



County of Yolo

PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

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

JOHN BENCOMO
DIRECTOR

TO: THE HONORABLE MIKE McGOWAN, Chair
and the Members of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: JOHN BENCOMO, Director
David Morrison, Assistant Director
Planning and Public Works Department

DATE: October 26, 2004

SUBJECT: Second Joint Meeting with the Planning Commission to Consider the General
Plan Update Process

RECOMMENDED ACTION

IT IS RECOMMENDED that the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- A. **RECEIVE** a presentation by staff and the consultant regarding the General Plan Update;
- B. **HOLD** a joint public hearing; and
- C. **PROVIDE** comments on any additions, revisions, and/or deletions, for the following:
 - i. General Plan Vision/Principles/Policy Definition Memo (Attachment A)
 - ii. Public Meeting Summary (Attachment B);
 - iii. Technical Background Reports; and
 - iv. Second Round of Public Workshops (Attachment C).

FISCAL IMPACT

The approved 2004-05 County budget includes the full \$772,086 needed for completion of the updated General Plan. On April 6, 2004, the Board directed staff to submit a grant to the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) in the amount of \$221,040, to pay for the costs of preparing the Land Use and Circulation Elements of the General Plan update. Staff has been informed by SACOG that the grant has been approved and that funds will be available later this year. The funds provided by SACOG were approved for the purpose of enhancing the current General Plan update effort to incorporate "Smart Growth" principles and implementation measures, in accordance with the SACOG Community Design Program. The grant funds will go to pay for the expanded work needed to comply with SACOG's requirements, in addition to the approved scope of work. Significant staff resources will be required to manage the contract and coordinate between

the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, various advisory committees, the consultant, and the public.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Joint Meeting between the Board and the Planning Commission will provide an early opportunity for members of each body to provide direction to staff regarding public comments received to date, the draft technical background reports, the second round of public workshops, and the draft revised visions memo. Although the General Plan Update will be an evolving process, which will rely extensively on public contributions, it is important for the staff and consultant to understand the concerns and priorities of decision-makers before proceeding with forming General Plan alternatives and initial policy recommendations.

BACKGROUND

On March 28, 2000, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to provide periodic progress reports relating to the proposed General Plan update schedule. The Board also approved a tentative schedule for updating various elements of the General Plan over several years. On May 13, 2003, the Board directed staff to return with a specific proposal for costs and schedules to update the Land Use and Circulation Elements of the County General Plan. Staff reported back to the Board on June 17, 2003, and recommended that a Request for Proposals be brought back for future consideration to update the entire General Plan.

On October 7, 2003, the Board reviewed the draft RFP and requested staff to return with several revisions. On November 25, 2003, the Board directed staff to send out Requests for Proposals including the approved Vision Statement to solicit bids from the list of planning consultants to prepare the County General Plan Update and Environmental Impact Report for the unincorporated area. The RFP was released on December 3, 2003. The deadline for responding to the RFP was Friday, January 9, 2004.

On February 24, 2004, the Board heard presentations by the two consulting teams that had submitted proposals in response to the RFP. After extensive discussion, the Board directed staff to pursue execution of a contract with Jones and Stokes Associates, pending negotiation of a lower contract price, a set of product milestones, and a shorter contract schedule. On May 4, 2004, the Board approved the contract with Jones and Stokes Associates.

On April 6, 2004, the Board directed staff to submit a grant application to SACOG for \$221,040 to supplement funding for the General Plan Update. On June 1, the Board held its first joint workshop with the Planning Commission to consider the General Plan update process and approved the draft stakeholders list, draft initial list of General Plan issues, and draft format and schedule for the first round of workshops. On July 20, 2004, the Board received a presentation from the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) and adopted a resolution supporting the terms of the Regional Affordable Housing Compact.

VISIONS/PRINCIPLES/POLICY DEFINITIONS

The consultant has reviewed the current 1983 General Plan, the list of planning issues originally presented by staff as part of the initial General Plan update process, the SACOG Regional Blueprint Project, the comments received during the five workshops, and the results of the technical background reports. Based on their review, staff and the consultant have prepared an initial list of policy issues that may require further consideration as the General Plan update proceeds:

Agriculture

- A. Use urban limit lines and greenbelts to protect agricultural lands and open space.
- B. Designate an area for agricultural-industrial development and support industries.
- C. Provide economic incentives to keep farmland in local ownership and production.
- D. Strengthen agricultural mitigation requirements.
- E. Allow areas for rural home site development on poor quality farmland.
- F. Create zoning/planning policies to act in place of the Williamson Act, if funding is eliminated.

