



# **Yuba County General Plan Update**

## **Board of Supervisors and Joint Board/Planning Commission Workshops**

### **Introduction**

The County conducted two workshops on the General Plan update in April and May of 2007, prior to the first round of public Town Hall Forums. The first workshop on April 17th was a General Plan kickoff with a joint convening of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. The second workshop was to discuss opportunities and constraints analysis, talk about issues brought up during the first workshop, and describe the first phase of public outreach for the General Plan update. Following is a description of these two initial workshops and the comments and input received.

### **General Plan Kickoff, April 2007**

The kickoff workshop began with introductions to some of the key staff and consultants involved in the General Plan update. A description of State law requirements and General Plan basics followed. The Yuba County General Plan update work program was briefly outlined, including specific discussions with the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors about two additional ideas for gathering input on the General Plan. The first of those ideas addressed general stakeholder outreach and the second idea had to do with organizing a General Plan focus group or General Plan advisory committee.

In this kickoff workshop, four key topics were introduced, including the County's role in the region, fiscal and economic balance, where and how to grow, and proactive/comprehensive planning. A summary of the April 2007 workshop agenda follows:

1. INTRODUCTIONS
2. GENERAL PLAN BASICS
3. GENERAL PLAN WORK PROGRAM
  - Main elements of the Work Program
  - Schedule
4. KEY ISSUES AND QUESTIONS
  - Four primary topics:
    - i. County's Place in the Region
    - ii. Growth that Results in Fiscal / Economic Balance
    - iii. Opportunities and Constraints – Where and How to Grow



**YUBA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN UPDATE**  
**Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission**  
**Workshop Summary – April/May 2007**

- iv. Comprehensive Planning and Implementation
5. STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH
6. GENERAL PLAN FOCUS GROUP
7. NEXT WORKSHOP
8. NEXT STEPS

**Decision Maker Comments**

Decision maker comments from the first public workshop are summarized below.

Related to a General Plan advisory committee (which has become known as the General Plan Update Advisory Committee [GPUAC]), decision makers had additional suggestions related to how that group might be composed, including the following representatives:

- ✓ Yuba College
- ✓ Yuba Water Agency
- ✓ Yuba-Sutter Economic Development Corporation
- ✓ Enterprise Zone Program
- ✓ A focus on representation from the broad community-at-large

**General Comments**

When staff and consultants began the discussion of key issues, several general topics of conversation arose, including:

- ✓ The need to create policy regarding incorporation of areas close to cities. Should these areas operate as unincorporated County territory or become part of a city? There is a need to have further discussion among the Board of Supervisors on this issue.
- ✓ Limit the size of development.
- ✓ It is difficult to supply “urban-type” services to development in the unincorporated County.
- ✓ There will be an increase of population in northern portions of the Sacramento region due to housing prices in Sacramento and Roseville. How should the County manage this growth?
- ✓ Culture of the community: what it is like to live in Yuba County.
- ✓ Regional recreation focused on local history, resources, and culture could be a regional attraction.

## **Topic #1: The County's Place in the Region**

Staff and consultants introduced the first of four primary topics for discussion at this first workshop, "the County's Role in the Region." This topic was described for the decision makers and discussion was then welcomed. Comments included:

- ✓ Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) mapping and flowing issues, Phase A and Phase B will be very important. Concerned about spending a lot of time and process on flood-prone land.
- ✓ Do not want to focus too much attention on urban development on any parcels or in any areas that FEMA could ultimately find are part of the floodplain.
- ✓ There is a need to be competitive for jobs and industry; don't raise County fees too much, such that employers may not consider locating in Yuba County.
- ✓ The County needs to prepare some kind of benchmark for jobs per household, or a jobs/housing balance benchmark for use in planning.
- ✓ A major issue for the County will be annexation and incorporation and interaction with the existing cities in the County.
- ✓ The south County area would like to be its own City.
- ✓ There is a need to improve transportation corridors (SR 65/70).

## **Topic #2: Fiscal/Economic Balance**

Staff and consultants introduced and described the second primary topic of discussion for the decision makers. Decision maker comments included:

- ✓ There is a need for highway and transit connections north to south in the County.
- ✓ There is a need for good northern connections (Colusa, Butte).
- ✓ There is a need to develop a regional sewer system instead of having a number of smaller local systems.
- ✓ Drainage and flooding issues are very important.
- ✓ Yuba County lacks the necessary infrastructure to attract industry.
- ✓ Beale Air Force Base (AFB) mission: the AFB would like to partner with private interests.
- ✓ Supply and demand principle will be important.
- ✓ The County needs to be able to take advantage of economic opportunities.
- ✓ The County needs to attract jobs that allow people to afford housing being built.



