



County of Yolo

John Bencomo
DIRECTOR

PLANNING, RESOURCES AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

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

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, Resources and Public Works Department

DATE: March 27, 2007

SUBJECT: Adoption of the General Plan Preferred Land Use Alternative for the purpose of proceeding with drafting of plan and environmental analysis. (No general fund impact.)

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. **ADOPT** the Preferred Land Use Alternative as discussed by the Board of Supervisors on February 6, 2007 and summarized in Attachment A, which includes modifications and clarifications recommended by staff. The modifications incorporate "Specific Plan" land use designations for the communities of Dunnigan, Knights Landing, and Madison to establish maximum development footprints, specific "quality of life" services, and minimum infrastructure "sustainability" standards for each community.
2. **RECEIVE AND FILE** the preliminary revised schedule provided in Attachment B for completion of the General Plan Update by of July 2008.

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. At present the General Plan Update process has a total budget of \$1,065,223 of which about 71 percent or approximately \$752,500 has been expended.

Should the Board of Supervisors direct staff to move forward with the analysis of infrastructure costs to examine development considerations within specified communities, additional General Funds of potentially several hundred thousand dollars per community and a schedule modification of between six to 12 months may be needed to adequately complete the task. Staff would return with appropriate budget and schedule modifications for future consideration by the Board.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

The discussion by the Board of Supervisors on February 6, 2007 provided important direction regarding the Preferred Land Use Alternative for the General Plan update. However, there remained unresolved concerns regarding the appropriate level of development within those communities that have outstanding infrastructure and service needs (specifically Dunnigan, Knights Landing, and Madison). Board members requested that staff analyze the public facilities needed to serve these communities and provide estimates of what it would cost to construct the necessary infrastructure. Those costs would then be factored into estimates of how much residential and commercial development would be needed to support the facility costs.

Staff has responded to this direction by requesting developers with interests in these three communities provide staff with any infrastructure or other engineering analysis they may have already generated as a part of their proposals. In addition, staff has also begun defining the scope of work that would be needed to respond to the Board's request. This information would be used to develop an RFP to solicit professional engineering consultants who would prepare the necessary infrastructure studies. As a part of the RFP, the consultant engineers would also peer review the existing infrastructure studies previously prepared by the developers. The required public contracting process would be followed in order to hire an appropriately qualified engineering firm or firms to develop the needed information.

Staff has also identified a possible alternative approach for consideration by the Board of Supervisors. In the course of preparing to respond to the Board's direction on the matter of community infrastructure costs and development thresholds, the staff identified an alternate process, which would ensure that the County would be supplied with the desired information, but at a different point in the process. This alternate approach would allow development of the Draft General Plan and EIR to begin, using the approved scope of work.

What prompted the staff to come forward with an alternative approach was the realization that this type of analysis is much more detailed than is typically seen at this stage of the General Plan process. The focus of a General Plan is broad ranging; it establishes policy and land use parameters at a very general level applicable to the entire unincorporated County. Once the General Plan Update is adopted, it would typically be the responsibility of private developers to then use the policy and land use parameters established in the General Plan as the basis for preparation of their own Specific Plans or more precise project proposals. At that time, the County would require them to prepare infrastructure plans and cost estimates consistent with County requirements. This is especially appropriate since private developers are ultimately the ones who will build the projects and pay the infrastructure costs in question.

Staff acknowledges that understanding the cost of infrastructure is important information that needs to be evaluated before any final decision regarding growth in a community is made. However, a primary concern is that it will be expensive and time consuming for the County to prepare infrastructure cost estimates at this point in the General Plan process. Our preliminary analysis leads us to believe that these costs could total several hundred thousand dollars per community, and could add from six months to a year to the update process. This would require the use of general fund dollars to explore development-related issues more appropriately funded by the landowner or developer as a part of the Specific Plan process, once the County has made the threshold policy and land use decisions that constitute the final revised General Plan. Consequently, staff recommends that the Board consider designating all or appropriate portions of the communities of Dunnigan, Knights Landing, and Madison as Specific Plan areas. This approach is discussed further later in this report under the heading "Specific Plan Recommendation".

BACKGROUND

On February 6, 2007 the Board of Supervisors heard testimony from over 60 individuals and deliberated over eight hours on a preferred land use alternative for the General Plan Update. The Board members discussed the four original land use alternatives, as well as the Planning Commission Alternative and staff recommendation which constitutes a fifth alternative. These scenarios formed the basis for the Board's direction on February 6, which upon adoption will become the County's Preferred Land Use Alternative.

