



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 LYNNEL POLLOCK, Chair,
and the Members of the Board of Supervisors

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

DATE: May 13, 2003

SUBJECT: Annual General Plan Progress Report

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

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

1. **ACCEPT** the Annual Status Report on the County General Plan (Attachment A) and direct staff to forward the report to the appropriate state agencies; and
2. **DIRECT** staff to return to the Board with a specific proposal for future consideration of costs and work schedules to prepare the Land Use and Circulation Elements, as well as details regarding preparation of a study to determine appropriate amounts for new fees on building and planning permits to recover the costs of updating the General Plan.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

California Government Code Section 65400.(b).(1) requires all cities and counties to submit an annual progress report to their legislative bodies regarding the status of the General Plan and progress in its implementation. A copy of the annual report must also be sent to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research and the State Department of Housing and Community Development.

In addition, the Annual Status Report outlines the overall strategy proposed by the Department to update the County General Plan in the coming years. The recent adoption of the Open Space Element and current consideration of the Housing Element are important first steps in making progress towards a new update of the Countywide General Plan. Of the remaining seven mandatory General Plan elements, the Safety, Noise, and Conservation Elements can be prepared over a longer time frame. However, the need for the Land Use and Circulation Elements is more immediate. In addition, they are more complicated documents, requiring technical studies and a level of staff support that will take more time to prepare. Given the increasing demand for housing

and development within the unincorporated area, as well as the uncertainty regarding future road funding, staff believes that it would be prudent to focus on completing the Land Use and Circulation Elements at this time.

BACKGROUND:

On March 28, 2000, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to provide periodic progress reports relating to the proposed General Plan update schedule (Minute Order No. 00-107). The General Plan update schedule approved at that time anticipated that preparation of the Land Use and Circulation Elements would begin in Fiscal Year 2002-03.

The last comprehensive update of the County General Plan was completed in 1983. Throughout the years, the Board has approved various updates and additions to the County General Plan. The most recent amendments to the General Plan were adopted in 2002, including the Agriculture Element, Open Space and Recreation Element, Clarksburg General Plan, and Cache Creek Resources Management Plan. The updated Dunnigan General Plan was adopted in 2001. A complete table listing all of the various elements to the County General Plan and when each has been updated is included at the end of Attachment A.

Of the remaining Elements that require updating, staff believes that the Circulation and Land Use Elements are the most pressing. Transportation and zoning are closely intertwined subjects and each directly influences the other. The placement of a new highway interchange or light rail station immediately increases the pressure for development on surrounding properties. Similarly, the construction of new homes, commercial businesses, and industries places additional demands on local public transit systems and roads. The preparation of General Plan Elements for either subject alone would create an incomplete analysis of policy needs and environmental impacts that may lead to inadequate planning for future needs. Consequently, staff is recommending that the County move forward to begin the joint preparation of both Elements.

A review and update of General Plan policies regarding growth and transportation is particularly timely, for a number of reasons. As indicated by recent sharp increases in housing costs, Yolo County is currently experiencing a strong demand for new housing, not only for local families, but for the growing number of residents who commute to jobs in the Sacramento and Bay Area regions. Although presently bolstered by high real estate prices and low interest rates, the overall demand for local housing is unlikely to significantly weaken in the future. Moreover, Yolo County's emphasis on rural lifestyles, open space preservation, and outdoor recreation provides an attractive location for many potential homebuyers.

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is currently studying the six-county region (El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties) in terms of future development trends, as they plan for affordable housing, public transportation, air quality and other "quality of life" factors in the future. As a part of their study, SACOG is projecting that Yolo County's share of regional growth may add as many as 100,000 new housing units over the next fifty years, along with 110,000 new jobs. This represents an annual growth rate of 1.5 percent, which would more than double the existing population of the four cities and unincorporated area, to nearly 370,000 residents. Workshops will be held in each of the cities and the County in the coming months in order to bring local residents and decision makers together to look at methods for managing the impact of such growth by applying "smart" growth practices that limit urban sprawl, balance jobs and housing, and enhance opportunities for public transportation. Staff is currently working with SACOG

to utilize this process as a means for beginning the public dialogue on future land use that can be subsequently incorporated into the Land Use and Circulation Elements.

BUDGET IMPACT:

The recommended action would impact the County General Fund. Staff estimates that an update of the Land Use Element would cost approximately \$100,000 with an additional \$150,000 required for updating the Circulation Element. A further \$100,000 may be required for the Environmental Impact Report. These costs assume that the consultant would provide both the technical studies necessary to provide the scientific foundation for creating a policy framework, as well as the writing and preparation of the Elements.

