
<td>436,611</td>
<td>425,889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2090</td>
<td>97,072</td>
<td>440,977</td>
<td>424,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy LU-2.5:
Where planned growth would occur on lands under Williamson Act contract, ensure that development is phased to avoid the need for contract cancellation, where feasible.
(DEIR MM AG-2)

Policy LU-2.6:
Encourage interim agricultural production on farmland designated for future development, prior to the start of construction, to reduce the potential for pest vectors, weeds, and fire hazards.

Policy LU-3.5:
Avoid or minimize conflicts and/or incompatibilities between land uses.

Policy LU-5.1
Balance land use decisions and land use burdens countywide so that there is not a disproportionate impact to any one group of residents because of age, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, socio-economic status, or other arbitrary factor.

Policy CC-1.4:
Identify and preserve, where possible, landmarks and icons which contribute to the identity and character of the rural areas.

Policy CC-1.10:
Protect existing ridgelines and hillsides from visually incompatible development.

Policy CC-1.12:
Preserve and enhance the scenic quality of the County’s rural roadway system. Prohibit projects and activities that would obscure, detract from, or negatively affect the quality of views from designated scenic roadways or scenic highways.

Policy CI-3.1:
Maintain Level of Service (LOS) C or better for roadways and intersections in the unincorporated county. In no case shall land use be approved that would either result in worse than LOS C conditions, or require additional improvements to maintain the required level of service, except as specified below. The intent of this policy is to consider level of service as a limit on the planned capacity of the County’s roadways.

A. Interstate 5 (County Road 6 to Interstate 505) – LOS D is acceptable to the County, assuming that one additional auxiliary lane is constructed in each direction through this segment. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from planned development. LOS D is anticipated by Caltrans according to the Interstate 5 Transportation Concept Report 1996 to 2016 (Caltrans, April 1997).
B. Interstate 5 (Interstate 505 to Woodland City Limit) – LOS D is acceptable to the County. LOS D is anticipated by Caltrans according to the Interstate 5 Transportation Concept Report 1996 to 2016 (Caltrans, April 1997).

C. Interstate 5 (Woodland City Limit to Sacramento County Line) – LOS F is acceptable to the County. The County will secure a fair share towards intersection improvements from all feasible sources including planned development at the Elkhorn site. LOS C is anticipated by Caltrans according to the State Route 99 and Interstate 5 Corridor System Management Plan (Caltrans, May 2009).

D. Interstate 80 (Davis City Limit to West Sacramento City Limit) – LOS F is acceptable to the County. LOS F is anticipated by Caltrans according to the Interstate 80 and Capital City Freeway Corridor System Management Plan (Caltrans, May 2009).

E. State Route 16 (County Road 78 to County Road 85B) – LOS D is acceptable.

F. State Route 16 (County Road 85B to County Road 21A) – LOS E is acceptable.

G. State Route 16 (County Road 21A to Interstate 505) – LOS D is acceptable, assuming that this segment is widened to four lanes with intersection improvements appropriate for an arterial roadway. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from planned development. Caltrans and the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians shall be encouraged to provide funding for the project.

H. State Route 16 (Interstate 505 to County Road 98) – LOS D is acceptable, assuming that passing lanes and appropriate intersection improvements are constructed. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from planned development. Caltrans and the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians shall be encouraged to establish a funding mechanism to pay the remainder.

I. State Route 113 (Sutter County Line to County Road 102) – LOS F is acceptable to the County. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from planned development. LOS F is anticipated by Caltrans according to the State Route 113 Transportation Concept Report 1991-2019 (Caltrans, May 2000).

J. State Route 113 (County Road 102 to Woodland City Limits) – LOS D is acceptable.

K. State Route 128 (Interstate 505 to Napa County Line) – LOS D is acceptable.

L. Old River Road (Interstate 5 to West Sacramento City limits) – LOS D is acceptable.

M. South River Road (West Sacramento City Limit to the Freeport Bridge) – LOS D is acceptable.
N. County Road 6 (County Road 99W to the Tehama Colusa Canal) – LOS D is acceptable, assuming this segment is widened to four lanes. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from all feasible sources.

