

**COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO  
CALIFORNIA**

Control No.: 20020105  
Type: GPB

**TO:** COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

**FROM:** PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

**SUBJECT: 2030 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE - ADOPTION HEARING #7**

**CONTACT:** *Dave Defanti, Senior Planner, 874-6155*

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**Overview**

This hearing begins with a presentation by Mike McKeever, Executive Director of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), on the Sacramento Region Blueprint, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and SB 375. After the presentation, review of the Draft Land Use Element will continue, starting with policy LU-13.

**Recommendations**

1. At hearing #7, review and comment on the Draft General Plan Land Use Element.
2. At future hearings:
  - a. Review and comment on all Draft General Plan Elements, making recommendations on policies and text as appropriate.
  - b. Make recommendations on the key themes and outstanding issues of the Draft Plan.
  - c. Forward the Draft 2030 General Plan to the Board of Supervisors.

**Measures/Evaluation**

The 2030 General Plan promotes the County's vision to be the most livable community with the highest-quality public service by guiding growth within the County through the year 2030.

**Fiscal Impact**

The 2030 General Plan sets policy for a wide variety of County activities and initiatives which collectively seek to improve the long-term fiscal sustainability of the County. In the near-term, adoption of the General Plan update will conclude a 7-year effort to meet State mandates and comply with requirements to maintain the General Plan.

## INTRODUCTION

Discussion at the August 10, 2009 adoption hearing was primarily focused on how best to approach reviewing and providing recommendations on the Draft 2030 General Plan (Draft Plan). The result of that discussion was to review and comment on each of the Draft Plan's fifteen Elements. This approach was preferred to ensure a thorough review of all policies and themes of the Draft Plan, as well as comments received from the public and other stakeholders and mitigation measures that may modify policies.

The public hearing of August 31, 2009 began with two presentations requested by the Planning Commission at the prior hearing. Cecelia Jensen, the County's Sustainability Coordinator, presented a summary of the County's Climate Action Plan and related efforts. This presentation was followed by an overview of the state legislative and regulatory environment, presented by Lisa Trankley of the State of California Attorney General's Office.

After these presentations, the Planning Commission began a policy-by-policy review of the Land Use Element, with public testimony taken throughout the hearing. The County Planning Commission reviewed and commented on Land Use Element policies LU-1 through LU-12. The County Planning Commission's comments and recommendations related to these policies are captured in Attachment A. As hearings on the Draft 2030 General Plan progress, this document will be updated to include all of the County Planning Commission's comments and recommendations. The latest version will be posted on the General Plan Update web site at: <http://www.planning.saccounty.net/gpupdate/gpu-index.html>

In addition, Planning staff updated the *Summary of Comments Received on Land Use Element Policies* document (Attachment B) to include additional comment letters received since early August. Planning staff will strive to update this document as necessary should additional comment letters be received.

## CONCLUSION

The Draft Land Use Element will again be the focus of tonight's hearing. After the presentation by SACOG, review of the Draft Land Use Element will continue, starting with policy LU-13. During the last hearing on August 31<sup>st</sup>, the County Planning Commission discussed and received public testimony on each individual policy. At tonight's hearing, discussion will focus on policies that have been the subject of previous public or stakeholder correspondence and comment, whereas policies that have not been the subject of previous correspondence and comment may be discussed in groups according to topic. Accordingly, public testimony will be taken on individual policies and/or groups of policies at the County Planning Commission's discretion.

Discussions related to strategically planning and building out new growth areas (i.e. phasing, etc.) and addressing individual landowner requests will take place at a future hearing once the Planning Commission feels that sufficient progress has been made reviewing and making preliminary recommendations on the Draft Land Use Element policy framework. Planning

staff will prepare a staff report and related materials at the appropriate time to specifically address these subsections.

**ATTACHMENTS**

- A. Summary of Land Use Element Policy Changes with County Planning Commission's Comments and Recommendations
- B. Summary of Comments Received on Draft Land Use Element Policies

This report was prepared on September 15, 2009.

**Summary of Land Use Element Policy Changes with County Planning Commission's  
Comments and Recommendations**

This document can be viewed at: <http://www.planning.sacounty.net/gpupdate/gpu-index.html>

This document contains the County Planning Commission's comments and recommendations on Draft General Plan Land Use Element policies. As hearings on the Draft 2030 General Plan progress, this document will be updated to include all of the County Planning Commission's comments and recommendations. Updated versions of this document will be posted online after each hearing.

