

# 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



08-017

**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

**TO:** Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Kevin Mallen, CDSA Director  
Wendy Hartman, Planning Director

**DATE:** January 10, 2008

**SUBJECT:** Yuba County General Plan Update (2030)  
Board of Supervisors Study Session #2:  
Transportation/Circulation & Infrastructure/Services

### SUMMARY

This is the second of four scheduled workshops/study sessions that have been set for the purpose of addressing significant General Plan issues at an early stage in the process. The staff is seeking guidance and direction in order to proceed with the preparation of a draft plan that reflects the Board's early thoughts on these issues. While the first study session focused on population growth, growth constraints and growth boundaries, this second session will address the issues of transportation/circulation and infrastructure/services. The Board may also wish to revisit or add comments relative to the issues addressed at the first workshop.

Future workshops will address economic development, jobs/housing balance, issues particular to the foothills portion of the County, and any remaining subjects relevant to the General Plan update.

### BACKGROUND

These Board study sessions have been organized following the initial information gathering done for the General Plan update. The purpose is to solicit early input from the Board on significant issues raised at earlier meetings of the Board, or at the town hall meetings, Citizen's Advisory Committee meetings, or otherwise brought to the attention of the staff.

Additional town hall meetings, advisory committee meetings, and public input is expected and may identify additional issues to be addressed.

Following these workshops the staff and consultants will prepare a draft General Plan and alternatives for further review and evaluation.

## **DISCUSSION**

**TRANSPORTATION:** Yuba County has the benefit of being served by three major highways. It also has the curse of having to deal with the traffic on these and other roadways as well as the difficulties of traversing a county with three major rivers that bisect the area. Traffic has steadily grown on the County's roads and highways as Yuba County and the surrounding region has grown. The impacts are felt on a daily basis by area residents and a commonly noted concern relates to traffic.

As is discussed in the Transportation and Circulation Background Report, traffic congestion was identified as a problem by an overwhelming majority of participants at all town hall forums. Participants identified problems along State Highway Routes (SR) in the County, including SR-20, SR-65, and SR-70. Certain participants proposed highway bypasses, especially for Wheatland and for truck traffic around Marysville. Many residents also identified a need for public transit. The large number of Yuba County residents commuting outside the County for work was recognized as the primary cause of traffic congestion by many forum participants. Streetscape improvements, including sidewalks, were suggested to improve safety.

The County's current General Plan as well as regional transportation plans have identified the need for significant and very costly transportation system improvements. Among these are:

- Yuba River Parkway – a connection between Highways 65/70 and Highway 20 north and east of Marysville;
- Highway 65/70 connector – a new roadway connecting Highway 65 and Highway 70 south of Olivehurst, in the vicinity of the Sports and Entertainment zone;
- Third bridge – A new bridge over the Feather River south of the Yuba/Feather River confluence;
- Highway 65 Bypass – A re-routing of Highway 65 to the east of Wheatland, reconnecting with the current alignment of Highway 65 near South Beale Road;
- New and expanded Highway 65 and Highway 70 interchanges (*Plumas Lake Blvd. & Feather River Blvd. on Highway 70, expansion of existing McGowan & Erle Rd. interchanges on Highway 70 and McGowan & 40-Mile Rd. on Highway 65, new interchange at/near S. Beale Rd. and Highway 65*); and,
- Additional traffic signals, road and bridge widening, and extension of existing roads.

Not surprisingly the cost of these improvement projects far outreaches the County's ability to fund them. As new development occurs, additional traffic adds to and exacerbates existing deficiencies.

Question #1 – *How is the County going to fund future transportation system improvements?*

Question #2 – *What is the priority for the various needed system improvement projects?*

Question #3 – *What is the County's role in the planning, funding and construction of the Hwy 65 bypass of Wheatland?*

Question #4 – *What is the County's role in the planning, funding and construction of a 3<sup>rd</sup> Bridge?*

Question #5 – *What is development’s role in financing needed improvements and should there be timing considerations in terms of limiting housing until improvements are built?*

Another transportation issue relates to the traffic generated by the significant sand and gravel businesses that operate in Yuba County. These businesses and the related hauling activities account for large portions of the truck traffic on certain road segments.

Question #6 – *Should the General Plan explore alternative methods of transporting aggregate, such as rail or conveyors?*

Question #7 – *Should the General Plan explore additional methods of recovering the actual maintenance costs associated with truck traffic on County roads?*

INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES: Residents of Yuba County are served with basic services by a variety of municipalities and special districts. Major municipal services such as sewer, water, fire, and parks are provided by the County, the cities of Marysville and Wheatland and special districts including Linda Water & Fire Districts, Olivehurst Public Utility District, Wheatland Fire Authority, River Highlands Community Service District and several others.

While all services are important to the County’s residents, sewer and water service are the most significant in terms of General Plan considerations. In the unincorporated area, the County determines when and where growth and new development are appropriate. However, the availability of sewer and water services can significantly affect the timing and placement of new development, or if it can happen at all. Therefore, these services and the agencies that supply them must coordinate their planning to efficiently accommodate new development.

The Yuba County Local Agency Formation Commission is charged with determining where and who provides many types of services. At the present time LAFCO is preparing municipal service studies that will address various agencies ability to provide services as well as sphere of influence studies that will look at where each agency may provide services in the future. The completion of these studies will help to inform the General Plan process. Similarly, the County’s decisions on where to allow growth will impact these agencies and special districts.

Municipal sewer & water service in the valley portion of the County is currently provided by the Linda Co. Water District, the Olivehurst Public Utility District, the Cities of Wheatland and Marysville, and some private systems.

Fire protection services are provided by Cal Fire, Linda Fire Dept., Olivehurst Fire Dept., Wheatland Fire Authority.

Question #1 – *Are there certain services that would be best or more efficiently provided through regionalization and/or consolidation? If so which ones?*

Question #2 – *If regionalization of sewer services is desirable, who should take the lead? Should Beale AFB be considered a potential partner in such an effort?*

Question #3 – *Are there improvements in fire protection services that the County should play a role in making happen? Are the current levels of service and response times appropriate in the newly developing areas of the County? Should the General Plan address level of service standards for such services?*

Question #4 – *Is it a policy of the County that development must pay its fair share of the cost of both the infrastructure and services necessary to serve the project? Is it anticipated that the County will seek funds from other sources to reduce such costs?*

ADDITIONAL GROWTH BOUNDARY/LOCATION DISCUSSION: As was mentioned at the first workshop, it may be that the Board has additional issues or wishes to add to the previous comments on the growth boundary/location discussion.

Question # 1- *With the additional information and discussion of these additional topics are there additional comments or other direction that the Board has at this time?*

### CONCLUSION

The Board's comments and any direction provided will assist in the preparation of the Draft General Plan and alternatives and insure that the continuing work reflects the Board's collective thoughts as much as possible. Following other workshops and at future meetings yet more opportunities for additional direction will be available.