



County of Yolo

John Bencomo
DIRECTOR

PLANNING, RESOURCES AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

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

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

DECEMBER 19, 2006

General Plan Update – Receive staff presentation comparing four land use alternatives and related background materials; accept public testimony; deliberate recommendations regarding a preferred alternative; direct staff to carry forward to Board of Supervisors a Planning Commission recommendation for a preferred alternative.

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

LOCATION: Countywide

ZONING: Various
FLOODING: Various
SOILS: Various

REPORT PREPARED BY:

Heidi Tschudin, Contract Planner

David Morrison, Assistant Director

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. Receive a staff presentation regarding an overview of the General Plan process, as well as information concerning how the four land use alternatives and physical constraints apply to each community;
2. Accept public testimony regarding the preferred alternative separately for each community, as well as comments regarding the overall preferred alternative;
3. After public comments have been accepted for each community, close the public hearing and deliberate a series of questions and issues regarding the preferred alternative as it relates to that community;
4. Receive staff's summary of the Commission's recommendations regarding each community and provide direction regarding the total preferred alternative; and

AGENDA ITEM: 4.0

5. Recommend a preferred land use alternative for the Countywide General Plan update to the Board of Supervisors for consideration.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

State law requires the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on the General Plan. Although we are not at the end of the process where a written recommendation of the Commission is required (Government Code Section 65354), the Commission nevertheless plays an important role in this process as the Board's appointed land use planning body.

Unlike typical General Plan hearings, where both the Commission and the public react to and debate a specific proposal, these hearings will provide an opportunity to engage in a community-based, ground-up, process of creating a preferred alternative for the consideration of the Board of Supervisors. The principles adopted by the Board of Supervisors for the General Plan update process call for an open and collaborative process that involves the public and that recognizes the uniqueness of each area of the County. The hearings are structured to allow for a dialogue between the Commission, staff, and the public that will lead to the Planning Commission's recommended preferred alternative, based on a series of questions and decision-points organized around specific community areas.

Based on the Planning Commission's recommendation, the Board of Supervisors will adopt a preferred land use and circulation alternative. The General Plan team will subsequently use the preferred alternative as the basis for writing the text of the updated General Plan, the development of appropriate maps and exhibits, the environmental review process, and further public workshops and hearings. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will have the ability to make further refinements to the preferred plan throughout this process. Final adoption of the Yolo County 2030 General Plan is targeted to occur by the end of 2007 or early 2008.

BACKGROUND, WORKSHOPS, AND THE PUBLIC "VISIONING" PROCESS

After several years of deliberation and preparation, the Board of Supervisors in May of 2004 began the process of updating the County General Plan. At the outset of the process, the Board of Supervisors elected to undertake an extensive process of public outreach and involvement. The first workshop, a joint meeting of the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission, was held in May 2004. That workshop focused on the schedule and process for the General Plan Update. In August 2004 five workshops were held in Clarksburg, Dunnigan, Esparto, Knights Landing, and West Plainfield to receive public comments on the range of issues that should be included in the General Plan. A second joint workshop of the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission was held in September 2004. The focus of that workshop was the adoption of key issues, guiding principles, and a vision statement to be used throughout the General Plan update process. In October, four more workshops were held in Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland. At these workshops the public was asked about whether and how the County should develop over the next 20 years.

Based on public comments and direction from the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission, staff and the consulting team prepared three General Plan land use alternatives

for public review: Alternative 1 (City Focused Growth), Alternative 2 (Town Focused Growth), and Alternative 3 (Dunnigan New Town). These were released in January 2005. A comprehensive Background Report was also published at that time. In March 2005 four more public workshops were held in Davis, Dunnigan, Esparto, and Woodland to take public comment on the alternatives. A fifth workshop (the General Plan "Summit") was held in April 2005 with the Board of Supervisors and the four City Councils of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland to hear the perspective of the city officials regarding the alternatives. In May 2005 staff presented the three alternatives in a joint meeting of the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission for their consideration in selecting a preferred alternative. In response to direction by the Board and public comment, the staff and consultant team developed a fourth alternative, Rural Sustainability, which was released in June 2005.

In June 2005 the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission met again in joint session to deliberate a "preferred" alternative among the four under consideration. The Board of Supervisors ultimately determined that they did not have enough information to choose a preferred land use alternative at that time and directed staff and consultant team to further research issues regarding fiscal impact, economic development, community infrastructure, and the viability of various conceptual projects.