- ✓ People working in Yuba County don't necessarily live here.
- ✓ Retail in South County is needed.
- ✓ Professional working opportunities are needed.
- ✓ The County should develop business parks.
- ✓ Drainage fees are high.

**Topic #3: Opportunities and Constraints: Where and How to Grow**

Staff and consultants introduced and described the process of considering opportunities and constraints for development and conservation. Decision maker comments included:

- ✓ The County should centralize infrastructure and services (as opposed to decentralized, smaller infrastructure and service provisions spread out throughout the County).
- ✓ School District bonds and partnering with schools as an opportunity for the future.
- ✓ There is opportunity for infill in Olivehurst and Linda. The County should take advantage of the existing infrastructure and community assets in these already developed areas.
- ✓ The County should eliminate proliferation of wastewater treatment plants.
- ✓ The County should identify where industry can be clustered to take advantage of shared infrastructure.

**Topic #4: Comprehensive Planning**

Staff and consultants introduced and described this last topic for consideration at the first workshop. The County could use this comprehensive policy update as an opportunity to proactively plan for future land development and conservation in this updated General Plan, as opposed to planning through General Plan amendment/Specific Plan adoption. Decision maker comments on this topic included:

- ✓ There are issues with commuters going through Yuba County. There are regional traffic problems experienced in Yuba County.
- ✓ The County needs a better match between housing and jobs.
- ✓ The County should identify regional connectors and determine how to improve them to handle increase in traffic.
- ✓ The County should identify what local connectors should be provided to get around locally and make these local connection improvements.

- ✓ The County should address high tech interfaces such as accessibility to high speed internet connections.
- ✓ The County's sustainability principles are good principles. They are all valuable.
- ✓ Mixed-use communities are needed.
- ✓ Growth boundaries are needed, with preserved open space between.
- ✓ Working on a regional water management plan.

## **General Plan Workshop, May 2007**

As noted earlier, this follow up workshop provided more information on the opportunities and constraints analysis that could inform the Yuba County General Plan update, reopened the discussion of the four primary topics from the last workshop, and described the first major phase of community outreach for the General Plan.

A summary of the May 2007 workshop agenda follows:

### INTRO AND SUMMARY

- Follow up to April 17th General Plan discussion
- General discussion of opportunities and constraints analysis
- Example constraints
- Next steps

### EARLY INPUT AND DIRECTION FOLLOW UP DISCUSSION

- Summarize key comments from last General Plan discussion
- Elaborate or add further input/direction
- Four major topics:
  - i. County's Place in the Region
    1. Annexation, incorporation, new town/s
    2. Transportation corridors, transit connections, especially north-south routes
  - ii. Growth that Results in Fiscal / Economic Balance
    1. Job growth and housing growth balance and match
    2. Business climate and fees for employment generating land uses
    3. Regional sewer system instead of large number of local systems
    4. Infrastructure and appropriate setting to attract business
    5. Role of Beale in private business development
    6. Land use policies that smooth impact of business/housing cycles



**YUBA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN UPDATE**  
**Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission**  
**Workshop Summary – April/May 2007**

- iii. Opportunities and Constraints – Where and How to Grow
  1. Flooding and floodplains
  2. Centralize and shared infrastructure and public services
  3. Infill development
  4. Community assets
- iv. Proactive Planning and Implementation
  1. Jobs/housing mismatch and traffic/commuting
  2. Regional and local transportation improvements
  3. Information technology and infrastructure provision
  4. Sustainability
  5. Mixed-use development and communities
  6. Growth boundaries and open space protection
  7. Regional water management
  8. Regional recreational resources

**OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS**

- General introduction to the use of opportunities/constraints analysis in long-range land use planning
- The use of opportunities and constraints analysis as anticipated in Yuba County General Plan Update Scope of Work
  - i. Identify key issues through public outreach, interaction with the BOS
  - ii. Assemble mapping for each key issue
  - iii. Weight according to relative importance and overlay
  - iv. End product shows areas that are more suitable and less suitable for development, conservation
- Examples of opportunities and constraints that may be useful to consider:
  - i. State and federal lands (show map, highlight State/federal lands)
  - ii. Inundation easements, floodplain, other permanent easements (show map, highlight 100-year floodplain and inundation easements)
  - iii. Areas within City limits (show map, highlight City limits)
  - iv. Clear zones and noise contours around airports
  - v. Steep slopes and other geologic/soil limitations
  - vi. Sensitive habitats
  - vii. Prime farmland (show map, highlight Prime, statewide, unique farmland)
  - viii. Areas where infrastructure and services could efficiently be provided
    1. Transportation, water, wastewater, drainage