Once adopted, staff will move forward using the Preferred Land Use Alternative to write the text and maps of the Draft General Plan, and begin preparation of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The resulting Draft General Plan and accompanying Draft EIR will be released for public review and then work their way through the Planning Commission to the Board of Supervisors for final consideration and adoption.

The Board of Supervisors provided extensive direction to staff regarding the scope and structure of the Preferred Land Use Alternative at the February 6, 2007 hearing. The staff has summarized this direction in Attachment A. Included within the discussion was direction to staff to return with further analysis regarding the nature of sustainable communities, particularly with regard to: (1) the threshold amounts of growth necessary to support different levels of service; and (2) construction costs for municipal infrastructure such as sewer, water, storm water drainage, and flood control. Each of these is discussed further below.

Community Thresholds

The Board of Supervisors expressed a desire to have a more precise sense of what size community is necessary to support minimum service thresholds for the communities of Dunnigan, Knights Landing, and Madison. Specifically, the Board of Supervisors identified several basic "quality of life" needs for a sustainable community: community-wide sewer system, community-wide water system, grocery store, basic medical service, elementary school, sheriff's services, and professional fire department.

A report prepared by DCE titled "Alternatives Evaluation" and released on December 6, 2006, identifies a number of generic development thresholds that are relevant to this issue. It is important to note that several of these thresholds are based on statewide criteria and/or general level assumptions. Actual communities and/or specific developments may be successful with differing levels of service and may be subject to differing market forces and financing strategies. The thresholds identified in the DCE report have been grouped together below into broad categories in order to provide a general idea of the level of services typically associated with various levels of development.

Homes	Population	Level of Community Services
2,500	7,000 (Currently, the size of Winters)	Elementary school (sustainable at $\pm 2,400$ homes) Neighborhood library (sustainable at $< 1,800$ homes) or Community library (sustainable at $> 1,800$ homes) Two convenience stores (each sustainable at $\pm 1,100$ homes) Several general medical/dental practitioners (each sustainable at ± 350 homes) Sheriff's substation (sustainable at $\pm 1,500$ homes)

5,000	14,000 (Currently, the size of Lathrop)	Two elementary schools Community library Several convenience stores One or two small grocery stores (sustainable at ±3,000 homes) Neighborhood shopping center (sustainable at ±4,300 homes) Several general medical/dental practitioners Sheriff's substation Full-time fire engine company (sustainable at ±4,300 homes)
7,500	21,000 (Currently, the size of Galt)	Three elementary schools Middle school Community library Several convenience stores Two small grocery stores Neighborhood shopping center Community shopping center (sustainable at ±7,150 homes) Several general medical/dental practitioners Small primary care clinic (sustainable at ±7,150 homes) Sheriff's substation Full-time fire engine company
10,000	28,000 (Currently, the size of Suisun City)	Four elementary schools Middle school High school (sustainable at ±8,300 homes) Community library Several convenience stores Several small grocery stores Two neighborhood shopping centers Community shopping center Several general medical/dental practitioners Small primary care clinic Sheriff's substation Two full-time fire companies

It should be noted that additional community benefits can be achieved if particular policy requirements are in place. For example, the County could negotiate in a development agreement with a particular developer that allowed only a specified number of residential units to be built in an area after which point a full-service grocery store would be required to be operational, or something to that effect. The burden to meet this requirement would rest with the developer to the benefit of the entire community. This approach essentially requires developers to subsidize construction of community benefits through the profits from their projects. It is generally only successful, however, to the extent that the required items do not cost more than the profits to be made on the project.

Based on the numbers and facts above, staff believes that generally a community would need to have a minimum of about 2,500 residential units in order to attract/provide most of the basic community services discussed above.

Infrastructure Construction Costs

The relationship between development yield (the number of homes or the amount of commercial or industrial square footage) and the costs to provide and maintain community services (particularly

municipal sewer, water, and drainage) is complicated. Within Yolo County there are several examples of the lack of correlation between the two:

- Wild Wings has 334 homes and is served by tertiary sewage treatment and a community water system. The Cache Creek Casino Resort also has tertiary sewage treatment and a community water system.
- Madison, Knights Landing and Esparto range from 158 to 783 homes and are served by secondary sewage treatment systems and municipal water. Similarly, the proposed Old Sugar Mill Specific Plan would include 162 homes with secondary sewage treatment and a community water system.
- Yolo has 223 homes and is served by municipal water with individual septic systems.
- Capay, Guinda, Zamora, Dunnigan and Clarksburg range from 22 to 404 homes and are served by individual wells with septic systems.