Land Use

- G. Accommodate future population growth through increased densities and mixed uses.
- H. Integrate Community, Regional, Specific, and Urban Area Plans with the General Plan.
- I. Adopt measures to eliminate antiquated subdivisions and limit rural residential development.
- J. Promote visual gateways or aesthetic themes for community points of interest.
- K. Create a new city to provide for urban development opportunities.
- L. Recognize unique needs and assets of individual communities within the County.

Housing

- M. Create more affordable housing and increase the diversity of housing available.
- N. Integrate affordable housing into the existing community.
- O. Design housing to complement the existing town through adopted guidelines.

Economy

- P. Build new efforts to support tourism and recreation development.
- Q. Redevelop existing communities and downtown areas.
- R. Provide additional opportunities for value-added agricultural products and direct sales.
- S. Invest portion of tax revenue back into communities where the taxes are generated.

Public Facilities and Services

- T. Create a regional hiking/biking trail system, connecting parks with towns along watercourses.
- U. Involve the County more actively in regional flood control efforts and partnerships.
- V. Adopt fees to ensure that new development bears the cost of services and amenities.
- W. Work with other agencies to provide more services for rural residents.
- X. Build or improve sewer and water facilities in communities where they are inadequate.
- Y. Enhance land use policies to ensure continued operation of the County landfill and airport.
- Z. Design facilities and neighborhoods to enhance public safety and accessibility.

Transportation and Circulation

- AA. Expand transportation alternatives and services.
- BB. Increase improvements and maintenance of County Road system.
- CC. Develop multi-modal transportation centers near housing, shopping, and employment.
- DD. Protect ability of farm equipment to use County Roads.

Natural and Cultural Resources

- EE. Develop financing mechanisms to acquire/maintain agricultural and open space protection.
- FF. Adopt measures to preserve existing trees and guidelines for replacement.
- GG. Coordinate with other agencies to protect local surface water supplies.
- HH. Establish programs to enhance groundwater supplies to reduce subsidence.
- II. Integrate the Parks Master Plan with the General Plan update
- JJ. Coordinate the General Plan update with development of the NCCP.
- KK. Expand the protection of cultural and historic resources.
- LL. Ensure that conservation easements comply with nearby existing and planned land uses.

Energy

- MM. Promote energy conservation and alternative generation technology.
- NN. Incorporate Energy Element into the Conservation Element.
- OO. Investigate the annexation of all or a part of the County into SMUD.

General

- PP. Specify how the General Plan will be implemented, financed, and who will be accountable.
- QQ. Encourage more community involvement and input in the General Plan update process.
- RR. Prioritize the goals of the General Plan.
- SS. Provide a glossary and definitions of terms, including prime farmland and rural recreation.

These issues will be explored in more depth during the second round of public workshops and will be further reviewed by staff and the consultant as a part of developing the initial policy recommendations to bring back to the Board and Planning Commission for future consideration.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC WORKSHOP COMMENTS

In all, 122 people attended the first round of five public workshops held in Knights Landing, West Plainfield, Esparto, Clarksburg, and Dunnigan. Sixteen additional people have contacted Jones and Stokes by either postcard and/or e-mail, for a total of 138. The participants generated approximately 566 separate comments regarding the General Plan update. Staff has grouped these comments

into broad topics to highlight general directions in the public discussion to date. These twelve topics account for about half of all comments received.

1. Protect agriculture – 7.6% (43 comments)
(create “green belts” between communities, eliminate antiquated subdivisions, establish permanent urban limit lines, increase lot sizes, strengthen agricultural mitigation requirements, and prohibit ranchette and high-end rural residential development).
2. Help farmers remain economically viable – 6.2% (35 comments)
(provide tax incentives, decrease County fees, attract agricultural industry, develop local markets for products, protect agricultural infrastructure, adopt development fees to support farming, and reduce regulation).
3. Develop more affordable housing – 4.8% (27 comments)

(build diverse housing, integrate affordable housing with the existing community, and design to complement the existing town).

