



# County of Yolo

## PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

**John Bencomo**  
DIRECTOR

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

**TO:** SUPERVISOR MARIKO YAMADA, Chair,  
and Members of the Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** JOHN BENCOMO, Director  
DAVID MORRISON, Assistant Director of Planning  
HEIDI TSCHUDIN, General Plan Project Manager  
Planning and Public Works Department

**DATE:** September 18, 2007

**SUBJECT:** Authorize Remaining Land Use/Mapping Assumptions for the General Plan Preferred Land Use Alternative and provide direction regarding both Agricultural Districts and rural residential development. (No general fund impact.)

---

### **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

- A. Authorize use of the attached land use/mapping assumptions for items held over from the July 17, 2007 meeting (Agenda Item 4.01) of the Board of Supervisors.
- B. Approve the definition of Agricultural Districts as outlined in this Board letter, for use by staff in developing the Draft General Plan.
- C. Direct staff to develop a program to address rural residential development, through such methods as clustered housing and unit location criteria, and return to the Board of Supervisors with the necessary Zoning Code amendments by March 2008.
- D. In accordance with Actions B and C above, direct staff to remove the reference to 200 new rural residential units in the Clarksburg Agricultural District, amend Attachment A accordingly, and stipulate that added rural residential units are not a component of the agricultural districts.

### **FISCAL IMPACTS**

The cost for the General Plan Update is a general fund item. The staff and consultant team are operating under scopes of work and budgets approved by the Board of Supervisors in previous actions. The total budget for the General Plan Update process was increased from \$1,639,599 to \$1,862,158 on July 31, 2007. To date approximately \$849,081 or 45.6 percent has been expended.

The County has previously been awarded a grant of \$221,000 from the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) for preparation of the Circulation Element. In addition, the General Plan cost recovery fees collected on building permits has accrued \$435,000 to date. The actual

cost to the general fund for the 5½-year process (June 2003 through Dec 2008) culminating in the General Plan Update is expected to be about \$1,000,000.

## **REASON FOR RECOMMENDED ACTION**

As directed by the Board of Supervisors on July 17, 2007 the General Plan team has performed additional analysis of unresolved land use/mapping assumptions for the General Plan Preferred Land Use Alternative. The recommended actions reflect this analysis. Each is explained in detail herein. Final action on these remaining outstanding items is requested so that the Preferred Land Use Alternative can be finalized and drafting of the updated General Plan and program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) can commence.

## **BACKGROUND**

On March 27, 2007 the Board of Supervisors took final action to adopt a Preferred Land Use Alternative for the General Plan Update. Within the Preferred Land Use Alternative, the Board took several actions that had the effect of identifying new acreage for commercial and industrial development (economic development) over the next 25 years. In some cases the Board also identified new acreage where residential development may be allowed as well. Based on the Board's direction, the staff prepared parcel-based recommendations for each area of the County where this potential new growth would occur. These recommendations were presented to the Board of Supervisors on July 17<sup>th</sup> in the form of land use and mapping assumptions to be used by the General Plan team in order to prepare the Draft General Plan land use diagram and land use table. This information, in turn, will be used to prepare the Draft EIR for the General Plan Update.

At the July 17, 2007 meeting, the Board of Supervisors authorized the majority of land use/mapping assumptions, but held over several items for additional analysis and deliberation. This report provides recommendations regarding the continued items for the Board's consideration so that direction may be provided on the remaining assumptions.

As previously reported, the land use diagram and land use table will be used extensively in the development of the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will have the ability to make further refinements to the Draft General Plan throughout the Update process; however, as the process continues to get more specific, changes later in the process (particularly to mapping and acreages) may adversely affect the budget and schedule.

## **REMAINING MAPPING ASSUMPTIONS**

The table in **Attachment A** provides the most up-to-date numeric representation of the Preferred Land Use Alternative. This table is revised from prior versions and reflects the Board's direction through July 17<sup>th</sup>, plus the staff recommendations provided in this report. The detailed actions and maps authorized on July 17, 2007 are documented in the minutes from that meeting (July 17, 2007 Agenda Item 4.01) which will be considered by the Board on September 11, 2007 and are not repeated in this report.