The number of factors at play is large, and the information that would allow for a reasonable estimate of some of the factors may not be readily available to the County. Variables include: cost of the land, soil characteristics, topography, biological habitat and wetlands resources, environmental constraints, developer/investor profit requirements, depth and experience of the developer and builder, capacity and condition of any existing infrastructure, roadway patterns, design requirements, density, flood exposure, length of time for application process, likelihood of approval, public interest in the project, market conditions, market capacity for fees, phasing requirements, experience and efficiency of the jurisdiction staff and decision-makers, mitigation requirements and costs, public benefit items and costs, and many others.

The following types of analyses would be needed to evaluate infrastructure development costs and associate development yield (number of homes and/or square footage) for a proposed project:

1. Initial Analysis – Early collection of available information; calls to service providers; site visits to identify opportunities and constraints; concept drawings to identify possible yields; and preliminary determinations regarding feasibility.
2. Preliminary Engineering – Development of preliminary infrastructure plans:
 - Topographic base map
 - Geotechnical report
 - Land planning
 - Preliminary environmental constraints (biology, hazardous materials)
 - Sewer service plan
 - Water service plan
 - Storm drainage plan
 - Flood control plan
 - Capital Improvement Plan and Infrastructure Cost Estimates
 - Preliminary Financing and Feasibility

As directed by the Board of Supervisors, staff will pursue development of a precise scope of work and budget to determine infrastructure costs and resulting development yield in each of the three communities. The size of the area under study will have some bearing on the budget. Similarly, the condition and unique circumstances of existing development in the community, as well as the site-specific constraints to extending infrastructure into these areas and connecting existing development to new development will also have an effect.

Specific Plan Recommendation

As an alternative to preparing infrastructure construction costs at this stage in the General Plan update process, staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors consider the use of Specific Plans in those communities where further information will be needed to determine the appropriate level of growth. Under this method, the General Plan would designate particular parcels as “Specific Plan.” No development could occur on these properties until a plan is approved by the County detailing the land uses, public and private facilities needed to support the land uses, phasing of development, standards for the conservation, of natural resources, and a program of implementation measures, including financing measures. The following table illustrates how Specific Plan designations could be used as a part of the General Plan update process to establish clear goals that would have to be met by any future development within these communities:

	DUNNIGAN	KNIGHTS LANDING	MADISON
General Plan land use designation	Specific Plan	Specific Plan	Specific Plan
Proposed range of new residential development	2500 to 7500 new units	200 to 800 infill units	80 to 1000 new units
Proposed new commercial/ industrial development	230 new acres	38 infill acres	23 new acres
Proposed range of total new development	650 to 1500 new acres	145 infill acres	230 new acres
Target average residential density	8 units/acre	8 units/acre	8 units/acre
Target average jobs density	16 jobs/acre	16 jobs/acre	16 jobs/acre
Minimum “quality of life” services	Grocery store	Grocery store	Grocery store, basic medical, elementary school, and fire protection exist nearby in Esparto
	Basic medical	Basic medical	
	Elementary school	Retain elementary school	
	Municipal fire	Municipal fire	
	Sheriffs services	Sheriffs services	Sheriffs services
Minimum “sustainability” standards for infrastructure	Municipal water system serving entire town	Upgraded water system for commercial fire flow to entire town	Upgraded water system serving entire town
	Tertiary sewer system serving entire town	Upgraded sewer system (tertiary treatment) for entire town	Upgraded sewer system (tertiary treatment) for entire town
	Municipal storm drainage system serving entire town	Municipal storm drainage system serving entire town	Municipal storm drainage system serving entire town
		Improved flood protection for entire town	Improved flood protection for entire town

Any Specific Plan prepared under this approach would be required to ensure consistency with both the County General Plan update and the local community General Plan. Project specific goals and policies for new development would be established in the Specific Plan, as well as design standards that address the character of the existing community. Provisions would be included in both the Specific Plan and accompanying Development Agreements to require phased economic development, and to require a match between jobs and housing (“concurrency” policies). Policies to ensure the primacy of the downtown area would also be included.