- ix. Infill opportunities (show map, highlight existing developed areas in County)
- x. Other types of opportunities and constraints

#### NEXT STEPS

### **Decision Maker Comments**

Decision maker comments from the May 2007 General Plan update workshop with the Board of Supervisors are summarized below. For organization, the comments were divided into six categories.

#### **New Development**

- ✓ Don't pattern growth after communities that are not like Yuba County.
- ✓ Need to have policies that emphasize developing first within growth boundaries.
- ✓ No leapfrog development – this leads to higher infrastructure costs.
- ✓ In the SACOG region, the only community that meets low-income housing needs is Davis (students).
- ✓ Need to be clear about how to grow – looking at how communities should grow – should have concurrency for public services, infrastructure (require necessary services/infrastructure to be in place b/f approving development)
- ✓ Should grow within boundaries before extending outward – need policy with clear guidance about growth management.
- ✓ Have many parcels already considered/approved development? It could be that the County already has 20-30 years of growth planned without revising the GP.
- ✓ Other places have been growing – want to ensure that County provides opportunities – need to bring jobs, opportunity.
- ✓ Quick growth in other areas has led to problems. The County should be proactive in determining how it wants to grow in the future and learn from other communities' past experiences.
- ✓ SACOG, Caltrans, other interests indicate that any growth should be along highways – along existing corridors – not sprawl development far from existing infrastructure and services.
- ✓ Need to bring along business with any residential growth.
- ✓ Want business development along 65/70 corridor.
- ✓ Many parcels have already been approved for development (Plumas Lake) – East? This is different than what is characterized as “plans in process.”



### **Sustainability**

- ✓ How do we grow healthy communities so that people don't have to use their cars? Should grow communities so don't have to use cars. There are obesity and public health concerns linked to sprawl that does not facilitate walking/biking. Walkability is important.
- ✓ Should have energy/resource efficient housing. County could have a goal for % of housing that is LEED platinum status. There are consumer preferences for efficient housing.
- ✓ Need to focus on improving existing neighborhoods, addressing existing housing stock, people already here, improving infrastructure, especially in southern part of county (drainage etc).

### **Natural Resources and Hazards**

- ✓ Some people want to preserve farmland – what should the GP do to protect farmland?
- ✓ Yuba County needs to implement measures for farmland protection.
- ✓ Map habitat easements (e.g., ducks unlimited)
- ✓ SACOG blueprint, floodplain – growth all in floodplains – in prime farmlands – contradicting – don't allow Plumas Lake to get any larger – have to decide whether to sacrifice flood plain – prime farmland – talked about not growing in farmland – have not addressed what will happen after FEMA remapping - should instead build along freeway.
- ✓ Tremendous job improving levees – would require 200 year protection – with new reservoirs to hold water, could get 300 or 400 year protection – while still preserving a lot of farmland.
- ✓ In Dist 10, Hallwood, there are habitat easements – County should find and ID those easements.
- ✓ HCP process – easements – draft plans – will get final layers – HCP – timeline? – JSA negotiations.
- ✓ County should specify the proper recording requirement for conservation easements.

### **Fiscal and Economy**

- ✓ How to fund growth, infrastructure and services?
- ✓ Are developers paying for cost of new development?
- ✓ 1-5 acre lots do not pay for themselves and they are not walkable, either.

- ✓ Fiscal sustainability should be a prominent part of the General Plan, if not own element.
- ✓ Look carefully about financing new development; there is a loss of funding through ERAF. Only small part of funding need be met. Reliant on property tax.
- ✓ Want to encourage retail, industry – will not come first – will come last. Don't lose track of economic realities.

#### **AFB**

- ✓ Incorporate ACUS and AFB information with the General Plan update.
- ✓ SACOG ALUP – need to ensure noise contours for all 3 airports are updated and incorporated into the GP update, including Beale.

#### **Public Services and Facilities**

- ✓ Should include parks study/plan as a part of the General Plan update.
- ✓ The Sheriff is studying County now w/figures on cost of covering law enforcement.
- ✓ Don't have the money to move highways; county is invested in levees.