Staff has provided various attachments showing recommended boundaries for each remaining unresolved mapping assumption. The discussion below details the analytical justification for each of the recommendations. Where applicable, the County Agricultural Commissioner and Economic Development Manager have been consulted and are in agreement with these recommendations.

The staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors address each item separately by way of adopting the staff recommendation and/or directing specific changes.

## 1) CLARKSBURG

### July 17<sup>th</sup> Direction:

Staff was directed to analyze alternative sites for the 100-acre agricultural industrial facility for wineries and winery-related uses, and to meet with interested parties.

### Response to Direction:

An alternative site was presented to staff for analysis by an area representative. The alternative site is comprised of all or portions of four parcels totaling about 105 acres located adjoining the deep water ship channel at the southerly end of the County where Jefferson Boulevard intersects Courtland Road (see **Attachment B.1**).

Staff has examined the opportunities presented by this site and concluded that both the original site and the alternative site merit consideration. The alternative site has the following characteristics:

- 1) Though further removed from the center of the Clarksburg planning area and previously identified Clarksburg wineries, it would be more centrally located for the whole of the emerging wine growing in this area including grapes from northern Solano County, southern Sacramento County, and northern San Joaquin County.
- 2) Similar truck access to I-5, I-80, SR-99, and SR-50 via Jefferson Boulevard (SR 84), the Freeport Bridge, and the Courtland Bridge.
- 3) The more remote location minimizes potential aesthetic and nuisance impacts. This is particularly true if the future processing facility is a purely industrial processing plant with no tourism component, in which case distancing the project from a key entryway to the town of Clarksburg is preferable.
- 4) Similar impacts to soils and active agriculture. The alternative property has the exact same soil type as the earlier recommendation (non-prime, Class III, Storie Index 38)
- 5) Similar floodplain constraints (Zone B: 500-year; protected by levees) if construction occurs off the levee; however this site presents the possibility of development on top of the levee and may offer better conditions for elevation of the entire site and/or ring levee protection given the adjacency of the by-pass levee.
- 6) Proximity to the deep water ship channel creates an opportunity for future use of the channel for transport of raw materials and output products from the site.

### Recommendation:

Staff supports identification and study of both sites for location of a future winery-related agricultural industrial facility.

Designate 103 acres at the original site (APN: 034-200-05 and -06, and 043-210-01) and 105 acres at the alternative site (APN: 043-020-01, -02, -17 and a portion of 043-020-03) for Agricultural Industrial use limited to wineries and winery-related uses (see **Attachment B.2**). For purposes of evaluation in the General Plan Update, only one site would be assumed to be developed.

## 2) DUNNIGAN

### July 17<sup>th</sup> Direction:

Staff was directed to report back on the following actions regarding Dunnigan:

1. Analyze the proposed Dunnigan Landowners alternative map that would increase the area from 2,000 acres to 2,600 acres, and consider whether to expand west, south, both (as proposed), or not at all.
2. Consider whether the 2,000 acres is a maximum, for all disturbed acreage, or whether it pertains to developed uses only (excluding infrastructure, mitigation, and parks, for example).

### Response to Direction:

Staff independently reanalyzed the assumptions used to initially define the Dunnigan new growth area, rebalancing the potential residential yields and job production, and factoring in acreage for parks (5 acres per 1,000 people), open space (habitat buffers and agriculture buffers), schools, and infrastructure.

During the course of this analysis, it became apparent that additional land would need to be designated for commercial and industrial uses in order to achieve the desired jobs-housing balance for Dunnigan. Staff concluded that an expanded footprint of  $\pm 2,284$  total acres comprised as follows would allow for a fully sustainable community described by the Board:  $\pm 430$  acres of jobs-producing commercial and industrial land uses;  $\pm 1,136$  acres of residential uses in a variety of densities allowing for no more than 7,500 new units;  $\pm 336$  acres of parks and open space uses; and  $\pm 382$  acres in public/quasi-public uses.