Assembly Bill No. 2936 (Aroner) was signed by the Governor on September 26, 2002 to amend Section 66014.(a) of the State Government Code. The bill authorized local governments to charge fees for planning and building approvals for those reasonable costs necessary to prepare and revise its General Plans and policies. It is staff's intention to include such fees as a future amendment to the Planning and Public Works Department's proposed Master Fee Resolution for the 2003-04 Fiscal Year. Collection of these fees would partially offset the costs listed above. Cost recovery for the updates, however, would occur over a longer period of time beyond the completion and actual expenditures for the update process.

In addition, preparation of the Circulation Element may provide the information needed to develop a Road Fee that could be charged to new development for the improvement and maintenance of the County transportation network, should the Board choose to do so in the future. Creation of this fee could provide supplemental monies to offset anticipated future reductions in State road funds.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

On April 10, 2003, the Planning Commission accepted the General Plan Annual Status Report and recommended that it be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. Preparation of the Circulation and Land Use Elements to the County General Plan would require an extensive public involvement process, involving residents and a wide variety of local, regional, state, and federal agencies and organizations.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – Annual Status Report and Update

YOLO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2002 ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT

As presented to the Yolo County Board of Supervisors on May 13, 2003.

INTRODUCTION:

The Yolo County General Plan was first adopted in 1958, as part of a Master Plan that included both the unincorporated area and the cities of Davis, Winters, and Woodland. Given the history of interagency cooperation regarding land use that has evolved since, it is not surprising that even then land use policy in Yolo County emphasized regionalism and partnership. The primary goal of the Master Plan as stated in 1958 still rings true today.

The general objective of the Master Plan is the guidance of the development of the area toward the most desirable future possible. In the case of the areas covered on this report unit, the best development is thought to be minimum urbanization. Preservation of rich Yolo farm resources and the amenities of open space is, in the long run, the highest and best use of this land.

As a metropolitan area grows, uncontrolled spread of development can have disastrous effects on the outlying areas. Community facilities and utilities will not efficiently serve scattered development and remaining land is chopped up so that it cannot be economically farmed and has no public value as open space. Yolo County can avoid these difficulties even as it absorbs its share of growth of the Sacramento Metropolitan Area.

The State first gave cities and counties the authority to prepare a Master Plan (General Plan) in 1927. Ten years later, local jurisdictions were required to adopt General Plans and were authorized to prepare Specific Plans as a means of implementation. The Land Use and Circulation Elements were the first of the seven core elements to be made mandatory in 1955. The Housing Element was included in 1969, with the Conservation and Open Space Elements closely following in 1970. The next year, Safety and Noise Elements were added. There have been no new additions to the mandatory elements since 1971, although the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has adopted General Plan Guidelines that allow for the inclusion of numerous optional elements, including: air quality, capital improvements, community design, economic development, energy, and parks and recreation.

Numerous communities have voluntarily adopted other elements in addition to those required and/or suggested by the State, including: administration, aesthetics, airports, agriculture, archaeological resources, bicycle paths, biological resources, child care, coastal resources, commerce, community development, culture and arts, design, economic, education, emergency, environmental, fire protection, fiscal, flood control, forestry, geothermal, governance, growth management, hazardous waste, historic preservation, implementation, military bases, mineral resources, parking, public facilities, redevelopment, regionalism, resource conservation, scenic highways, seismic, services, social services, trailways, transportation, urban boundaries, waste management, and water resources.

Similar to other communities, Yolo County has adopted a number of optional and specific or community plans in addition to its General Plan, as follows:

| | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Agriculture Element | Airport Master Plan | Cache Creek Area Plan |
| Capay Valley Area Plan | Clarksburg General Plan | Davis Area General Plan |
| Delta Protection Plan | Dunnigan General Plan | East Yolo Area General Plan |
| Energy Element | Esparto General Plan | Historic Preservation Element |
| Knights Landing General Plan | Madison General Plan | Monument Hills Area Plan |
| Rumsey General Plan | Scenic Highways Element | Southport Area General Plan |
| Watts-Woodland Airport Plan | Winters Area General Plan | Woodland Area General Plan |

SUMMARY OF PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN 2002:

Goals And Objectives:

As adopted in the 2001-02 Fiscal Year Budget, and reiterated in the Department’s Annual Report submitted to the Board of Supervisors in November, the Planning and Public Works Department set out last year to accomplish the following goals. A brief summary of the Department’s success towards fulfilling each goal is provided in italics.