Work on the General Plan Update slowed significantly after June of 2005, due in part to high staff turnover in the Planning, Resources, and Public Works Department. As a result, the County hired a General Plan Project Manager and made changes to the General Plan consultant team in April of 2006. In May of 2006 the Update process resumed.

On September 19, 2006 the General Plan team appeared before the Board to present additional background papers analyzing the range of possible land use and circulation alternatives, as well as the preliminary fiscal and market considerations involved regarding the alternatives. At that time, the team asked the Board to confirm the continued use of the four previously developed General Plan land use alternatives, and to confirm that those land use alternatives should not be modified at that time to incorporate project-specific development proposals. The Board confirmed both of these actions on a unanimous vote and directed staff to move forward to develop a Preferred Alternative.

GENERAL PLAN DOCUMENTS AND STUDIES PRODUCED TO DATE

In 2004 and 2005 a number of documents were produced that the Board has confirmed should continue to guide the General Plan process. These documents are all posted on the County's General Plan Update website:

- Draft List of General Plan Issues, June 2004
- Draft General Plan Stakeholders List, June 2004
- General Plan Vision Statement, June 2004
- General Plan Vision/Principles/Policy Definition, October 2004
- General Plan Land Use and Circulation Conceptual Alternatives, January 2005
- General Plan Update Background Report, January 2005
- Preliminary Goals and Objectives of Rural Sustainability, June 2005.

More recently, in 2006, the General Plan team has prepared four additional background/technical reports that provide information useful to the General Plan deliberations.

Two of these reports, the Alternatives Overview and Analysis and the Market and Fiscal Considerations, were released September 19, 2006 in conjunction with the staff report to the Board. These reports are available on the County's General Plan website. Three additional reports, Agricultural Preservation Techniques, County Infrastructure Conditions, and Alternatives Evaluation are being released in conjunction with this staff report to the Planning Commission. They are available for purchase at the Planning Department public counter (contact Susan Provencal at 530-666-8808) or at the County General Plan website at www.yolocountygeneralplan.org. A summary of each of these reports is provided below:

Alternatives Overview and Analysis

This report provides an updated description of each alternative. The report also examines three questions: 1) How do the alternatives compare to various ways the County could grow? 2) How do the alternatives compare to regional modeling and growth projections? 3) Are current development proposals from the private sector encompassed in the alternatives?

A summary description of each alternative is provided later in this report. Regarding the first question the alternatives were compared to six generic growth models (scattered rural growth, scattered suburban growth, town infill growth, town edge growth, city edge growth, and new town growth) and were determined to reasonably span the range of growth models. Regarding the second and third questions, relevant summaries are provided later in this report.

Market and Fiscal Considerations

This report includes the following: 1) an assessment of demographic and economic trends by examining population, housing, and employment data, real estate market conditions, estimated absorption potential, and market issues specific to the unincorporated County; 2) an assessment of the fiscal implications of growth including a summary of the current condition of the County general fund and identification of key factors affecting the fiscal impacts of new development; 3) a summary of the existing City/County revenue sharing agreements including the redevelopment tax increment pass-through agreements, annexation revenue sharing agreements, and capital facilities impacts of new development; 4) an economic evaluation of the six growth models introduced in the Alternatives Overview and Analysis (available on the website). The conclusions of the report are as follows:

- Given the constraints of the County's current revenue structure, new development in the unincorporated area will not by itself solve the County's current or future fiscal problems. This is particularly true of residential development. In some areas residential development with an overall average home value exceeding \$360,000 could be revenue positive (assuming no loss of City pass-through revenues; see discussion below). However the County's share of property taxes varies substantially by geographic location within the unincorporated area. In areas where the County's share of property taxes is below average (relative to the unincorporated area as a whole) overall average home values of around \$500,000 better reflect the break-even point. Retail development is more likely to result in net revenue gains for the County in the form of sales taxes. However, it should be noted that retail development is generally dependent upon proximity to large populations (i.e., housing).
- The demand to build housing appears to be greater than any other segment of the market. However, other options for development exist. Opportunities exist for research and

development space to serve spin-offs from UCD research activities, highway-oriented commercial development particularly along I-5 and I-505, and “opportunistic” niche retail to serve regional populations. There is significant competition for these land uses because of their economic development benefits. Successfully attracting this type of land use requires a greater effort on the part of the County than other land uses. In order to capitalize on specific locations where these revenue-generating uses might best fit, the County may need to better position itself against competing jurisdictions, establish a more supportive policy framework, streamline the regulatory framework, and/or provide or accommodate the provision of improved infrastructure.