**Summary of Comments Received on Land Use Element Policies**

*Updated 9/14/09 – Comments received since last hearing on August 31 are highlighted in yellow*

LU-6. All residential projects involving ten or more units, excluding remainder lots and Lot A's, shall not have densities less than 75% of zoned maximums, unless physical or environmental constraints make achieving the minimum densities impossible, ~~or unless existing zoning is inconsistent with LU-17.~~ (Modified existing Policy LU-4)

**Attorney General**

Policy LU-6, for example, states that all residential projects involving more than ten units, excluding remainder lots and Lot A's, shall not have densities less than 75% of zoned maximums, unless physical or environmental constraints make achieving the minimum densities impossible. We suggest changing the 75% to 100%. The DEIR suggests this change, but only if the Mixed Use Alternative is adopted. It would be desirable to make this change no matter which Alternative is selected. Also, the County should consider adding to the Draft Land Use Element policies that increase minimum densities in the various land use designations, reduce areas designated for low densities, and provide for density transfers to eliminate development from conservation or farmland.

**Rick Bettis for Natural Resources Voters of Sacramento County**

Should be modified to read "not less than" than the maximum adopted density. Allowing densities of 75% of maximum would not be consistent with the smart growth and climate change goals of adopted State legislation

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-6 to read as follows:

*All residential projects involving ten or more units and units greater than 20 du/acre, excluding remainder lots and lot A's, shall not have densities less than 75% of zoned maximums, unless physical or environmental constraints make achieving the minimum densities impossible.*

**OR**

*All residential projects involving ten or more units, excluding remainder lots and lot A's, shall not have densities less than 75% of zoned maximums, unless physical or environmental constraints make achieving the minimum densities impossible." In light of the overall plan flexibility and integration of mixed use development in master plans, density ranges for large master planned communities shall be established separately for each master planned community, and this policy shall not apply.*

**Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS), Sierra Club and Friends of the River**

Revise LU-6 to read as follows:

*All residential projects involving ten or more units, excluding remainder lots and Lot A's, shall not have densities less than ~~75%~~ 80% of zoned maximums ~~unless physical or environmental constraints make achieving the minimum densities impossible.~~*

**Add Implementation Measure under LU-6**

Add Implementation Measure to read as follows:

*F. Amend the Zoning Code to incorporate a minimum density requirement consistent with Policy LU-6. (The variance process in the zoning code eliminates the need for the “physical and environmental constraints” exception in the policy, which has been widely abused in the approval of previous projects.)*

**George Phillips for Natomas Landowner Group**

Revise LU-6 to read as follows:

*All ~~residential~~ residential projects involving ten or more units, excluding remainder lots and Lot A's, shall ~~not~~ should strive to have densities of at least less than 75% of zoned maximums, unless physical, planning or environmental constraints make achieving ~~the minimum~~ such densities impossible impracticable.*

**Gregory Thatch for South of Elk Grove Owners Group (SEGOG)**

This policy would establish a requirement in the General Plan that all projects involving ten (10) or more residential units must have a density of not less than 75% of the maximum density allowed by its zoning. In essence, this new Policy LU-6 effectively revises all of the density ranges in the County zoning code by eliminating three-quarters (3/4) of the dwelling unit ranges allowed in each zoning category by raising the minimum density to no less than 75% of the highest density allowed under the zoning code. Such a new policy is too restrictive and does not allow for the consideration of any market forces to help determine what types of residential housing units will be built in a project. It once again removes and restricts the discretion and decision making authority of the Board of Supervisors and makes it subservient to a General Plan policy that may not be appropriate in every situation. Policy LU-6 will also create implementation and enforcement problems. Policy LU-6 needlessly complicates zoning requirements.

**WalkSacramento**

Revise LU-6 to read as follows:

*All residential infill projects involving ten or more units on sites within existing urban areas that have infrastructure capacity available, excluding remainder lots and Lot A's, shall not have densities less than 75% of zoned maximums, unless physical or environmental*

LU-9. Maximize residential buildout of planned communities at a minimum of the approved plan densities. (New Policy)
--

**Rick Bettis for Natural Resources Voters of Sacramento County**

A policy that emphasizes that the County encourages and will provide incentives for the modification of current Specific Plans and Zoning to increase densities should be added and evaluated. This policy should be consistent with or exceed the requirement of recent State legislation SB 375 and the Scoping plan for AB 32.

**Building Industry Association**

Minimum of approved plan densities in planned communities. Forces property owners (small properties in particular) into unwanted development & tie their hands. Examples include family legacy TM's & carve outs for existing homes.

LU-13. The County **will promote new urban developments within identified growth areas and prohibit** ~~shall not approve~~ land use projects which are for noncontiguous development, **specifically proposals outside of the Urban Policy Area** (i.e. leapfrog development). (Modified existing Policy LU-7.)