1. Complete the Agricultural Element and Open Space and Recreation Element for the General Plan.

The Agricultural Element and Open Space and Recreation Element were approved by the Board of Supervisors on November 26, 2002.

2. Complete an update of the County General Plan Housing Element.

Following a year-long public process and the recommendation of the Planning Commission and Housing and Community Development Advisory Committee, the Housing Element was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 25, 2003.

3. Further increased code enforcement efforts through prioritizing and targeting code violations.

Zoning and Building Code violations are complaint driven and are prioritized according to potential health and safety concerns and staff workloads. General enforcement of the Zoning and Building Codes has become more aggressive in recent years. The Planning Commission has reviewed several outstanding violations, including the Knights Landing RV Park, Environmental Reclaiming Solutions in Zamora, Backhaus Auto Storage Yard in Dunnigan, the Cervantes Farm Labor Camp north of Woodland, and the Yolo-Sutter Boat Club in Knights Landing. In addition, staff has processed between 20 and 30 minor violations each of the past three years.

4. Proceed with expanding an Internet presence by making forms and information available on the County website.

The number of Building Permit and Business License application forms available on the Internet have been significantly expanded. In particular, forms for mobile home installations, agricultural building exemptions, and flood zone status are all available on-line. In addition, agendas and minutes for the County Planning Commission for the past two years are currently provided on the Internet. It is anticipated that the GIS mapping system will be available on the Department website by the end of the fiscal year.

Goals established for the 2002-03 Fiscal Year include:

1. Begin updates to the Capay Valley and Esparto Community Plans, as well as the Land Use Element to the County General Plan.
2. Streamline permit processing procedures and provide materials to the public that provide clear and understandable information about zoning and building issues.
3. Increase building and zoning violation efforts through adoption of a County enforcement code.
4. Expand our Internet presence by making forms and information available on the County web site.

In addition, staff is currently looking at the potential elimination of subvention funding for the Williamson Act from the State, and any effects on land use planning should the Board choose to discontinue the program. Approximately two-thirds of the County are enrolled in Williamson Act contracts. Also, the provisions of the Williamson Act are embedded in the County's Zoning Ordinance and General Plan policies. Elimination of the program could place additional development pressure on unincorporated farmland, while removing a basic land use tool that has been fairly effective over the past thirty years. Staff is looking at alternative zoning and general plan approaches that could be utilized to protect agriculture and habitat other than the Williamson Act, if needed in the future.

General Plan Elements and Community Plans:

The past year has been extremely busy for the Planning and Public Works Department, resulting in the adoption of several new and updated elements to the County General Plan, including:

- New County Agricultural Element; and
- Updated County Open Space/Recreation Element; and
- Updated Clarksburg Community General Plan; and
- Updated Cache Creek Resources Management Plan.

The Department also started the process of updating several additional elements last year, including the County Housing Element; the Sugar Mill Specific Plan; the Capay Valley Area Plan; and the Esparto Community General Plan.

A complete table listing all of the various elements to the County General Plan and when each has been updated is included in Attachment B.

Planning Permit Applications:

In 2002, the Planning and Public Works Department took in a total of 160 planning permit applications, which equaled the previous years' number. The types of planning permits applied for can be broken down into the following categories:

| Planning Permit Type | Number |
|--|--------|
| Subdivisions/Parcel Maps/Lot Line Adjustments/Certificates | 46 |
| Violations | 39 |
| Use Permits/Variances/Site Plan Reviews/Mining | 38 |
| Ag Preserve Contracts/Divisions | 11 |
| Zone Designations/General Plan Amendments/Ordinances | 7 |
| Other (Flood Permits, Pre-applications, CEQA, Road Abandonments, etc.) | 16 |
| Total | 157 |

The past year represents the latest in a continuing upward trend in the number of development applications over the past five years. In particular, it should be noted that the 2002 level is more than 200 percent of the number of applications in 1998. A table of the recent trend in development applications is shown below:

| Year | Maps | Violations | Use Perm. | Ag | Zoning | Other | Total |
|----------------|------|------------|-----------|----|--------|-------|-------|
| 2001 | 28 | 30 | 48 | 15 | 2 | 18 | 141 |
| 2000 | 26 | 21 | 43 | 6 | 2 | 29 | 127 |
| 1999 | 22 | 21 | 17 | 10 | 5 | 21 | 96 |
| 1998 | 24 | 2 | 25 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 66 |
| 5-Year Average | 29 | 23 | 34 | 10 | 4 | 18 | 118 |