In adding another 289 acres to the previous Dunnigan growth boundary, staff took several factors into consideration. One was the need to preserve the Tehama-Colusa Canal as the community's western boundary and as an important potential source of future domestic water. A second was to plan for development outside of the Federal-designated critical habitat for the Tiger Salamander, located to the northwest. Third was to maintain Bird Creek as Dunnigan's southern boundary and as an important riparian habitat and open space area. The revised growth boundary respects each of these constraints, while providing additional area for future economic development.

The expanded land area is self-contained in that all services, parks, buffers, and infrastructure would be developed within the identified

boundaries. Mitigation lands for loss of agricultural land and hawk habitat are assumed to be located outside of the plan area<sup>1</sup>.

Staff subsequently met with representatives of the Dunnigan Hills Landowners Group. The landowner group is in agreement with the proposed modified recommendation from staff.

Recommendation:

Apply the new "Specific Plan" designation to approximately 2,284 acres comprised of the following assessor parcels: 051-150-09; 051-160-01, -02, and -03; 052-010-06 and -07; 052-020-01, -02, -05, -06, and -08; 052-030-05, -16, and -17; 052-060-01, -02, -12, and a portion of -13; 052-070-06, -09, -10, -13, -15, and -16; 052-030-03, -04, and -07; 052-050-01; 052-100-03; and portions of 052-110-01 and -06 (see **Attachment C** new acreage and specific plan overlay boundary). Apply the new "Specific Plan Overlay" to the entire existing Dunnigan Area General Plan boundary.

### 3) MADISON

July 17th Direction:

Staff was directed to consider expanding highway commercial along the frontages of both State Route 16 and I-505, moving the sewer ponds to a different location within the community, including an area for agricultural industrial development, and potentially adjusting the number of homes to include casino workforce housing.

Response to Direction:

Staff reanalyzed the assumptions used to define the Madison new growth area from scratch, rebalancing the potential residential yields and job production, and factoring in acreage for parks (5 acres per 1,000 people), open space (habitat buffers and agriculture buffers), schools, and infrastructure based on preliminary assumptions about minimum service levels.

Staff concluded that an expanded footprint of ±398 acres comprised as follows would allow for a small sustainable community based on the parameters described by the Board: ±116 acres of jobs-producing commercial land uses; ±44 acres of agricultural industrial land; ±125 acres of residential uses in a variety of densities allowing for no more than 1,335 new units; ±63 acres of parks and open space uses; and ±50 acres in public/quasi-public uses (relocated sewer facility and new elementary school).

This expanded acreage would ensure a desirable jobs/housing balance, and would be located so as to keep the majority of the new residential area out of the floodplain. The revised footprint would maximize commercial exposure along both SR 16 and I-505. Land for a future agricultural industrial facility is preserved and the sewer ponds would be moved to a new more remote location with room for expansion.

---

<sup>1</sup> This approach would be applied to all specific plan areas and is consistent with the approach generally taken by the County for past development projects.

The expanded land area would be self-contained in that all services, parks, buffers, and infrastructure would be developed within the identified boundaries. Mitigation lands for loss of agricultural land and hawk habitat are assumed to be located outside of the plan area<sup>1</sup>.

Staff subsequently met with representatives of development interests in the area. These groups are in agreement with the proposed modified recommendation from staff.

Recommendation: Apply the new “Specific Plan” designation to approximately 398 acres comprised of the following assessor parcels: 049-090-08 and portions of 049-090-03; 049-090-11; 049-100-03, and -23 (see **Attachment D**, new acreage and specific plan overlay boundary).

#### 4) INTERSTATE 505/COUNTY ROAD 12A ALTERNATIVE

July 17<sup>th</sup> Direction: Staff was directed to report back with a map of 15 acres at the intersection of I-505 and County Road 12A as an alternative location to 15 acres approved for study as highway commercial or agricultural commercial at I-505 and CR 14.