4. Promote infill instead of sprawl – 4.2% (24 comments)
(increase residential densities, and build homes close to jobs, transit, and shopping).
5. Improve existing services – 4.2% (24 comments)
(build more schools in rural towns, provide more law and traffic enforcement, expand and modernize fire protection, clean up abandoned vehicles and roadside trash, add more landscaping to County Roads and town gateways).
6. Charge developer fees to provide new infrastructure and services – 4.2% (24 comments)
(build sewer and water systems, develop community amenities, and expand existing services).
7. Encourage economic development – 4.2% (24 comments)
(provide opportunities for eco-tourism, agri-tourism, recreation, employment, and downtown commercial revitalization – especially community shopping and services).
8. Expand public transit – 3.5% (20 comments)
(provide more options, accommodate seniors and the handicapped, enhance connections, develop multi-modal centers, plan for light rail, and increase availability).
9. Create more recreational opportunities – 3.2% (18 comments)
(connect towns to parks with hiking and biking trails, build regional trails along waterways, improve existing trails and park facilities, and develop new parks in accordance with the Parks Master Plan).
10. Repair and improve County Roads – 2.8% (16 comments)
(fill potholes, widen streets to accommodate farm equipment, and improve County Roads to meet demands of new growth).
11. Allow limited development on farmland – 2.8% (16 comments)
(provide areas for ranchette development, build on poor quality farmland, permit home sites to be divided from farms, reduce parcel sizes in the A-P Zone, and give farmers the flexibility to economically use their land).
12. Provide flood control – 1.9% (11 comments)
(maintain levees, clean out waterways, avoid development in flood plains, and fix existing drainage systems).

Staff believes that the comments received so far indicate general support for strengthening the County's past policies of protecting agriculture and wildlife habitat, while directing growth towards existing cities and towns. In addition, there appears to be growing support for "Smart Growth" policies, which SACOG has defined as including: (1) Provide a variety of transportation choices; (2) Offer housing choices and opportunities; (3) Encourage compact development; (4) Promote in-fill development and reuse; (5) Allow for mixed residential and commercial uses; (6) Preserve open space and farmland; and (7) Create distinctive, attractive communities with quality design. A summary of the second round of public workshops will be provided at the next joint session of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors regarding the General Plan update, to see if these

general trends continue.

SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL BACKGROUND REPORTS

The Draft Technical Background Reports are still in the process of being finalized and will be provided to the Board, Commission, and made available to the public at the workshop. A summary of some of the more interesting findings from each report are presented as follows:

Land Use

SACOG estimates that the County population will increase from its current level of 180,000 to 266,000 from 2000 to 2025. During this same period, the unincorporated area is expected to increase from 21,420 to 35,155. The County's overall density is 167 people per square mile, compared with a Statewide average of 220. Nearly 90 percent of the County population lives in the four cities.

Current land use within the unincorporated area is dominated by agriculture, which includes cultivated cropland, orchards, vineyards, and livestock, accounts for a total of 86 percent of the County. Ten percent of the area consists of public and/or private open space. The majority of open space consists of Federal and State-owned land, which accounts for more than 36,000 acres, or 56 square miles. Developed urban land, including the four cities and all unincorporated towns, total only 3 percent. Water features make up the remaining 1 percent of Countywide land use.

Between 1992 and 2002, 4,300 acres (about 6.7 square miles) of important farmland was converted to non-agricultural use. However, even with that loss, farming accounts for 89 percent of total existing land use within the unincorporated area. Even 14 percent of the land within the incorporated areas of the cities is currently used for agriculture.

Economics

The most recent economic data is from 2003, which shows that there were 98,500 employees in Yolo County. The growth in employment was slower than the regional average from 1995 to 2000, but has increased faster than the rest of the region since 2000. Similarly, this was reflected in Yolo County's unemployment rate of 5.3 percent in 2003, which was lower than both the SACOG region (5.9 percent) and California Statewide (6.7%).

As of 2003, the largest economic sector by far in Yolo County was government, accounting for 36 percent of all employees. Other primary employers include services (8%), utilities (8%), retail sales (8%), hospitality (7%), and manufacturing (6%). Workers in the agricultural industry provide only 4 percent of County employment, although this is a higher percentage than the farm industry within the region and/or the State. If we only look at the unincorporated area, employment would generally parallel the County-wide figures. The largest employers are government (70%), agriculture (6%), services (6%), wholesale sales (6%), and retail sales (6%).

Between 1995 and 2003, those business sectors expanding the most in employment have been construction (+89%), recreation (+67%), hospitality (+37%), government (+36%), food and drink (+30%), and real estate (+25%). Those suffering declines in employment include agriculture (-16%), retail sales (-3%), and manufacturing (-2%). The firm of Applied Development Economics also analyzed industries throughout the County to determine where we have a comparative advantage in the region and State. Business sectors were placed into one of four categories:

growing; emerging; transforming; or small and declining.