The significant changes in planning applications have also been seen in the number and type of Building Permits as well in recent years. For example, in 2000 there were 190 Building Permits issued for new structures with an average valuation of roughly \$104,000. By 2002, the number of Building Permits for new structures had risen to 298. More importantly, the average valuation had also increased to nearly \$125,000. Furthermore, total valuation of all Building Permits (new structures and remodels) has nearly doubled over the past three years, from \$22.8 to \$42.5 million annually. This is important, since higher valuations are generally associated with larger and more complex construction projects. Similar to planning applications, building permits have not only increased in total volume, but have also increased in their scope and difficulty, placing greater demands upon scarce staffing resources.

Customer Service And Public Involvement:

The Planning and Public Works Department primarily relies on County-appointed advisory groups to provide local input and recommendations on planning and land use decisions. These groups range from volunteers who review community development projects to committees that provide policy recommendations for the entire County. Each of these groups has meetings that are noticed and open to the public, providing a variety of opportunities for local residents to participate in the planning process. A brief list of Department advisory groups includes:

- Airport Development Advisory Committee
- Aviation Advisory Committee
- Cache Creek Technical Committee
- Capay Valley Citizens Advisory Committee
- Clarksburg Citizens Advisory Committee
- Dunnigan Citizens Advisory Committee
- El Macero County Service Area
- Esparto Citizens Advisory Committee
- Historic Preservation Advisory Committee
- Housing and Community Development Advisory Committee
- Knights Landing Citizens Advisory Committee
- North Davis Meadows County Service Area
- Parks, Recreation and Wildlife Committee
- Planning Commission
- Willowbank County Service Area

Foremost among these groups in terms of land use is the Planning Commission, which has held workshops and taken field trips into various towns throughout the County to further engage the public. Similarly, staff has attended numerous other public meetings of local and regional groups, such as the Capay Valley Vision, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, County 2x2 meetings, Farm Bureau, Chambers of Commerce, Rotary Clubs, and others. All told, these efforts have resulted in hundreds of hours of community outreach over the past year. These outreach efforts have been supplemented by extensive noticing of proposed development projects and policies, involving both direct mailing and local newspapers.

As noted earlier, the Department has worked closely with the IT Department to expand the County's presence on the Internet and improve the ability of the public to access documents, notices, and planning information. One of the goals of the coming year is to place the current General Plan on the Internet for easier public access. It is also anticipated that an interactive version of the Geographic Information System will also be placed on the Internet in the next few months, allowing the public to look at a graphic display of parcel information, zoning, flooding, soils, and other data frequently in demand. These two efforts will make it easier for the public to access information directly, improving customer convenience, while reducing the number of phone calls and visits to the counter, freeing staff for other duties and improving overall efficiency.

For those customers who do visit the Department front counter, a second computer has been added to allow for more people to be helped at one time and to provide easier access to the GIS mapping system. An administrative staff position was also converted to a Counter Technician position to provide additional help in meeting the high volume of Building Permit applications. The Counter Technician program continues to work well, with cross-trained staff providing a wide range of customer services, including building permits, flood zone requests, parade permits, transportation permits, and business licenses. Recent efforts have been made to better coordinate with the Environmental Health Department in reviewing projects that require approvals from both agencies.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING INFORMATION FOR 2002:

The following information is provided in accordance with Government Code Sections 65583 and 65584, as well as the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Housing Element Guidelines.

Total Net Housing Units Added In 2002:

The County Planning and Public Works Department approved 158 Building Permits for single-family residential units in calendar year 2002. This was partially offset by a total of 19 demolition permits issued for residential units last year.