There appear to be many advantages to this approach as an alternative for addressing the Board of Supervisors concerns:

1) It allows the General Plan update process to continue on its present course, budget, and schedule. Rather than slowing the General Plan Update to enable the infrastructure analyses to be developed, this allows the County to establish performance standards for a possible range of development so that planning can continue, and it defers site-specific analysis to the later project implementation phase and ensures that such analysis remains a developer (rather than general fund) cost.

2) It maintains the “policy based” vs. project-based focus of the Yolo County General Plan Update. Some fairly precise assumptions about how and where development will occur will need to be made in order to provide meaningful information correlating development thresholds to infrastructure costs. This may lead some to believe the Board has in effect “pre-approved” these project assumptions. The use of designated Specific Plan areas would avoid this predicament. The Specific Plan boundaries would be based on considerations consistent with the policy direction of the Board and would not be based on any current project proposals.

3) The preparation of Specific Plans provides an opportunity for local residents to play an extensive role in shaping and defining the future of their community. It puts the burden on the development community to research, fund, and promote potential community solutions. It allows the County to peer review and analyze the submitted information, and it allows the public to critique and question the submitted information, all through a focused Specific Plan process.

4) It allows the County to establish specific “quality of life” services and specific minimum infrastructure “sustainability” standards for these communities. This approach places primary emphasis on community benefit in future discussions with landowners and development interests. Developers would have to demonstrate to the community how their projects would best meet or exceed the community thresholds established by the Board, essentially putting the applicant in the position of proving to County and its residents how their proposal is not only consistent with the General Plan but provides net community benefits.

5) It retains discretionary control for the Board of Supervisors. By setting a maximum envelope for growth within particular areas, this establishes outer bounds for potential development but avoids creating a right or entitlement to develop. The decision about the appropriate amount of growth (if any) in a particular community and/or precise location would remain under Board control.

6) Finally, it recognizes that important community indicators, economic indices, and governance issues have yet to be explored for each of these small communities, and that this is best done in through a deliberative public planning process where the attention can be focused on the specific needs of a particular community and not overwhelmed by the countywide process currently underway.

POLICY-BASED APPROACH

There has been some confusion recently among property owners, citizens, and the press regarding the issue of how individual developer projects and requests for consideration of specific project do or do not fit into the General Plan Update process. Part of this confusion stems from the project-driven planning model used by many other jurisdictions for purposes of funding General Plan Updates.

Yolo County has a long history of engaging in policy-based planning rather than project-based planning. This allows for land use decisions to be made based on broad-based policies and good

planning practices, rather than ancillary issues like ownership. The Board of Supervisors has repeatedly confirmed their direction that this General Plan Update is a policy-driven (not project-driven) exercise. This is confirmed by the fact that the County has not, nor does it intend to, solicit project proposals from the development community. Where this has perhaps become confusing, is that despite this approach, many landowners and development interests have, nonetheless, taken the opportunity to make comments at various public hearings on the General Plan process to promote their particular project proposals.

The County's process does not allow for consideration of projects until after adoption of the General Plan, at which time, dependent on any phasing or growth rate restrictions the County may choose to impose, applications for specific plans and/or project proposals consistent with the General Plan may then be considered. This is not to say, however, that specific properties will be ignored during the process. The County must consider and ultimately apply a precise land use designation to every parcel within the unincorporated County area. This will be documented on the General Plan Land Use Diagram. Once a Preferred Land Use Alternative is identified by the Board of Supervisors, a proposed General Plan Land Use Diagram will be prepared and published as a part of the Draft General Plan document. The consideration of what type of land use is appropriate on a particular property is very different from consideration of an actual development proposal on a property.

REVISED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE SCHEDULE

The County General Plan Update is currently running about nine months behind schedule. This is not the result of any particular problem or miscalculation but rather the result of recognition at various points in the process that more time was needed to successfully complete certain key tasks, particularly development of the Preferred Land Use Alternative. A preliminary revised schedule is provided for the Board's review in Attachment B. This schedule utilizes the same amount of time for each task as was identified in the prior schedule, but shifts the overall process by nine months to account for the current condition. As adjusted, the General Plan Update would be completed in mid-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.