- Growing Industries have a high number of people employed locally and are growing faster than similar businesses in the region and/or State. This category generally consists of the agricultural and health fields, including: farm labor contractors, residential health care, industrial machinery/equipment, skilled nursing facilities, fresh fruits and vegetables, diagnostic substances, crop preparation services, and hospital and medical service plans.
- Emerging Industries have few local employees, but are growing faster than similar businesses in the region and/or State. The health field, particularly general medical and surgical hospitals, and surgical and medical instruments, dominate this category.
- Transforming Industries have a high number of people employed locally, but are stagnant or shrinking compared to the region and/or State. This category is largely made up of the agricultural and support sectors, with the largest employers including: trucking, vegetables and melons, general crop farms, mobile homes, rice milling, and warehousing and storage.
- Small and Declining Industries have few workers employed locally and are stagnant or shrinking compared to the region and/or State. This category is generally dominated by agriculture and health, with the largest employers including: doctor's offices, dentist's offices, landscaping and horticulture, newspapers, and health practitioners.

ADE also provides estimates of future employment in Yolo County through the planning period of 2025. Based on analysis provided by both SACOG and a private economics firm, the number of jobs County-wide is expected to grow from the present estimate of about 111,000 in 2005 to nearly 174,000 in 2025. For the unincorporated area only, employment is projected to increase from 30,000 in 2005 to 40,000 in 2025.

Natural Resource Conservation

Water: Approximately 960,000 acre-feet of water is used annually in Yolo County. The primary supplies are surface water from Cache Creek and the Sacramento River, and groundwater supplies from the eastern portion of the County. The majority of water use is agricultural, accounting for 92 percent of total consumption. The four cities account for another 5 percent of water use. The remaining 3 percent is used for environmental purposes.

The groundwater storage capacity for all of Yolo County has been estimated at 14 million acre-feet, with 6.5 million acre-feet contained in storage. Groundwater is generally characterized by the presence of sodium magnesium, calcium magnesium, and/or magnesium bicarbonate. Water quality is good for agricultural and municipal uses, but is hard to very hard in terms of mineral content. Elevated concentrations of selenium, nitrate, boron and arsenic have been found in the groundwater along Cache Creek. Subsidence has primarily been located in the area along Interstate 5, extending from Woodland to Zamora, with some subsidence also located near Knights Landing. As much as 4 feet of subsidence has occurred since the 1950s. Since 1999, the area near Davis has subsided two inches, while Zamora has subsided three inches.

Surface water quality concerns vary from one watershed to another. The Sacramento River is impaired by diazinon, mercury, and unknown toxicity. Pesticides from agricultural use are contaminants of concern, particularly thiobencarb and molinate. Cache Creek water quality concerns include mercury, boron, sediment, and unknown toxicity. Putah Creek also has mercury

and boron, along with concerns regarding effluent. It should be noted that in all of the previous instances, the levels of mercury do not exceed drinking water standards, but are a concern for wildlife bio-accumulation. Willow Slough has documented unknown toxicity, with monitoring currently focused on sediments and nutrients. Nutrients are also a concern within the Yolo Bypass.

Agriculture: The largest crops for Yolo County in 2003 were: processing tomatoes (\$61.2 million), rice (\$39.9 million), wine grapes (\$37.4 million), alfalfa (\$31.1 million), seed crops (\$17.9 million), wheat (\$16.4 million), walnuts (\$12.3 million), almonds (\$12.2 million), organic crops (\$10.6 million), and cattle (\$10.2 million). Alfalfa in particular has seen rapid growth recently, with the acreage in production increasing by one-third over the past five years. Similarly, rice has seen a doubling of acreage planted, but has limited future potential for growth due to limited land and water availability. Fruit and nut crops have seen an increase of 10 percent, particularly almonds, walnuts, and wine grapes. Cattle has also increased about ten percent, while milk production is up 300 percent.

In contrast, tomato acreage has dropped by one-third since 1998, due to price decreases and the loss of local canneries. Prunes have had a similar decrease as a result of depressed prices. Although seed prices have remained stable, their acreage has decreased about 10 percent. More dramatically, sugar beets are no longer planted in Yolo County, while the acreage devoted to cotton has plummeted due to low commodity prices.

The total value of agricultural production in Yolo County over the past ten years has not significantly changed, holding steady throughout at about \$300 million. Although there are bright spots, most commodities have been experiencing increasing production costs with no corresponding increase in prices. The number of farms in Yolo County has decreased from 1,077 to 1,060 over the past five years. Yolo County's agricultural production is struggling to maintain even a steady state in today's economy.