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-13 to read as follows:

*"The County will promote new urban development within identified growth areas and prohibit land use projects which are not contiguous to existing planned communities or master plan areas for noncontiguous development, specifically proposals outside of the Urban Policy Area (i.e. leapfrog development)."*

**Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS), Sierra Club and Friends of the River**

Revise LU-13 to read as follows:

*The County ~~should~~ shall promote new urban developments within identified growth areas and shall prohibit all land use projects which are for noncontiguous development, specifically proposals outside of the Urban Policy Area (i.e., leapfrog development).*

**WalkSacramento**

Revise LU-13 to read as follows:

*The County will promote new urban developments within identified growth areas and prohibit Master Plan area land use projects which are for noncontiguous development, including specifically proposals outside of the Urban Policy Area (i.e. leapfrog development).*

LU-14. **A Public Facilities/Infrastructure Master Plan shall be prepared to identify the major facilities required to serve new development in urban growth areas. A Public Facilities Financing Plan shall be prepared and approved by the Board of Supervisors prior to the approval of any zoning for any urban uses in urban growth areas. The Financing Plan shall include a Public Facilities/Infrastructure Master Plan describing required major infrastructure improvements necessary to support proposed developments, and present a detail plan for the phasing of capital improvements and identifies the extent, timing and estimated costs of all necessary infrastructure.**

~~Infrastructure financing plans which specify the extent, timing and estimated cost of all necessary infrastructure shall be approved by the Board of Supervisors together with the approval of zoning for any urban uses in urban growth areas. The resulting financing mechanisms shall be implemented prior to the approval of all entitlements in urban growth areas.~~ (Modified existing Policy LU-8.)

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-14 to read as follows:

*A Public Facilities/Infrastructure Master Plan shall be prepared to identify the major facilities required to serve new development in urban growth areas. A Public Facilities Financing Plan shall be prepared and approved by the Board of Supervisors. ~~prior to the approval of any zoning for any urban uses in urban growth areas.~~ The Financing Plan shall include a Public Facilities/Infrastructure Master Plan describing required major infrastructure improvements necessary to support proposed developments, and present a detail plan for the phasing of capital improvements and identifies the extent, timing and estimated costs of all necessary infrastructure.*

**George Phillips for Rendering Plant**

Revise LU-14 to read as follows:

*A Public Facilities/Infrastructure Master Plan shall be prepared to identify the major facilities required to serve new development in urban growth areas. A Public Facilities Financing Plan shall be prepared and approved by the Board of Supervisors prior to or concurrent with the approval of any zoning for any urban uses in urban growth areas. The Financing Plan shall include a Public Facilities/Infrastructure Master Plan describing required major infrastructure improvements necessary to support proposed developments, and present a detail plan for the phasing of capital improvements and identifies the extent, timing and estimated costs of all necessary infrastructure.*

LU-16. Planning and development of new growth areas shall be consistent with the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan and other efforts to preserve and protect natural resources. (New Policy)
---

**Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS), Sierra Club and Friends of the River**

Revise LU-16 to read as follows:

*Planning and development of new growth areas shall ~~should~~ be consistent with the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan and other efforts to preserve and protect natural resources.*

**Taylor and Wiley for Stonebridge Properties**

This policy can only be in effect once the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) is adopted and the policy should reflect that fact. It should also be noted that the SSHCP is a voluntary participation plan and the policy as written ignores that reality.

**Brookfield Sacramento Land Holdings LLC**

The Draft General Plan Update makes numerous references that all plans and proposals should be consistent with the goals and objectives of draft or adopted habitat conservation plans. We feel that this statement is too broad in its description, and should be modified/clarified by adding the words "South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan" since the language appears to be addressing that issue. Saying that all draft HCP's should be considered is too onerous. Draft HCP's can change, and so can adopted ones for that matter.

**US Fish and Wildlife Service**

The Service also submits this comment on the draft General Plan Update (dated April or May 2009): several Elements of that document specify that the new General Plan need only "be consistent with Habitat Conservation Plans that ... are in draft format". The Service is concerned that outdated early informal drafts of the SSHCP will be used to guide future mitigation and conservation within the proposed new growth areas over the next 30 years. The Service requests that the final EIR and the final General Plan Update reference only the final SSHCP and SSHCP permits, if these are issued by the Service and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG).