Attachment A – General Plan Preferred Land Use Alternative

Attachment B – Preliminary Revised General Plan Update Schedule

ATTACHMENT A

PREFERRED LAND USE ALTERNATIVE FOR THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

(as directed by the Board of Supervisors on February 6, 2007
with staff-proposed modifications shown in ~~strike-out~~/redline format)

Capay Valley:

Residential: No change to potential for 27 residential units in Capay and 26 residential units in Guinda under build-out of the existing General Plan.

Commercial/Industrial: No change to potential for 12 acres of non-residential development under build-out of existing General Plan.

Clarksburg:

Residential: No change to potential for 22 residential units under build-out of the existing General Plan.

Commercial/Industrial: Add 100 acres of agricultural industrial in the area to complement the pending Old Sugar Mill project and assist in establishing a successful critical mass of grape processing facilities to support emerging wineries.

Dunnigan:

General: Designate between 650 and 1,500 new acres as "Specific Plan" to potentially allow for future development as described below. Any Specific Plan prepared under this approach must ensure consistency with both the County General Plan update and the local community General Plan. Project specific goals and policies for new development will be established in the Specific Plan, as well as design standards that address the character of the existing community. Provisions will be included in both the Specific Plan and accompanying Development Agreements to require phased economic development, and to require a match between jobs and housing ("concurrency" policies). Policies to ensure the creation of a downtown area will also be required.

Residential: Allow for the possible development of a sufficient number of between 2,500 and 7,500 new residential units. The developer would be required to show significant net benefit to the community after accounting for all capital and operational costs including to finance the following minimum "quality of life" needs for a sustainable community: community-wide sewer system, community-wide water system, community-wide drainage system, grocery store, basic medical service, elementary school, sheriff's services, and professional fire department. ~~In order to determine the number of homes necessary to provide these needs, staff was directed to: 1) develop construction cost estimates for infrastructure items; and 2) report back on the threshold development size needed to accomplish these goals.~~

Develop housing with an average density of 8 units per acre. Housing should be located away from Interstate 5 and should connect the Hardwood Subdivision and the Old Town area. Smaller lots and higher densities would be located on the valley floor, while larger lots and lower densities would be located in the poorer hill soils. Schools should be centrally located.

Commercial/Industrial: Add 230 new commercial/industrial acres, proportionate to meet local retail demand, target an average jobs density of 16 jobs per acre, and to ensure a balanced jobs/housing relationship of 1.2 jobs per house, at build-out. Include requirements for concurrency between housing and jobs, and/or other mechanisms to constrain housing to stay balanced with job creation through build-out of the area. Each phase of housing shall be required to be accompanied by balanced job-generating development. Overall wages shall be matched to home prices. Concentrate commercial and industrial uses between Interstate-5 and Road 99W. Commercial trucking uses should continue to be concentrated at the County Road 8 and Interstate-5 interchange.

Esparto:

Residential: No change to potential for 985 residential units under build-out of the existing General Plan.

Commercial/Industrial: Evaluate the 75 acres currently designated for industrial use, located south of Highway 16 and east of County Road 93C, for mixed commercial and residential development. No other changes to the potential for the other 49 acres of non-residential development under build-out of the existing General Plan

Knights Landing:

General: Designate 145 infill acres in Knights Landing as “Specific Plan” to potentially allow for future development as described below. Any Specific Plan prepared under this approach must ensure consistency with both the County General Plan update and the local community General Plan. Project specific goals and policies for new development will be established in the Specific Plan, as well as design standards that address the character of the existing community. Provisions will be included in both the Specific Plan and accompanying Development Agreements to require phased economic development, and to require a match between jobs and housing (“concurrency” policies). Policies to ensure the primacy of the downtown area are also required.

Residential: Allow for the possible residential development potential under build-out of the existing General Plan of 993 of between 200 and 800 residential units on 145-acre infill property with a target density of 8 units per acre. ~~may not be desirable.~~ Develop additional analysis regarding how existing planned residential and commercial growth would impact key issues, including: 1) the loss of prime farmland; 2) levee stability and flood protection; and 3) traffic impacts to State Highway 113 and local roads.

Commercial/Industrial: Allow for possible development potential under build-out of the existing General Plan of 50 of 38 acres of non-residential uses with a target job density of 16 jobs per acre. ~~may not be desirable.~~ Develop additional analysis regarding how existing planned residential and commercial growth would impact key issues, including: 1) the loss of prime farmland; 2) levee stability and flood protection; and 3) traffic impacts to State Highway 113 and local roads.