Mineral Resources: The State of California designates Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs) of regional and/or Statewide significance. The only MRZ-2 (areas where significant mineral resources are likely present) located in Yolo County consists of about 18,500 acres along lower Cache Creek, generally extending from the Capay Dam to the town of Yolo. Producing natural gas fields are generally located in the Dunnigan Hills, northeast of the City of Winters, the Rumsey Hills, and along the Yolo Bypass. Other mineral resources located within Yolo County include gold and silver (McLaughlin Mine), mercury (northwest area of the County), limestone (west of Esparto), sandstone and tuff (along Putah Creek), and clay (near Woodland, Winters, and Capay).

Biological Resources: There are five main types of biological communities in Yolo County. The valley floor is largely characterized by agricultural communities, while the Capay Hills support woodland and grassland habitats. Wetlands and riparian communities are found along local riparian corridors. A total of 39 special-status plants are known to occur in Yolo County, of which 3 are Federally and/or State listed. Yolo County has been designated as critical habitat for Colusa grass and Solano grass. There are 37 special status animal species in Yolo County, of which 14 are State and/or Federally listed. Yolo County has been designated as critical habitat for vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp. Critical habitat is proposed for the California tiger salamander. There are 10 special-status fish known in Yolo County, of which 4 are State and/or Federally listed. Yolo County has been designated as critical habitat for winter-run Chinook salmon and delta smelt, as well as essential fish habitat for the fall/late fall-run Chinook salmon.

Air Quality: Yolo County is in attainment for carbon monoxide (CO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). It is

in non-attainment for ozone (both Federal and State standards); and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀) during a 24-hour period (State standard only). Yolo County was in violation for 7 days in 2003, compared with 25 days of violations in 2002, and 14 days in 2001. According to 2003 data, about 47 percent of the precursors to ozone emitted in Yolo County came from off-road motor vehicles, including light trucks, gas trucks, diesel trucks, motorcycles, buses, and motor homes. Another 20 percent comes from other mobile sources, such as aircraft, trains, ships, recreational boats, off-road vehicles, farm equipment, and fuel storage. As for PM₁₀, 87 percent is generated by miscellaneous processes, including construction and demolition, farming operations, road dust, fires, waste burning, cooking, residential fuel combustion, and fugitive windblown dust.

Energy: There are no hydroelectric or geothermal power plants located in Yolo County. Although there aren't any commercial wind power plants in Yolo County, a portion of western Yolo County has been designated by the State as a wind resource area with winds between 11 and 14 miles per hour. There are two solar power plants in Yolo County, one located in the City of Davis and the other at the Cache Creek Casino. In addition, there are three other power plants, a natural gas facility located at UC-Davis, a bio-mass facility located in Woodland, and a waste-to-energy facility located at the Yolo County Landfill.

Transportation and Circulation

The County currently maintains about 800 miles of roads. In general, the busiest County routes are Roads 98 and Road 102, each averaging between 450 and 700 vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour. This level of activity is similar to that of two-lane rural State highways within Yolo County. In contrast, major roads within the incorporated cities range between 1,000 and 2,200 vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour. The Interstates have a much wider range of intensity, varying anywhere from 450 trips per peak hour to nearly 9,000.

All County Roads are currently operating at LOS "C" or above. With regards to traffic safety, State Route 16, State Route 45, and State Route 128 all have accident rates higher than the State average for similar highways. The highest concentration of accidents on County Roads over the past three years have generally occurred on Russell Boulevard; County Road 98; Old River Road; and South River Road.

Concerning alternative transportation, about one-third of all County residents either carpool, bicycle, walk, take public transit, or work at home. Last year, the Yolo County Transportation District served 1.2 million riders, while the Paratransit system served 1,400 riders. There are four park-and-ride lots in the County, at Winters, Davis, and West Sacramento, with one planned by the County for Casino employees. The County has over 11 miles of bicycle paths.

The County also has a range of transportation resources. There are four general aviation airports: County, Watts-Woodland, Borges-Clarksburg, and University. There are 218 airplanes based at the four airports, which serve a total 322 aircraft operations per day. The Port of Sacramento is the only harbor located in Yolo County, occupying approximately 165 acres and serviced by the Union Pacific rail line and terminal area, as well as more than 50 trucking companies. More than 736,000 tons of freight were handled at the Port last year, primarily consisting of rice, aggregate, fertilizer, and wood chips. The County is also served by three railroads: Union Pacific, Sacramento River Train, and California Northern Railroad.