Response to Direction: Staff analyzed the alternative intersection and recommends the southeast corner which has suitable topography and allows for access to CR 90A for circulation purposes (see **Attachment E.1**).

Recommendation: Designate the original site (northern portion of APN: 054-180-05 at the southwest quadrant of Interstate 505 and County Road 14) and the alternate site (portion of APN: 054-180-18) at the southeast quadrant of Interstate 505 and CR 12A) for highway commercial or agricultural uses (see **Attachment E.2**). For purposes of evaluation in the General Plan Update, only one site would be assumed to be developed.

#### 5) DUNNIGAN HILLS AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT

July 17<sup>th</sup> Direction: Staff was directed to coordinate with the Agricultural Commissioner and report back with a proposed Dunnigan Hills Agricultural District boundary map.

Response to Direction: Staff and the Agricultural Commissioner analyzed cropping patterns and considered agricultural productivity and emerging trends in the area encompassed by the Dunnigan Hills wine appellation. The entire appellation encompasses about 66,300 acres including all of the new Dunnigan growth area, all of Zamora, and a substantial portion of the County’s existing and future gravel mining area within the boundaries of the Cache Creek Area Plan. It borders Yolo and Monument Hills, and is in close proximity to the Capay Valley and Madison.

As proposed by staff the Dunnigan Hills Agricultural District would include 6,146 acres of almonds and walnuts, 102 acres of olives,

and 4,340 acres of wine grapes. These particular crops would represent over 15 percent of the proposed total area of the District.

This proposed district boundary captures 66 percent of the County's total almond crop, 25 percent of the County's total olive crop, and 43 percent of the County's total wine grapes. The proposed acreage (66,300) is similar in size to the proposed 67,000-acre Capay Valley Ag District, both of which are larger than the proposed 35,500-acre Clarksburg Ag District.

**Recommendation:**

Designate the Dunnigan Hills Agricultural District to encompass 66,300 acres, within the existing Dunnigan Hills wine appellation; area, excluding the proposed Dunnigan Specific Plan Area discussed above under item #2 and the town of Zamora (see **Attachment F**).

**DISCUSSION OF THE AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT CONCEPT AND THE ISSUE OF RURAL RESIDENTIAL HOUSING**

There has been considerable speculation among property owners, citizens, and the press regarding the emerging concept of "agricultural districts". In order to provide greater clarity concerning this topic, staff has researched to see how the term is applied in other General Plans throughout the country. In general, agricultural districts have three primary functions: tax relief programs (such as the Williamson Act which is used extensively in Yolo County), local agricultural zoning (such the A-P and A-1 zones in the Yolo County Zoning Code), and nuisance protection (such as Yolo County's Right to Farm ordinance). Since Yolo County already employs each of these programs throughout the rural area, questions have been raised as to what "agricultural districts" could mean in the context of the County's General Plan Update process.

In prior staff reports, the districts have been described generally as areas within Yolo County where agricultural business development and expansion (including industrial processing, commercial sales, and agricultural tourism) would be encouraged through the use of targeted regulatory streamlining, financial incentives, and specialized marketing efforts. Representatives for development interests and concerned County residents have recently been engaged in a discussion through the local media about whether and how increased residential development has a role within agricultural districts. Staff has noted that rural residential housing units have been linked by some with the agricultural district concept. It is the position of staff that policies and programs addressing rural residential development are a separate and distinct issue from agricultural districts and that they should not be joined.

Programs such as clustering of home sites within antiquated subdivisions, the location of farm dwellings on agricultural parcels, and transfer of development rights (TDR) programs are countywide issues that can provide benefits throughout the unincorporated area. In fact, these tools can be particularly effective in addressing a number of areas that are not located within any proposed agricultural district, particularly around the City of Davis, the County Airport, and the town of Esparto. The effectiveness of these tools would be significantly diminished if they were limited only to those properties located within agricultural districts.