The developer would be required to show significant net benefit to the community after accounting for all capital and operational costs including ~~Also evaluate whether existing planned growth would address~~ the following minimum “quality of life” needs for a sustainable community: sewer system improvements, water system improvements, community-wide drainage system, grocery store, basic medical service, elementary school retention, sheriff’s services, and a professional fire department. ~~In order to determine~~

~~whether planned growth would provide these needs, staff was directed to: 1) develop construction cost estimates for infrastructure items; 2) report back on the threshold size needed to accomplish these goals.~~

Madison:

General: Designate 230 new acres as “Specific Plan” to potentially allow for future development as described below. Any Specific Plan prepared under this approach must ensure consistency with both the County General Plan update and the local community General Plan. Project specific goals and policies for new development will be established in the Specific Plan, as well as design standards that address the character of the existing community. Provisions will be included in both the Specific Plan and accompanying Development Agreements to require phased economic development, and to require a match between jobs and housing (“concurrency” policies). Policies to ensure the creation of a downtown area will also be required.

Residential: ~~Allow for the possible development of 80 to 1,000 new residential development potential under build-out of the existing General Plan is 83 units with a target density of 8 units per acre; however, existing conditions in this community are not acceptable.~~ The developer would be required to show significant net benefit to the community after accounting for all capital and operational costs including the following minimum “quality of life” needs for a sustainable community: sewer system improvements, water system improvements, community-wide drainage system, grocery store, basic medical service, elementary school retention, sheriff’s services, and a professional fire department. Develop additional recommendations regarding how to resolve key infrastructure problems. ~~Staff was directed to: 1) develop construction cost estimates for water, sewer, and storm drainage/flooding solutions; 2) report back on the issue of threshold size to accomplish these goals; and 3) evaluate alternate solutions to community challenges not based on residential growth.~~

Commercial: Add 23 acres highway commercial at State Route 16 and Interstate-505 interchange. Change 6 acres of existing industrial and residential land along the south side of State Route 16 (west of County Road 89) to commercial use. This acreage shall be developed in a manner that seeks to achieve a target jobs density of 16 jobs per acre and a balanced jobs/housing relationship of 1.2 jobs per house, at build-out. Include requirements for concurrency between housing and jobs, and/or other mechanisms to constrain housing to stay balanced with job creation through build-out of the area. Each phase of housing shall be required to be accompanied by balanced job-generating development. Overall wages shall be matched to home prices.

Monument Hills:

Residential: No change to potential for 25 residential units under build-out of the existing General Plan.

Commercial/Industrial: Add 3 acres of commercial use at the intersection of County Road 94B and State Route 16.

Yolo:

Residential: No change to potential for 56 residential units under build-out of the existing General Plan.

Commercial/Industrial: Add 13 acres of highway commercial use at the interchange of Interstate-5 and County Road 17.

Zamora:

Residential: No change to potential for 14 residential units under build-out of the existing General Plan.

Commercial/Industrial: Add 16 acres of agricultural commercial use between Interstate-5 and Road 99W, south of County Road 13.

Other Economic Development Items:

General: Encourage mixed use development in commercial areas in order to attain small ancillary residential opportunities, particularly in the upper floors of multi-story buildings.

Elkhorn Property: Add 100 acres of commercial and industrial uses along Interstate-5, generally located south of County Road 22 and along County Road 118. The property shall be required to build-out from north to south. The property straddles I-5 and the area to the north is an island, whereas the area to the south adjoins productive agricultural land and later phasing would allow continued farm production.

County Airport Property: No change to potential for approximately 150 acres of industrial and commercial development under build-out of the existing General Plan.

Spreckels Property: See Woodland edge recommendation.

Interstate-505 Interchanges: Add 15 acres of highway commercial and/or agricultural commercial at the County Road 14 interchange, which is a full interchange and more centrally located from other identified highway commercial locations.

Add 20 acres of highway commercial at the County Road 27 interchange. There are full interchange improvements at this location and it is already being used as an east/west route. Development of this site shall be carried out in a collaborative process with the City of Winters.

Interstate-5 Interchanges: See Dunnigan, Yolo, and Zamora recommendations.

Interstate-80 Interchanges: See Davis edge recommendation.

Agricultural Preservation Items:

Establish growth boundaries for each unincorporated community.

Establish “agricultural districts” to emphasize the agricultural and tourism strengths of the following three areas, which may include tailored zoning requirements and/or marketing efforts:

Capay Valley: organic agriculture; wine making; open space and creek recreation.

Clarksburg: wine making; river recreation.

Dunnigan Hills: wine making; off-road vehicle recreation.

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.

Reduce development restrictions for new and/or expanded agricultural processing, on-site agricultural sales, and possibly bio-diesel production.

Create a new agricultural commercial land use designation that would allow direct marketing opportunities with limited discretionary review.

Reject a minimum 80-acre parcel size for the construction of any new home(s) in the agricultural area.

Collaborate with farming and agricultural interests, assisted by two members of the Board, to receive input regarding items listed above and other ideas for addressing rural residential conflicts, including cluster zoning, improving the County's Right to Farm Ordinance, and adopting a "rural oath" requirement.

Natural Resources:

Integrate the HCP/NCCP into the General Plan.

Incorporate any future Parks Master Plan update, particularly regarding areas to be preserved for future regional parks and open space opportunities.

City Edge Items:

General:

Any new development at the edge of a city should occur in such a manner as to ensure that the project provides fiscal benefits to the county.

Davis:

General: The County will meet with the City of Davis through the 2x2 process to allow for joint exploration of revenue producing uses and opportunities, regarding development adjoining the City as described below. Additional issues to be addressed include extending sewer and water services to Binning Farms, alternatives to the Binning Estates subdivision, development impact fees for parks

and roads, formal adoption of County Road 27/County Road 29 buffer, and the use of Transfer of Development Rights (TDR).

Residential: Designate a joint “special study area” overlay in the area north of Covell Boulevard and west of State Highway 113 (known as the Northwest Quadrant), by both the County and the City of Davis, to allow for joint exploration of revenue generating opportunities and “special needs housing” (such as housing for seniors), to take advantage of the proximity to the University, University Retirement Community, Sutter-Davis Hospital, and other nearby social services.

Commercial/Industrial: a) Add 30 acres of highway commercial use at the interchange of Chiles Road and Interstate-80. b) Add 13 acres of commercial use at the interchange of Mace Road and Interstate-80, south of County Road 32A. c) Add 383 acres of commercial and mixed uses at the northwest corner of the intersection of Covell Boulevard and Pole Line Road, through the use of a joint “special study area” overlay by both the County and the City of Davis to allow for joint exploration of revenue producing uses and opportunities, as well as to allow for coordinated planning with the adjoining Hunt-Wesson cannery property.

West Sacramento:

Residential/Commercial/Industrial: Further examine whether new development in this area would address the potential flooding of the Northwest Interceptor sewer pump station before a position is taken on growth south of West Sacramento.

Winters:

Residential: No new development.

Commercial/Industrial: Add 96 acres of agricultural industrial and/or agricultural commercial use at the southeast quadrant of intersection of State Route 128 and Interstate-505, through the use of a joint “special study area” overlay by both the County and the City of Winters to allow for joint exploration of revenue producing uses and opportunities.

Woodland:

Residential: No new development.

Commercial/Industrial: The County will meet with the City of Woodland through the 2x2 process to allow for joint exploration of revenue producing uses and opportunities, regarding development adjoining the City as described below. Additional issues to be addressed include development impact fees for parks and roads, formal adoption of County Road 27/County Road 29 buffer, and the use of Transfer of Development Rights (TDR).

Add 160 acres of industrial or agricultural industrial uses on the central and eastern portions of the Spreckels’ site, through the preparation of a Specific Plan. This site is served by a natural gas line, rail, and high voltage electrical power lines.

Add 30 acres of highway commercial use along the freeway frontage east of County Road 103, between County Road 22 and Interstate-5.

Board of Supervisors Preferred Alternative Land Use Alternative¹				
Area	Residential Units		Non Residential Acreage	
	Build-Out Under Existing GP	Added New Units Under Pref Alt	Build-Out Under Existing GP²	Added New Acreage Under Pref Alt
Capay Valley ³	53	0	12 ⁴	0
Clarksburg ⁵	22	0	1	100
Dunnigan	173	2500 to 7500	94 ⁶	230
Esparto	985 ⁷	0	124 ⁹	0
Knights Landing	993 ⁸	0	50 ⁸	0
Madison	83	80 to 1000	1	23 ¹⁰
Monument Hills	25 ¹⁸	0	0	3 ¹¹
Yolo	56	0	3	13 ¹⁹
Zamora	14	0	1	16 ¹²
Elkhorn Property	0	0	0	100
County Airport	0	0	150 ¹³	0
I-505/CR14 and CR27	0	0	0	35 ²⁰
Rural Residential	1610 ¹⁴	0	0	0
Davis Edge	0	0	0	426 ¹⁵
West Sac Edge	0	0	0	0
Winters Edge	0	0	0	96 ¹⁶
Woodland Edge	0	0	0	180 ¹⁷
Sub-Totals	4014 units	2580 to 8500 dus	436 acres	1222 acres
TOTALS	6594 to 12,514 units		1658 acres	

Source: Yolo County General Plan Team, March 10, 2007.

Notes: 1/ Based on actions of Board of Supervisors taken February 6, 2007 and March 27, 2007.
2/ Combines Retail/Services, Industrial, Public/Quasi-Public, Office/Other, and Lodging acreage as identified in Yolo County General Plan Land Use and Circulation Conceptual Alternatives (page 7, Jan 2005) updated and corrected.
3/ Includes Guinda.
4/ 12 existing vacant acres left out of Alternative 1 in error.
5/ Does not include the Old Sugar Mill project. At the time the original four alternatives were developed the project was in process with no approvals. At the time of the PC direction, the project was approved but pending on appeal at Delta Protection Commission. The Old Sugar Mill project consists of 162 residential units and 77 acres of non-residential uses. These uses would fall under the category of Build-Out Under Existing GP.
6/ Alternative 1 estimate of 108 acres has been corrected.
7/ Alternative 1 estimates for residential and non-residential build-out have been corrected to reflect subsequent development.
8/ Includes 145-acre Howald property which has a mixed use designation under the existing General Plan and was left out of Alternative 1 in error. Under the existing land use designation, the Howald property is projected to build-out with 800 units and 38 acres of non-residential.
9/ 75 Industrial designated acres to be evaluated for Commercial and Residential.
10/ 23 acres at SW quadrant of SR 16 and I 505; 3.5-acre Feenstra and Cummings properties (existing Industrial changed to Commercial); 2.5-acre de los Reyes property (existing Residential changed to Commercial).
11/ At CR 94B and SR 16.
12/ Agricultural Commercial at Bayliss property.
13/ Originally included in Alternative 4 in error; now included in Alternative 1.
14/ This does not represent potential "full" build-out but rather a projection of future rural residential units through 2030 based on past trends. Assumes an average of 70 rural residential units annually over 23 years.
15/ 13 acres at Mace Blvd/I-80 south of CR 32A; 30 acres at Chiles Rd/I-80; 383 acres at NW corner Covell/Pole Line.
16/ At SE quadrant of I-505 and SR 128.
17/ The central and eastern portions of the Spreckels property (160 acres), plus 30 acres of highway commercial along the freeway frontage east of CR 103, between CR 22 and I-5 .
18/ Alternative 1 estimate of 0 units has been corrected.
19/ 3 acres Highway Commercial at I-5/CR 17.
20/ 15 acres at I-505/CR 14; 20 acres at I-505/CR 27.

ATTACHMENT B

PRELIMINARY REVISED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE SCHEDULE

	Task	Adopted Completion Date	Revised Completion Date
1.	Initiate Project	May 2006	May 2006
2.	Review Additional Existing Conditions	May 2006	Aug 2006
3.	Review and Refine Alternatives	May 2006	Sep 2006
4.	Evaluate and Select Preferred Alternatives	Jul 2006	Mar 2007
5.	Develop Preliminary Goals and Policies	Sep 2006	Jun 2007
6.	Develop Administrative Draft General Plan	Oct 2006	Jul 2007
7.	Prepare Draft General Plan	Nov 2006	Aug 2007
8.	Public Hearings on Draft General Plan	Jan 2007	Oct 2007
9.	Public Review of Draft General Plan	Feb 2007	Nov 2007
10.	Public Review of Draft General Plan EIR	Apr 2007	Jan 2008
11.	Public Hearings on Draft General Plan EIR	Apr 2007	Jan 2008
12.	Administrative Draft Final General Plan	Jul 2007	Apr 2008
13.	Final General Plan	Aug 2007	May 2008
14.	Certification of EIR and Adoption of Final General Plan	Oct 2007	Jun 2008
15.	Final Adopted General Plan	Nov 2007	Jul 2008