O. County Road 24 (County Road 95 to County Road 98 – LOS D is acceptable. (DEIR MM CI-2)

P. County Road 27 (County Road 98 to State Route 113 – LOS D is acceptable. (DEIR MM CI-2)

Q. County Road 31 (County Road 95 to County Road 98) – LOS D is acceptable. (DEIR MM CI-2)

R. County Road 32A (County Road 105 to Interstate 80) – LOS D is acceptable.

S. County Road 98 (County Road 29 to County Road 27) – LOS D is acceptable. (DEIR MM CI-2)

T. County Road 99W (County Road 2 to County Road 8) – LOS D is acceptable, assuming that this segment is widened to four lanes. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from all feasible sources. (DEIR MM CI-2)

U. County Road 102 (County Road 13 to County Road 17) – LOS E is acceptable, assuming that passing lanes and appropriate intersection improvements are constructed. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from all feasible sources. (DEIR MM CI-2)

V. County Road 102 (Woodland City Limit to Davis City Limit) – LOS D is acceptable assuming that passing lanes and appropriate intersection improvements are constructed. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from all feasible sources.

X. Additional exceptions to this policy may be allowed by the Board of Supervisors on a case-by-case basis, where reducing the level of service would result in a clear public benefit. Such circumstances may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Preserving agriculture or open space land;
2. Enhancing the agricultural economy;
3. Preserving scenic roadways/highways;
4. Preserving the rural character of the county;
5. Avoiding adverse impacts to alternative transportation modes;
6. Avoiding growth inducement; or
7. Preserving downtown community environments.
8. Where right-of-way constraints would make the improvements infeasible. (DEIR MM CI-2)
Policy AG-1.3: Prohibit the division of agricultural land for non-agricultural uses.

Policy AG-1.5: 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 activities on surrounding lands designated Agriculture.

Policy AG-2.1: Protect areas identified as significantly contributing to groundwater recharge from uses that would reduce their ability to recharge or would threaten the quality of the underlying aquifers.

Policy AG-6.3: Within the Delta Primary Zone, ensure compatibility of permitted land use activities with applicable agricultural policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.

Policy ED-1.12: Seek productive expansion and re-use of existing County assets, including the Yolo County Airport, old military facilities and the County landfill.

Policy CO-1.2: Develop a connected system of recreational trails to link communities and parks throughout the county.


Policy CO-2.2: Focus conservation efforts on high priority conservation areas (core reserves) that consider and promote the protection and enhancement of species diversity and habitat values, and that contribute to sustainable landscapes connected to each other and to regional resources.
Policy CO-2.3:
Preserve and enhance those biological communities that contribute to the county’s rich biodiversity including blue oak and mixed oak woodlands, native grassland prairies, wetlands, riparian areas, aquatic habitat, agricultural lands, heritage valley oak trees, remnant valley oak groves, and roadside tree rows.

Policy CO-2.38:
Avoid adverse impacts to wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites (e.g., nest sites, dens, spawning areas, breeding ponds). Preserve the functional value of movement corridors to ensure that essential habitat areas do not become isolated from one another due to the placement of either temporary or permanent barriers within the corridors. Encourage avoidance of nursery sites (e.g., nest sites, dens, spawning areas, breeding ponds) during periods when the sites are actively used and that nursery sites which are used repeatedly over time are preserved to the greatest feasible extent or fully mitigated if they cannot be avoided. (DEIR MM BIO-4a)

Policy CO-2.40:
Preserve grassland habitat within 2,100 feet of documented California tiger salamander breeding ponds or implement required mitigation (equivalent or more stringent) as imposed by appropriate agencies or through the County HCP/NCCP, to fully mitigate impacts consistent with local, State, and federal requirements. Implementation and funding of mitigation measures for projects that will be developed in phases over time may also be phased, with the applicable mitigation being implemented and funded prior to the final approval of each phase or sub-phase. (DEIR MM BIO-4c)

Policy CO-2.41:
Require that impacts to species listed under the State or federal Endangered Species Acts, or species identified as special-status by the resource agencies, be avoided to the greatest feasible extent. If avoidance is not possible, fully mitigate impacts consistent with applicable local, State, and Federal requirements. (DEIR MM BIO-5a)

Policy CO-2.42:
Projects that would impact Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat shall participate in the Agreement Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson’s Hawk Foraging Habitat in Yolo County entered into by the CDFG and the Yolo County HIP/NCCP Joint Powers Agency, or satisfy other subsequent adopted mitigation requirements consistent with applicable local, State, and federal requirements. (DEIR MM BIO-5b)

Policy CO-4.1:
Identify and safeguard important cultural resources.

Policy CO-4.11:
Honor and respect local tribal heritage.