The staff is seeking confirmation from the Board that no new housing units beyond those allowed under the 1983 General Plan will be analyzed anywhere in Yolo County unless that area is identified for new growth, as summarized in Attachment A. With the exception of 200 new units in the Clarksburg agricultural area (now proposed by staff to be eliminated from consideration), the

Preferred Land Use Alternative does not presently include any new units (beyond individual farm dwellings allowed under the 1983 General Plan) outside of specified growth areas within identified existing towns (Dunnigan, Esparto, Knights Landing, and Madison). Furthermore, with the exception of Clarksburg (unless removed as recommended), Esparto, and individual farm dwellings, all new residential growth is subject to a specific plan process which allows for further detailed analysis and public involvement.

To emphasize these distinctions and provide a framework for distinguishing between these issues, the General Plan team, including the Agricultural Commissioner and Economic Development Manager, has provided the following outline for how Agricultural Districts can be utilized, as well as an overview of the various tools available to address rural residential development.

### Agricultural District Program

The General Plan Team recommends a customized agricultural district program that makes use of a variety of methods that would be applicable only within designated agricultural districts. The staff envisions the districts as specially designated areas within which recognition of high value crops and area “branding” is already taking hold, and where additional efforts by the County would be valuable to the agricultural success of the area. While agricultural efforts countywide would continue to be strongly protected and promoted, focused efforts within the districts to promote agricultural processing and tourism would yield additional benefits to farming throughout the unincorporated area. As the initial districts mature and the County is able to document successes and failures, programs within the agricultural districts would be modified in response to changing market conditions, and may encompass new areas or evolve into countywide programs. By initially limiting these efforts to specific districts, however, the County will be able to effectively test various programs for broader application in the future. Concepts that staff recommends exploring within the agricultural districts include the following:

- Lower building permit fees to promote improvements and structures related to agricultural processing, rural tourism, and other value-added activities.
- Relaxed standards for parking (e.g. allowed use of gravel surfaces rather than paved), occupancy (e.g. allowed use of barn structures for events), lighting (e.g. lower minimum standards), pedestrian circulation (e.g. allowed use of surfaces other than paved sidewalk), and sanitation (e.g. allowed use of portable toilets and related facilities rather than permanent systems) to encourage agricultural tourism opportunities.
- Free or subsidized participation in specialized marketing efforts to continue targeted “branding” and name recognition within the districts.
- Free or subsidized use of County sponsored CEQA clearance documents (e.g. master EIRs) to allow for more intense agricultural “tourism” use of properties (e.g. dude ranch, winery, restaurant, bakery, itinerant vending, cheese production, oil press, wine crush, outdoor entertainment/music, culinary classes, tourist cabins, etc.).
- Differentiated impact thresholds for rural roadways that allow higher traffic levels for agriculturally related events while maintaining the rural setting and design of the existing roadways.
- County “permit coordinator” services to educate and assist land owners in securing various permits for agricultural-related endeavors and infrastructure within the districts.

- Improved opportunities for development of on-site housing for agricultural families and farm-workers (e.g. mobile home parks; recreational vehicles; worker “camps”, etc.).

### Rural Residential Development

The General Plan team recommends the development of a program to apply countywide, including the agricultural districts, to provide incentives for better managing the placement of allowed residential development within the agricultural areas. The program would focus on two primary tools: 1) clustering of residential units (particularly within antiquated subdivisions); and 2) the “unit placement” criteria already approved by the Board of Supervisors as a part of the Preferred Land Use Alternative. It is likely that through the General Plan update process additional program ideas may emerge that will result in an enhanced rural residential management program. However, an ordinance can be developed ahead of the General Plan Update, to put clustering and unit placement criteria into practice in the near-term. Once in place, the ordinance can be amended later to incorporate new ideas emanating from the updated General Plan. This two-tiered approach will ensure that these needed tools are in place as soon as possible.