- The County has a history of mutually beneficial arrangements with the cities including “pass-through” agreements for a portion of redevelopment tax increments, annexation revenue sharing agreements, and imposition of County impact fees on development within the incorporated areas. These arrangements have in the past been advantageous for both the cities and the County. They merit continued consideration as tools to assist the County financially and spread the burden of agricultural and open space preservation, but the agreements may need continued review to ensure that they accurately respond to changing County circumstances.
- Among the County’s most marketable attributes from a development point of view is access to Sacramento and the Bay Area via existing freeway networks. This allows residential land uses to access job centers and urban amenities. It provides commercial and industrial land uses with good regional placement and the ability to move goods and supply services along relatively uncongested routes. Within this context, the growth models that exhibit the greatest market potential are city edge growth and strategically located new towns.
- More than 4,000 dwelling units or a base population of 12,000 people is needed for a stand-alone new town community (i.e. not adjoined to another community) to be able to support a modern neighborhood retail center anchored by a full-sized major chain grocery store. Along with this, the center would have a small selection of other convenience retail and services. A smaller population would likely not have the full grocery store or other economic amenities. A bigger population would support a wider variety of retail space.

Agricultural Preservation Techniques

This report profiles existing and potential agricultural preservation techniques for consideration as a part of the General Plan Update. The report makes recommendations as to how the County might take further steps to protect and preserve the agricultural economy. The discussion provides an overview of agricultural land and land conservation in the County, and examines in more detail specific mechanisms for preservation including:

- General preservation techniques (Williamson Act contracts, Farmland Security Zones, urban growth boundaries, tax revenue sharing agreements, and taxation and fee mechanisms)
- Limits on use (use restrictions, conditional use permit requirements, minimum lot sizes, lot merger requirements, agricultural buffers, agricultural easement requirements, limits on house size and location, cluster zoning and parcel averaging, agricultural production and stewardship plans, and agricultural water use restrictions)

- Conservation easements and mitigation programs (conservation easements, mitigation requirements, and transfer of development rights)
- Marketing and economic support (agricultural marketing and tourism, agricultural districts, zoning for agricultural development, and enterprise zones)
- Farmer support (increased residential densities, regulatory relief and streamlining, education and technical assistance, and water supply incentives)
- Rural culture (agricultural use noticing, rural service standards, and rural oath commitments)

County Infrastructure Conditions

This report presents an overview of existing water, wastewater and drainage infrastructure conditions in Yolo County, and explains general approaches and attendant issues to serving new development, as background information in support of the Yolo County General Plan Update. It examines both countywide conditions, as well as conditions within specific community areas and provides a planning-level analysis of the amount and type of growth that might be supported by existing infrastructure or system improvements.

Alternatives Evaluation

This report evaluates the four alternatives and other development scenarios under consideration and provides an overview of economics (including market viability, community services, and fiscal impacts), infrastructure (including water, wastewater, storm drainage, and flooding), transportation (including proximity to freeways, regional roadways, transit service, and bicycle and pedestrian circulation), environment (including agricultural, biological resources, and proximity to airports), and “smart growth” (including preservation of open space, and compact and healthy design). Each issue is evaluated within each of the four alternatives for various communities and locations throughout the county. This information will be referenced extensively as a part of the process to develop the preferred alternative. This process is described in more detail later in this report.

Recommendations of the Economic Development Panel

On September 19, 2006 the Board of Supervisors directed the General Plan team to integrate the recommendations of the 2030 Economic Development Panel into the General Plan Update. The key recommendations of this panel include the following:

- Improved agriculture enhancement and support efforts.
- Targeted biotechnology development, including development of “high tech” research and development campuses, as well as regional office, business park, and light manufacturing nodes.
- Increased tourism, including farms and wineries as entertainment and educational destinations, as well as recreation associated with accessible and useable open space.
- Reinvigorated County/City fiscal dialogue.

- Establishment of a limited number of retail highway commercial nodes.

SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

As noted earlier in this report, these alternatives are the outcome of an extensive public process. They represent different philosophical approaches to planning for the County's future. The alternatives are conceptual and the land use exhibits that accompany them (see Alternatives Overview and Analysis report on the website) are not parcel-specific. Existing conditions and the four alternatives can be summarized as follows (corrected and refined since September 2006 presentation to the Board of Supervisors):

Current Conditions

Based on State Department of Finance estimates (DOF 1/1/06, Tbl2:E-5 Estimate) and data compiled by the General Plan team (Alternatives Overview and Analysis, September 2006, Table 3, page 6; Alternatives Evaluation, November 2006, Appendix A, Table A-4, page A-6) the following information describes current conditions in the unincorporated area of the County:

- 1.0 percent annual growth rate (20 year rate, DOF for 1987-2006; 3787÷18950÷20)
- 618,155 acres total unincorporated County area (DCE 9/06)
- 27,420 acres existing development (DCE 11/06)
- 7,876 existing housing units (BAE for 2005)
- 16,425 acres existing commercial/ industrial/public (DCE 11/06)
- 25,787 existing jobs (BAE for 2005)
- 27,593 existing population (BAE for 2005)

Alternative 1, City Focused Growth

Consistent with existing and historic County policy, this alternative assumes that most of the future development (90 percent) that would occur in the County would occur within the incorporated cities. This alternative does not specify whether this growth would occur within existing city planning boundaries, or whether growth would occur in the unincorporated areas immediately adjoining the cities for future annexation. The growth that does occur outside of the cities (10 percent of the total) is assumed to be scattered throughout the unincorporated area. Unincorporated area growth by 2030 would consist of:

- 1.0 percent annual growth rate (26 year rate, 2005-2030; 7468÷27593÷26)
- 8,472 acres of new development (DCE 11/06)
- 2,696 new housing units (DCE 11/06)
- 289 acres of new commercial/industrial/public (DCE 11/06)
- 3,240 new jobs (DCE 9/06)
- 7,468 new population (using 2.77 persons per household; DOF 1/06 Tbl2:E-5 Estimate)

Alternative 2, Town Focused Growth

This alternative assumes that 85 percent of all future development would occur within the cities, and the remaining 17 percent would be directed primarily into Esparto, Knights Landing, Dunnigan, and Madison, with the goal of supporting economic development and improved

infrastructure in those areas. Additional density would be allowed in Monument Hills as well. Unincorporated area growth by 2030 would consist of:

- 2.1 percent annual growth rate
- 9,459 acres of new development
- 5,525 new housing units
- 478 acres of new commercial/industrial/public
- 6,630 new jobs
- 15,304 new population

Alternative 3, New Town in Dunnigan

This alternative assumes that 75 percent of all future development would occur within the cities. Of the remaining 30 percent that would develop within the unincorporated area, 75 percent would be directed into a new town developed in and/or around the existing town of Dunnigan. Unincorporated area growth by 2030 would consist of:

- 3.7 percent annual growth rate
- 9,925 acres of new development
- 9,523 new housing units
- 717 acres of new commercial/industrial/public
- 11,428 new jobs
- 26,379 new population

Alternative 4, Rural Sustainability

This alternative (previously identified by staff as Alternative 2a) combines features of Alternatives 2 and 3. It assumes that 78 percent of all future development would occur within the cities, and the remaining 22 percent would be directed primarily into Esparto, Knights Landing, and Dunnigan, with the goal of increasing the level of economic development and further restricting housing in the rural agricultural areas. Additional density would be allowed in Monument Hills as well. This alternative specifically emphasizes industrial development at the Yolo County airport, a conference center and business park in Elkhorn, a business park at the Spreckels plant, and an agricultural industrial project near Winters. Unincorporated area growth by 2030 would consist of:

- 2.6 percent annual growth rate
- 4,675 acres of new development
- 6,978 new housing units
- 1,051 acres of new commercial and industrial
- 8,374 new jobs
- 18,498 new population

REGIONAL MODELING AND GROWTH PROJECTIONS

The SACOG regional transportation modeling and growth projections predict 38,915 new dwelling units (dus) countywide by 2030 of which 3,354 (8.6 percent) would occur within the unincorporated area.

The SACOG “Blueprint” model projects 53,700 new dwelling units countywide by 2032 of which 3,100 (5.8 percent) would occur within the unincorporated area.