Highway 16 through the Capay Valley is currently designated as a local scenic highway, but it is

also eligible for designation as a State Scenic Highway. Highway 128 from Winters to Berryessa, Old River Road, and South River Road are also designated as local scenic highways.

Safety

Flood control is the responsibility of many different agencies, including the Reclamation Board, FEMA, SAFCA, Reclamation Districts, US Army Corps of Engineers, and others. The primary sources of flooding are Cache Creek and the Sacramento River/Yolo Bypass. (It should be noted that during a 100-year flood, the Yolo Bypass carries 82 percent of the Sacramento River flow.) Putah Creek, Willow Slough, and the Colusa Basin Drain provide secondary flood sources. The County is also susceptible to inundation from the failure of Cache Creek Dam, Monticello Dam, Indian Valley Dam, Folsom Dam, Shasta Dam, and the Feather River Dam.

The primary threat from earthquakes in Yolo County is ground shaking. The only fault in Yolo County subject to surface rupture is the Hunting Creek Fault, west of Rumsey, which has the potential to generate a 6.9 on the Richter Scale.

Communities at risk from wild land fire include Esparto, Guinda, Rumsey, and Winters. During the last 50 years, there have been 55 fires greater than 100 acres, all located in the western County (excluding the current fire season). The cause of only one fire was lightning, the rest were either caused by arson or an unknown source.

The County has only one Superfund site, the Frontier Fertilizer facility in Davis. To date, about 193 underground tanks have been re-mediated, while another 81 underground tanks are in the process of being cleaned up.

Cultural and Historical Resources

There are more than 1,200 recorded cultural resources in Yolo County, 270 of which are archaeological sites. The number of prehistoric archaeological sites is 157. These include habitation and occupation sites, hunting/processing camps, milling stations, quarries, rock art, and burial locations. Many of these sites are found along various local rivers. As a result, the prehistoric archaeological sensitivity of the riparian areas in Yolo County is considered high. The remaining 118 historic archaeological sites typically involve old transportation corridors and alignments, historic homesteading, ranching, agriculture, and mining. The overall historic archaeology of the County is considered moderately high.

Excluding the cities, there are 188 buildings within the County that qualify for placement on either the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historic Places. The majority of these structures are located in Clarksburg, Yolo, Knights Landing, and Esparto. A total of four buildings are listed on the National Register, including: the Canon School in Brooks; the Union Church in Dunnigan; the Town Hall in Rumsey; and the Branch Library in Yolo. In addition, there are four California Points of Interest in the unincorporated area, including: Mary's Chapel at the intersection of Roads 15 and 98; St. Agnes Church in Zamora; the Capay School site in Capay; and the Leonidas Taylor Monument near the Elkhorn area.

Noise

The major sources of noise are Interstate and State Highways, airports, trains, mining, and farming activities. Noise sensitive receptors include residences, hospitals and healthcare facilities, parks and wildlife areas, places of worship, libraries, and schools.

PUBLIC WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

As previously mentioned, the second round of public workshops will take place within the cities, to complement the previous workshops held in the unincorporated communities. Similar to the first round of workshops, staff will begin each meeting with a general overview of the update process, principles, and background information. Participants will then move into smaller groups, each with their own facilitator, to take comments from the public. At this round of workshops, we will be asking the public to focus their comments on the broad issues of land use, natural resource conservation, agriculture, and transportation, as these are the primary topics that will define much of the General Plan update. Times, dates, and locations for the meetings are as follows. Spanish translation will be available at the Winters workshop, for non-English speakers.

Winters

Tuesday, October 26
Winters Library Community Room
318 First Street
6:30-8:30 p.m.

West Sacramento

Thursday, October 28
Civic Center Galleria
1110 West Capitol Avenue
6:30-8:30 p.m.

Davis

Wednesday, November 3
Davis Teen Center
303 Third Street (Third & B)
6:30-8:30 p.m.

Woodland

Wednesday, November 10
Woodland DESS Community Room
25 North Cottonwood Street
6:30-8:30 p.m.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

The General Plan update process will require coordination with numerous County Advisory Committees, local agencies, non-profit groups, community organizations, State and Federal agencies, and individual landowners and residents.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – General Plan Vision/Principles/Policy Definition Memo
Attachment B – Public Meeting Summary (on file with the Clerk of the Board)
Attachment C – Public Workshops Notice