There are other approaches that can be used. However, they would limit existing property rights enjoyed by land owners within agricultural areas. Under the County’s current zoning regulations, one principal residence and one second unit can be constructed on any legal parcel in the County so long as zoning code standards, such as setback requirements, can be met. The Code could be amended to require Use Permit approval for second units or for primary units on parcels smaller than a specified size. However, this would also make it more difficult for farmers, their family members, and workers to live on-site. A second approach would be to increase the minimum parcel size (currently 20 acres) in agricultural areas. Staff had previously explored an increased minimum parcel size of 80 acres which would have the effect of eliminating units currently allowed on smaller parcels. On March 27, 2007 on a 3:2 vote, the Board directed staff to eliminate this from consideration as a part of the Preferred Land Use Alternative (Minute Order No. 07-100; Ayes: Chamberlain, McGowan, Rexroad; Noes: Thomson, Yamada).

Staff believes that a successful ordinance can preserve established private property rights, while rewarding projects that locate and design allowed rural residential homes in a manner that minimizes impacts to agriculture. Clustering of residential units is the first key tool that could be used to provide incentives for the beneficial placement of rural homes in Yolo County. Here are two examples of how it could work:

Example A (Joint Holdings) -- One property owner with several small parcels (e.g. 10–acres) within an agricultural area could choose to cluster the allowable farm dwellings in one area of the property and place permanent conservation easements on the remainder. As an incentive, the County could provide one or more bonus units (“Agricultural Preservation Credits”) or the County could allow the individual home sites to be split off from the original parcel. This type of clustering would be particularly helpful in addressing concerns relating to antiquated subdivisions.

Example B (Coordinated Holdings) – Adjoining property owners voluntarily join together to locate their respectively allowed farm dwellings on clustered adjoining property corners with permanent conservation easements protecting the rest of the property. Similar to the first example, as incentives the County could provide one or more bonus housing units (these could be called “Agricultural Preservation Credits”) or the County could allow the individual home sites to be split off from the original parcels.

The second key tool would involve establishing unit placement criteria. On March 27, 2007, the Board directed staff to pursue management of rural home site development by establishing specific criteria for approval (Minute Order No. 07-99), as follows:

Control rural home site development by establishing specific criteria for approval. Proposed homes that comply with the criteria would be issued Building Permits, while those that are not consistent with the criteria would require approval of a Use Permit. Criteria may apply to both the primary and the ancillary home, and would include but not be limited to the following:

- Size of the home(s);
- Location of the home(s) within the property;
- A stewardship plan demonstrating how the property would be farmed;
- Placement of the remainder of the property, outside of any home site(s), in a permanent agricultural conservation easement;
- Home sites less than 20 acres require a use permit.

With the evolution of the concepts discussed above staff believes that assignment of an additional 200 rural residential units in the Clarksburg Agricultural District may not necessary for the success of that district. The added units have taken on an unintended significance that could diminish the opportunities offered through the agricultural districts. Staff believes that a countywide approach to unit clustering and controls on unit placement provides greater benefits overall. If it is ultimately determined that added residential units are needed to provide "bonus units" for a successful TDR program, then that would be addressed at a later time. In the interim it is recommended that the Board of Supervisors direct staff to remove the reference to 200 new rural residential units in the Clarksburg Agricultural District and amend Attachment A accordingly. Staff also recommends that the Board clarify that added rural residential units are not a component of the agricultural districts.

## **NEXT STEPS**

With the approval of the Preferred Land Use Alternative completed, staff will focus on preparation of the Draft General Plan for public review. This document will not only put into place the actions needed to implement the Preferred Land Use Alternative, but will also address all of the priorities that the Board has discussed over the previous three years of the General Plan Update process. These issues will be developed within an overall policy framework that both reflects the County's historic commitment to protecting agriculture and open space, and provides the foundation needed to successfully meet the future challenges associated with improving communities, managing growth, and growing the local economy.

It is anticipated that the Draft General Plan will be presented to the Board of Supervisors for their review in February 2008. At the same time, staff will be working closely with the consultant team to prepare the Draft EIR, to analyze the potential impacts associated with the updated General Plan. The Draft EIR is expected to be released by March 2008.