Alternative 1 would result in fewer unincorporated units than predicted through these modeling efforts. The other three alternatives would result in residential growth in the unincorporated area greater than predicted through these modeling efforts:

- Alternative 1 2,700 dus in the unincorporated area by 2030
- Alternative 2 5,500 dus in the unincorporated area by 2030
- Alternative 3 11,200 dus in the unincorporated area by 2030
- Alternative 4 7,000 dus in the unincorporated area by 2030

The General Plan team also looked at market demand, separate from the regional growth projections. This is important because the SACOG projections reflect the existing General Plans of each jurisdiction within the region, and it is well known that Yolo County has put strict constraints on growth over the years. As such, the projections incorporate the current policy framework, rather than reflect the maximum number of homes the market could bear in the absence of strict policies. In order to test the feasibility of the alternatives against projected demand, Bay Area Economics (BAE) was asked to analyze market conditions in the County (see Market and Fiscal Considerations report on the website). The conclusion regarding residential demand is that as many as 15,000 new dwelling units might be absorbed in the unincorporated area of the County by 2030, absent existing policy constraints that limit growth in the unincorporated area. As a result, all four alternatives are considered feasible and do not overestimate the potential for housing within the County. Further, it should be noted that the market demand is 34 percent higher than Alternative 3, which is the most aggressive growth scenario.

SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

The General Plan team is aware of at least 16 speculative development proposals that would trigger a General Plan development if pursued, and were known to the staff as of May of 2006 (see Alternatives Overview and Analysis, September 2006, Table 8, page 31). These 16 speculative interests total 11,400 acres, 19,700 to 21,400 new dwelling units, 6.4 million industrial square feet, and 8.9 million commercial square feet. This collectively is more than double the growth expected under Alternative 3, the most aggressive alternative and far exceeds projected market demand for the unincorporated area.

Of the proposals on the list, half of them are represented in one or more of the alternatives. Of the remaining eight, half of those are located at the edge of Davis or Woodland, which would place them into the city-edge growth model – a model the County has in the past generally sought to avoid.

In making a recommendation to the Board regarding a preferred alternative, the Planning Commission has the opportunity to make modifications to include or expand particular growth and/or conservation options to accommodate or exclude the known development proposals, or to include other projects should they arise during the course of these hearings.

DEVELOPMENT OF A PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Overview of the Process

The four defined land use alternatives provide a range of differing philosophies for the Planning Commission to consider as a starting point in the development of a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for a Preferred Alternative. The alternatives illustrate various expected consequences for each community, based on differing amounts of assumed development. These scenarios will be used by the General Plan team as they engage the Commission in a series of questions to define the preferred future for each of the communities and areas of the County. The Planning Commission's consensus or majority direction on each decision point will cumulatively result in the formulation of the Commission's preferred alternative. At the end of this exercise, the Planning Commission will have incrementally "built" their preferred alternative, one community at a time. The individual recommendations will be summarized, so that the Commission can review the cumulative impact of its community-based decisions and determine whether the whole is consistent with the General Plan vision previously adopted by the Board. Once the Commission is satisfied with the overall result, the summary will be brought forward to the Board by staff as the Planning Commission's recommendation.

No matter how the Preferred Alternative is ultimately defined, the Board of Supervisors has made it clear that a policy framework and implementation requirements to accomplish the following items shall be included:

- Ensure "smart" and attractive growth (design guidelines; minimum design requirements; "visitability"; universal design; transit orientation; diversity of housing types; etc).
- Design projects that provide an efficient delivery of infrastructure and services, including public transit and safety.
- Establish standards for home placement in rural areas that protect and "defend" agriculture.
- Establish buffers between communities and cities to keep them distinct and unique, through the use of dense development in compact forms to reduce sprawl.
- Support agricultural-based and ecology-based tourism.
- Support viticulture operations, agriculture-industrial opportunities, and farm marketing efforts.
- Protect, enhance, and redevelop existing communities.
- Consider commercial nodes along I-505 and I-5.
- Create opportunities for economic growth within the communities that are not solely residentially-dependent, to provide local jobs and investment.
- Use development agreements to add community value

The staff proposes the following process to assist the Planning Commission in formulating their recommendation to the Board:

Step 1 -- Receive a staff report from the General Plan team regarding the overall update process and background studies.