Policy CO-4.13:
Avoid or mitigate to the maximum extent feasible the impacts of development on Native American archaeological and cultural resources.
Policy CO-4.14:
Within the Delta Primary Zone, ensure compatibility of permitted land use activities with applicable cultural resources policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.

Policy CO-5.9:
Within the Delta Primary Zone, ensure compatibility of permitted land use activities with applicable water policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.

Policy CO-5.14:
Require that proposals to convert land to uses other than agriculture, open space, or habitat demonstrate that groundwater recharge will not be significantly diminished.

Policy HS-1.1:
Regulate land development to avoid unreasonable exposure to geologic hazards.

Policy HS-1.3:
Require environmental documents prepared in connection with CEQA to address seismic safety issues and to provide adequate mitigation for existing and potential hazards identified.

Policy HS-2.1:
Manage the development review process to protect people, structures, and personal property from unreasonable risk from flooding and flood hazards.

Policy HS-2.2:
Ensure and enhance the maintenance and integrity of flood control levees.

Policy HS-2.5:
Within the Delta Primary Zone, ensure compatibility of permitted land use activities with applicable flood control and protection policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.

Policy HS-4.1:
Minimize exposure to the harmful effects of hazardous materials and waste.

Policy HS-5.1:
Ensure that land uses within the vicinity of airports are compatible with airport restrictions and operations.

Policy HS-5.2:
Ensure that new development near commercial and public use airports is consistent with setbacks, height, and land use restrictions as determined by the Federal Aviation Administration and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Airport Land Use Commission. Ensure that development proximate to private airstrips addresses compatibility issues. (DEIR MM HAZ-3)

Policy HS-5.3:
Respect and conservatively enforce airport safety zones as identified in airports CLUPs.
Policy HS-5.4:
Within the Delta Primary Zone, ensure compatibility of permitted land use activities with applicable airport policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.

Policy HS-7.1
Ensure that existing and planned land uses are compatible with the current and projected noise environment. However, urban development generally experiences greater ambient (background) noise than rural areas. Increased density, as supported by the County in this General Plan, generally results in even greater ambient noise levels. It is the County’s intent to meet specified indoor noise thresholds, and to create peaceful backyard living spaces where possible, but particular ambient outdoor thresholds may not always be achievable. Where residential growth is allowed pursuant to this general plan, these greater noise levels are acknowledged and accepted, notwithstanding the guidelines in Figure HS-7.

Policy HS-7.2:
Ensure the compatibility of permitted land use activities within the Primary Delta Zone with applicable noise policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.

Policy HS-7.5:
Minimize the impact of noise from transportation sources including roads, rail lines, and airports on nearby sensitive land uses.

Action HS-A14:
Require a minimum 50-foot setback for all permanent improvements from the toe of any flood control levee. (Policy HS-2.2) Responsibility: Planning and Public Works Department
Timeframe: Ongoing

Action HS-A15:
Restrict proposed land uses within 500 feet of the toe of any flood control levee, including but not limited to the items listed below, unless site-specific engineering evidence demonstrates an alternative action that would not jeopardize public health or safety:

- Prohibit permanent unlined excavations;
- Large underground spaces (such as basements, cellars, swimming pools, etc) must be engineered to withstand the uplift forces of shallow groundwater;
- Prohibit below-grade septic leach systems;
- Engineered specifications for buried utility conduits and wiring;
- Prohibit new water wells;
- Prohibit new gas or oil wells;
- Engineered specifications for levee penetrations; and
- Require landscape root barriers within 50 feet of the toe. (Policy HS-2.2)
Responsibility: Planning and Public Works Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
Action HS-A46:
Provide adequate separation between areas where hazardous materials are present and sensitive uses. The following land uses are considered sensitive receptors for the purpose of exposure to hazardous materials: residentially designated land uses; hospitals, nursing/convalescent homes, and similar board and care facilities; hotels and lodging; schools and day care centers; and neighborhood parks. Home occupation uses are excluded. (Policy HS-4.1)
Responsibility: Planning and Public Works Department
Timeframe: Ongoing
NOTES:
A : 100-year flood zone
AE : Areas subject to inundation by the 100 year flood determined by detailed methods
AH : Areas subject to inundation by the 100 year shallow flooding (usually areas of ponding) where average depths are between one and three feet
AO : Areas subject to inundation by the 100 year shallow flooding (usually sheet flow on sloping terrain) where average depths are between one and three feet
D : Areas of undetermined but possible flood hazards
X : Not included in a flood hazard area
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