The General Plan process is a broad-based policy initiative that will directly and indirectly affect most County operations. Consequently, there are a number of areas where the General Plan Update coincides with priorities already identified with the Action Outlines 2007 document adopted

by the Board of Supervisors in July. The Planning and Public Works Department and consultant team are coordinating closely with the CAO's office to ensure that the General Plan Update reinforces the adopted Policy Agenda and associated Actions. Specific examples include:

- Action B: Economic Development Plan and Performance Measurements. The Economic Development Manager is working with Bay Area Economics (part of the General Plan consultant team) to prepare an Economic Strategy to address tourism, expanding agricultural and biotech opportunities, highway commercial development, and the development review process. The resulting strategy will be adopted as an appendix to and referenced within the General Plan Update.
- Action F: Development Impact Fees. The circulation study being developed by Fehr and Peers for the General Plan Update will be useful for determining future traffic impact fees, as will the policies included in the updated Circulation Element to the General Plan that identify truck routes and primary County roads. The General Plan EIR will also begin to assign levels of responsibility for mitigation of road improvements to the various growth areas. Similarly, staff and consultants are working with the Parks and Resources Department to identify future regional park sites for inclusion in the updated General Plan, which will also be used in development of the Parks Strategic Plan.
- Action H: Green Policy Development. The strategies and policies developed by the CAO's office as they relate to green standards in new construction will be included in the updated General Plan.
- Action J: Roads Capital Investment Program. As noted above, the circulation study being developed by Fehr and Peers for the General Plan Update will be useful for determining future traffic impact fees, as will the policies included in the updated Circulation Element to the General Plan that identify truck routes and primary County roads. The General Plan EIR will also begin to assign levels of responsibility for mitigation of road improvements to the various growth areas.
- Action K: Housing Strategy for Yolo County. The housing goals and strategy being developed by the CAO's office will be included in the updated Housing Element.
- Action N: Agricultural Related Business Retention and Attraction Strategy and Actions. The agricultural business development policies being developed by the Agricultural Commissioner and the Economic Development Manager will be included in the Economic Strategy being appended to the Land Use Element and will be referenced in the General Plan where appropriate.
- Action O: Agricultural Mitigation Ordinance. The agricultural mitigation standards will be reflected in the General Plan Update.
- Action Q: Rural Community Service Standards Report and Policy Direction. The appropriate range and levels of services provided to rural communities by County agencies will be incorporated into the policies of the updated General Plan and will form the basis for analysis in the EIR.
- Action T: Integrated Regional Water Management Plan. Relevant policies of the adopted IRWMP will be referenced and/or incorporated into the General Plan Update.

- Action U: Habitat Mitigation Ordinance. Staff and consultants are working with the Parks and Resources Department to coordinate background data and analysis between the HCP/NCCP and General Plan Update, as well as to ensure that the policies of the two documents are compatible.
- Action Z: Parks and Open Space Master Plan Project Prioritization and Funding. As noted above, staff and consultants are working with the Parks and Resources Department to identify future regional park sites for inclusion in the General Plan, which will also be used in the update of the existing Parks Master Plan.
- Action AA: General Plan Update. The General Plan Update is expected to be brought to the Board of Supervisors for adoption in the autumn of 2008

## **ATTACHMENTS**

All referenced General Plan documents are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and available through the county's General Plan website at [www.yolocountygeneralplan.org](http://www.yolocountygeneralplan.org).

- Attachment A – Preferred Land Use Alternative Summary Table (revised and updated)
- Attachment B.1 – Clarksburg, Vicinity Map for Original Site and Alternative Site
- Attachment B.2 – Clarksburg, Revised Recommendation
- Attachment C – Dunnigan, Revised Recommendation
- Attachment D – Madison, Revised Recommendation
- Attachment E.1 – Vicinity Map for I-505/CR 14 Site and I-505/CR 12A Alternative
- Attachment E.2 – I-505/CR 12A Alternative
- Attachment F – Proposed Dunnigan Hills Agricultural District Boundary