New Affordable Housing Units Added In 2002:

The County Planning and Public Works Department does not monitor or require detailed information regarding the sales and/or rental prices of new residential units. It should be noted, however, that the OPR Housing Element Guidelines do not mandate local agencies to keep such information. Absent specific data, staff makes the following assumptions regarding housing affordability. The average household density in Yolo County is approximately three persons, based on 2000 U.S. Census statistics. Staff assumes that each household spends no more than thirty percent of its gross income on housing costs (based on State Housing and Community Development (HCD) Guidelines), and that the average mortgage to purchase a home would be financed at six percent. Using the 2002 affordable income criteria for a three-person family, as determined by HCD (a table of which is attached), the affordability of homes in Yolo County can be classified into the following categories, based on purchase price:

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Very Low Income | Less than \$106,875 |
| Low Income | Between \$106,875 and \$171,042 |
| Moderate Income | Between \$171,042 and \$256,458 |
| Above Moderate Income | More than \$256,458 |

Based on the purchase price numbers and using the construction value of each home as reported in their Building Permit (plus fifty percent to account for land costs and profit), the number of new homes in each affordability category for the 2002 calendar year would be as follows:

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Very Low Income | 39 |
| Low Income | 23 |
| Moderate Income | 31 |
| Above Moderate Income | 65 |
| Total | 158 |

For comparison purposes, rents can be broken down into similar affordability categories in Yolo County, as follows. The HCD defines affordability based on a percentage of median income, based on the most recent State data. For Yolo County in 2002, HCD uses a median household income of \$51,300. In other words, half of the households in Yolo County earned less than this amount, and half earned more. Affordability for a “Very Low Income” household is defined as fifty percent of the median income, while “Low Income” is defined as eighty percent of median. The upper limit of the “Moderate Income” range is defined as 120 percent of median income. Using these figures, again

assuming a three-person household, results in the following designation of rents for Yolo County for 2002. It should be noted that there is no information available as to how many of the new units constructed last year are being rented, or for what amount if any.

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Very Low Income | Less than \$641 per month |
| Low Income | Between \$627 and \$1,026 per month |
| Moderate Income | Between \$1,026 and \$1,539 per month |
| Above Moderate Income | More than \$1,539 per month |

Comparison with the Regional Housing Needs Allocation:

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation for Yolo County, as established by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), requires that adequate building sites and zoning are made available to meet the approved target allocations between 2000 and 2007, as shown in the following table. The table also includes the affordable housing numbers for 2002 provided above, as well as similar estimates for 2000-2001.

| | Required by SACOG | New Homes in 2002 | New Homes in 2000-2001 | Remaining SACOG Allocation |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Very Low Income | 136 | 39 | 61 | 36 |
| Low Income | 180 | 23 | 9 | 148 |
| Moderate Income | 238 | 31 | 35 | 172 |
| Above Moderate | 449 | 65 | 65 | 319 |
| Total | 1,003 | 158 | 170 | 675 |

A total of 328 homes have been produced in Yolo County between 2000 and 2002. This represents 32.7 percent of the total required by SACOG for the seven-year period. In order to meet the County's Regional Housing Needs Allocation goal, there should have been 430 homes constructed in the first three years of the seven-year time period. However, the rate of housing has increased recently, with as many houses constructed last year as there were in the first two years. With the anticipated development of the Esperanza Estates and Wild Wings subdivisions in the next two years (totaling 432 units), the rate of construction is expected to remain high in the unincorporated area. Based on this information, staff believes that the County will meet its regional housing allocation for 2007.

When broken down by affordability category, Yolo County has had the most success in meeting its Very Low Income housing goals, with 100 of the 136 (about 74%) having been constructed. The majority of these units have been mobile homes. Approximately 28-29 percent in each of the Moderate and Above Moderate Income housing categories have also been provided. Again, it's anticipated that the majority of these requirements will likely be met in the coming years by new housing construction in Wild Wings and Esparto.

The category that has been the least successful to date has been housing for Low Income households. In response, Yolo County has continued to incorporate inclusionary housing requirements for all new subdivisions over ten units in size. Under this program, the developer records an agreement that limits the purchase price or rent on ten percent of all new homes within the development so that they are affordable to Very Low or Low Income households, as determined by HCD. The restriction is enforced for thirty years. A total of 13 such units have been constructed

during the past three years, with another 44 units approved. It is hoped that ongoing application of the inclusionary program will assist in meeting the demand for Low-Income housing.

| Element | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | | |
|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|--|
| Agriculture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cache Creek | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capay Valley | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Circulation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Clarksburg | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conservation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County Airport | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Davis | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delta Protection | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dunnigan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| East Yolo | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Energy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Esparto | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Historic Preserv. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Housing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Knights Landing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Land Use | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Madison | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monument Hills | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Noise | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Open Space | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rumsey | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Safety | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scenic Highways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Southport | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Watts Woodland | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Winters | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Woodland | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |