

# The County of Yuba

## Community Development & Services Agency

### Kevin Mallen, Director

Phone - (530) 749-5430 • Fax - (530) 749-5434  
915 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 123  
Marysville, California 95901  
www.co.yuba.ca.us



09-229  
BUILDING  
749-5440 • Fax 749-5616  
CODE ENFORCEMENT  
749-5455 • Fax 749-5464  
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH • CUPA  
749-5450 • Fax 749-5454  
HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES  
749-5460 • Fax 749-5464  
PLANNING  
749-5470 • Fax 749-5434  
PUBLIC WORKS • SURVEYOR  
749-5420 • Fax 749-5424  
FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION  
749-5430 • Fax 749-5434

**TO:** Board of Supervisors  
**FROM:** Kevin Mallen, CDSA Director  
Wendy Hartman, Planning Director  
**DATE:** May 12, 2009  
**SUBJECT:** Yuba County General Plan Update 2030  
Board of Supervisors Study Session

### RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board of Supervisors:

1. Receive an overview of the General Plan Update process to date and receive preliminary information on the analyses being conducted on Land Use Alternatives A & B.
2. Provide direction to staff to investigate potential issues identified in the analyses being conducted with the General Plan Update Advisory Committee (GPUAC) and solicit feedback from the GPUAC, and
3. Direct staff to return to the Board of Supervisors promptly; once the analyses are completed and feedback has been provided by the GPUAC, with a recommendation for selection of the final alternative.

### BACKGROUND:

On November 20, 2008 the Board directed staff to analyze two land use alternatives in order to identify the advantages and disadvantages of the two growth scenarios in order to provide the Board adequate information to select a preferred land use alternative. The two alternatives, A & B, were developed from five alternatives that were reviewed in the General Plan Update visioning process held throughout the County last summer and through a series of workshops with the Board. On January 20, 2009, Alternative B was modified by the Board to include the recently approved Bear River and Country Club Estates projects, but was also modified to maintain the overall population estimate envisioned in the November 20<sup>th</sup> version.

Each alternative represented an emphasis on Board priorities and key issues such as local economy, agricultural and open space preservation, housing, transportation and air quality, and incorporation viability. Descriptions of the two alternatives and the relative priorities behind the vision each represents are attached (Attachment 1).

Preliminary analyses of both alternatives are ongoing by the County’s GPU consultant team as well as staff and evaluation of issues such as absorption, provision of services, fiscal impacts/revenue, traffic, air quality and infrastructure needs are ongoing.

**DISCUSSION:**

Preliminary analysis of the volume of residential and non-residential units based on land use designations as well as gross volume of overall vehicle trip generation associated with these volumes is summarized in a table below. The volumes of Alternatives A & B as well as the existing plus approved column represent theoretical maximums based on build out of all designated land uses and the traffic volumes shown are without consideration of any policies to reduce vehicle trips.

PRELIMINARY VOLUME ESTIMATES				
Land Use Type	Existing	Existing + Approved	General Plan Alternative A	General Plan Alternative B
Dwelling Units	25,000	60,000	85,000	72,000
Non-Residential	4 million sq. ft.	12 million sq. ft.	30 million sq. ft.	28 million sq. ft.
Daily Trip Generation	300,000	900,000	1,400,000	1,200,000
Notes:				
Non-residential includes all retail, office, industrial, PQP, and related uses.				
“Approved” – projects that are approved, but not yet built, i.e. Approved Tentative Maps, Projects with Development Agreements, etc.				

This raw preliminary data gives us a good baseline of information to start discussing growth patterns, infrastructure needs, funding opportunities, and facilities phasing. When looking at these preliminary figures it helps put a raw number with the graphic illustration shown on the land use alternative maps. The term “raw” is used since this data is without any policies to better direct the end product of the land use maps, however it helps identify where focus is needed. For instance, with the land uses identified in Alternative B there is land available for 3 times as many residences as currently exist and 7 times as much non-residential buildings resulting in 4 times as many vehicle trips as currently exist on our roadways. This data helps to identify where developing policies and/or refinement of land use designations is needed in order to achieve success. As an example, will retaining the same amount of land identified for non-residential uses in Alternative B (7 times more than currently exists) be as successful to implement as identifying a smaller footprint that is more in balance with projected growth over the next 20 years? Would retaining the same amount of land but developing a phasing plan for where development will occur first be a better fit? There are many variables that play into answering these types of questions such as infrastructure availability and costs, location relative to housing and major roads, and market pressure. Staff would like the opportunity to develop potential solutions to these types of questions and proposes to vet the issues further with the GPUAC and then return to the Board with recommendations.

The amount of growth potential shown in the preliminary data above also provides an opportunity to evaluate how this compares to the growth projected by the State Department of Finance (DOF). Items such as how the land uses designated will be absorbed and how this absorption may affect cost of service provisions, job creation, and retail sales tax opportunities can be further evaluated. For example, both Alternatives A & B identify an amount of growth that exceed what is being projected by the DOF for the year 2030 (250,000 people in Alternative A, 205,000 Alternative B vs. 138,000 people for DOF). Based on the historic accuracy of the DOF projections, the amount of growth over the next 20 years will not “build out” the areas being designated in either Alternative. As such, considerations need to be evaluated as how to best address this issue so that the County does not end up 20 years from now with partially built communities struggling to fund services, and fund infrastructure which could be further exacerbated if some infrastructure is not eligible for funding through SACOG due to differences in planned growth areas between the County and the SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Having land designated in reserve of anticipated growth is beneficial with the right policies in place to ensure that communities are grown in a balanced and orderly fashion and that outside funding sources for infrastructure are preserved.

An item that has been brought up in previous discussions with the Board and is a common topic with nearly all local jurisdictions in the State are the additional challenges AB32 and SB375 pose for communities that are growing. The intent of this legislation is to reduce the State’s greenhouse gas emissions and one of the primary means identified to accomplish this is by reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT). For communities in the State that are projecting substantial growth such as ours this legislation’s intent appears impossible to meet. How can you double in population and reduce vehicle miles traveled at the same time? Staff and the GPU consultant team have been actively researching how to meet the intent of the legislation recognizing the growth the County will see in coming years. Although State policies on this topic are still evolving, it appears one potential solution appears to be forming that would involve implementing smart growth principals into the land use and circulation elements of the General Plan that are focused on reducing the County’s overall average VMT per household. For example, currently the average household in the Sacramento region generates 51 VMT/day. In Yuba County we currently have communities that are below that average such as the Linda/Olivehurst areas at 49 VMT/day and communities that are above that average such as Plumas Lake at 72 VMT/day or Loma Rica at 95 VMT/day. Staff intends to explore the VMT per household issue further and present potential recommendations to the GPUAC for vetting before returning to the Board with recommendations on how to address this legislation in the GPU.

### **SUMMARY:**

Staff is seeking input and/or direction from the Board considering the process summary and update provided today. In addition, staff is recommending to return to the GPUAC to update them and seek input/guidance regarding preliminary analysis of the Alternatives. Finally, staff will return to your Board and present a completed analysis of areas discussed today, and present recommendations for selection of a preferred land use alternative.

#### Attachments:

1. Alternatives Description

## ALTERNATIVES DESCRIPTIONS

### ALTERNATIVE A

- Allows for ~250,000 at buildout.
- Targeted goal of retaining 90%+ of County Important Farmland.
- Focused on Valley Growth including Hwy. 65 Corridor.

Alternative A provides for more “greenfield” development opportunity in the valley portions of the County than anticipated under the current General Plan. The increased “greenfield” opportunities would be located primarily along the Highway 65 corridor with expansion of the Linda Area south towards the Hwy 65/70 connection and some expansion of the Plumas Lake Specific Plan, including the Bear River and Country Club Estates projects. Foothill development opportunities would be somewhat limited to rural residential growth, but would allow for village centers within the community boundaries that would allow for rural commercial or other community services (i.e. community center) that meet community needs. This would be done through grassroots efforts funded by grants or other funding sources. The area known as the River Highlands Community Plan would be scaled back in development potential, but would allow for some community planning/expansion in the Smartsville area. The Spring Valley plan would also be anticipated for development in this alternative.

The growth scenario would breakdown as follows:

	<b>2030 Additional Population</b>	<b>Additional Population at Buildout</b>
Wheatland & Marysville	16,300	32,300
Foothills	11,000	37,350
Valley (Existing)	18,000	49,900
Valley (New)	21,700	59,450
Total Unincorporated	50,700	146,700
County Total	67,000	179,000
<b>Total Population at Buildout</b> (includes existing population of 71,000)	<b>250,000</b>	

### ALTERNATIVE B

- Allows for ~200,000 at buildout.
- Targeted goal of retaining 95%+ of County Important Farmland.
- Focused on Valley Growth around existing growth areas including jobs focused growth in the Hwy. 65 Corridor.

Alternative B would place more of an emphasis on preservation of open space and infill development than under Alternative A. Alternative B would prioritize development adjacent to existing developed areas where infrastructure and services could be extended. It would envision

new neighborhoods directly adjacent to Linda, Olivehurst, and the Plumas Lake Specific Plan, including the Bear River and Country Club Estates projects.

Alternative B also includes employment uses along the Highway 65 corridor, although no housing would be allowed in this area under this scenario. Foothill development opportunities would be similar to Alternative A, including rural residential development and potentially a mix of other land use types in the River Highlands area, but at a smaller footprint than Alternative A.

The growth scenario would breakdown as follows:

	<b>2030 Additional Population</b>	<b>Additional Population at Buildout</b>
Wheatland & Marysville	16,300	32,300
Foothills	11,000	35,000
Valley (Existing)	30,000	49,900
Valley (New)	9,700	16,800
Total Unincorporated	50,700	101,700
County Total	67,000	134,000
<b>Total Population at Buildout</b> (includes existing population of 71,000)	<b>205,000</b>	