Step 2 – Receive staff analysis regarding constraints and opportunities as they apply to communities within the unincorporated area, as well as specific development proposals within the following areas:

Communities:

- 1-Clarksburg
- 2-Dunnigan
- 3-Esparto/Madison/Capay Valley
- 4-Knights Landing
- 5-Monument Hills
- 6-Yolo/Zamora

Economic Development:

- 7-Elkhorn Business Park
- 8-Yolo County Airport Industrial Development
- 9-Commercial along I-5 and I-505

Agriculture and Natural Resources

- 10-Agricultural
- 11-Natural Resources

City Edges:

- 12-Davis
- 13-West Sacramento
- 14-Winters (including the Winters Agricultural Industrial Site)
- 15-Woodland (including the Spreckels Industrial Site)

Step 3 -- Deliberate the preferred alternative for each of the above communities/areas, using the following format. The staff will record the Commission's direction and maintain running totals on a white board:

- a. Receive a staff report specific to the area.
- b. Allow for public testimony specific to the area.
- c. Close the hearing on that item.
- d. Questions for consideration.
- e. Commission discussion.
- f. Straw vote on the Preferred Alternative

For the discussion of a preferred alternative for each of the "Communities" and for the "City Edges" discussion, the Commission will be asked to consider the following:

- 1-Which of the four alternatives, if any, is the best fit in terms of a starting point for the discussion of land use?
- 2-What amount and type of housing is appropriate for this area and where should it be located?

3-What amount and type of economic development is appropriate for this area (e.g., retail, office, industrial) and where should it be located?

4-What agriculture, natural resources, and/or open space needs to be protected in this area?

5-What infrastructure needs to be developed to support this area (e.g., sewer, water, flood protection, fire protection, roads, parks, law enforcement, community centers, etc.) and where should it be located?

6 –What additional developments, if any, should be accommodated in this area?

7-For City Edge discussion only, should this land remain under County control or should annexation to the City be assumed?

For the discussion of a preferred alternative for the “Economic Development” and “Agricultural and Natural Resources” items, the list of questions varies by item:

Elkhorn Business Park and Airport Industrial – Should either project be included and if so what amount and type of economic development is appropriate (e.g., retail, office, industrial)?

Commercial along I-5 and I-505 – Should this type of development be included and if so, what amount and type of economic development is appropriate along these corridors (e.g., retail, office, industrial) and where should it be located?

Agricultural Resources -- What additional land use protections should be put into place for the protection of agriculture? How should we define agriculture and should all agriculture be treated equally (e.g. Important Farmland mapping, soil type, Storie Index rating, land capability classification, etc.)? Should residences built on agricultural land be restricted (e.g. minimum size of parcel, maximum size of home, required proximity to streets, required clustering, etc)?

Natural Resources and Open Space Areas – What additional natural resource or open space areas should be designated?

Step 4 – The staff will summarize the direction of the Planning Commission in total after which it is recommended that the Planning Commission allow for final public testimony on the overall recommendation.

Step 5 -- The Planning Commission should undertake final deliberations and will then take a final formal vote to direct staff to carry forward the Recommended Preferred Alternative to the Board.

Information for Decision Making

The Alternatives Evaluation provides an evaluation of the four alternatives and other development scenarios, by community/location, within five key issue areas: economics, infrastructure, transportation, environment, and site design (“Smart Growth”). The executive

summary at the front of the Evaluation provides an overview of these issues. The Planning Commissioners and public are encouraged to familiarize themselves with this report as it is likely to be referenced extensively as an information source for developing the Commission's preferred alternative.

In addition, the following tables excerpted from Appendix A of the Alternatives Evaluation provide more detailed land use information for each alternative, broken down by town/area:

TABLE A-1 HOUSING GROWTH THROUGH BUILDOUT

	2005 Existing Units ^a	New Units			
		Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4
Clarksburg	179	22	22	22	22
Dunnigan	404	173	1,273	7,000	3,000
Esparto ^b	783	460	1,260	460	1,150
Knights Landing ^b	383	193	993	193	1,250
Madison	158	83	883	83	83
Monument Hills	618	25	150	25	450
Other Communities	535	123	123	123	123
Outside of Communities	4,816	1,617	821	1,617	900
Total Unincorporated County	7,876	2,696	5,525	9,523	6,978

Notes: See original report.

TABLE A-2 JOB-GENERATING GROWTH THROUGH BUILDOUT (IN ACRES)

	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4
Clarksburg	1	1	1	1
Dunnigan	108	184	536	284
Esparto	88	169	88	117
Knights Landing	12	50	12	105
Madison	1	27	1	27
Other Towns	5	5	5	37
Outside of Towns	77	42	77	480
Total Unincorporated County	292	478	720	1,051

Notes: See original report.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no separate attachments to this report. However, all referenced general Plan documents and reports, plus additional relevant information, is available on-line through the County's General Plan website at www.yolocountygeneralplan.org.