LU-17. The County will initiate and lead processes (including Community Plans, Specific Plans, Comprehensive Plans, etc.) to plan for development within the Jackson Highway Area, as illustrated in Figure 7. The resulting plans should be consistent with the vision plan resulting from the Jackson Visioning Study Area effort. (New Policy)

**Building Industry Association**

Planning in Jackson Road should be consistent with the Vision Plan. Visioning Plan process was not a public process, was not accepted by the Board (only vision was from the Planning Dept.) and must not be referenced in any way.

**Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS), Sierra Club and Friends of the River**

Revise LU-17 to read as follows:

*Except as permitted by LU-60, the County shall not accept applications to amend the General Plan Land use Diagram from a designation in Column A to a designation in Column B for property located outside of the Urban Policy Area but within the Urban Services Boundary unless the expansion is deemed to be minor and logical, as follows:*

- *The property adjoins property substantially developed, to at least 80% build-out, with urban land uses and its shape and extent comprise a logical extension of infrastructure and services; and*
- *There is clear evidence that infrastructure capacity and service availability exist or can be easily extended to the property; and*
- *The proposed development is consistent with draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plans; and*
- *The Board finds that the unincorporated area land supply within the Urban Policy Area contains an insufficient land supply to accommodate a 10 year supply of growth.*

**Taylor and Wiley for Stonebridge Properties**

This policy should be modified to apply to all the new growth areas, not just the Jackson Highway Area.

**George Phillips for Rendering Plant**

Revise LU-17 to read as follows:

*The County will initiate and lead processes (including Community Plans, Specific Plans, Comprehensive Plans, etc.) to plan for development within the Jackson Highway Area, as illustrated in Figure 7. The resulting plans should be consistent with the vision plan resulting from the Jackson Visioning Study Area effort.*

We suggest that an implementation measure be added to the New Growth Areas section of the GPU, following Policy LU-17 (Land Use Element, page 44). Identical to Implementation Measure D that addresses the West of Watt area, new Implementation Measure E would initiate a master planning effort for the SRC site.

*E. Initiate a master planning effort for the Sacramento Rendering Company site to alleviate land use incompatibilities and to define redevelopment of the site, including a relocation strategy for the existing rendering plant.*

**Judith Waegell**

The sections the General Plan relating to the Jackson Road Visioning Study (JHVS) should be re-written to reflect that the Board of Supervisors action on the JHVS was to receive and file the study not "endorse" it as was assumed by the current documents.

LU-25. Providing compact, mixed use developments shall be an integral part of all master planning efforts for new growth areas and commercial corridors. (New Policy)

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-25 to read as follows:

*Providing compact, mixed-use developments should be an integral part of all master planning efforts for new growth areas and commercial corridors only when it is found to be appropriate by the Board.*

**George Phillips for Natomas Landowner Group**

Revise LU-25 to read as follows:

*Providing opportunities for compact, mixed use developments ~~shall~~ should be an integral part of all master planning efforts for new growth areas and commercial corridors.*

**Gregory Thatch for South of Elk Grove Owners Group (SEGOG)**

Revise LU-25 to read:

*Providing compact, mixed-use developments ~~should~~shall be an integral part of all master planning efforts for new growth areas and commercial corridors.*

LU-27 Depending on its emphasis, a mixed use development should include the following proportions of different uses, shown as percentages of the site area: (Existing unmodified Policy LU-12.)

**TABLE 7  
EMPHASIS OF DEVELOPMENT**

	<u>COMMERCIAL</u>	<u>OFFICE</u>	<u>RESIDENTIAL</u>
Retail	50-70%	10-30%	10-30%
Office	0-20%	50-70%	0-30%
Residential	20-40%	0-30%	50-80%
Public	10-30%	10-30%	10-30%

**Building Industry Association**

Refers to a mix of uses and defines percentages. What do the percentages apply to? Acreage? Square Footage? Some value associated with such use?

LU-28. When planning for new development in either new or existing communities, the following features shall be considered for their public health benefits and ability to encourage more active lifestyles:

- Compact, mixed use development and a balance of land uses so that everyday needs are within walking distance, including schools, parks, jobs, retail and grocery stores.
- Streets, paths and public transportation that connect multiple destinations and provide for alternatives to the automobile.
- Wide sidewalks, shorter blocks, well-marked crosswalks, on-street parking, shaded streets and traffic-calming measures to encourage pedestrian activity.
- Walkable commercial areas with doors and windows fronting on the street, street furniture, pedestrian-scale lighting, and served by transit when feasible.

(New Policy)

**Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS), Sierra Club and Friends of the River**

Revise LU-28 to read as follows:

*When planning for new development in either new or existing communities, the following features shall be considered for their public health benefits and ability to encourage more active lifestyles:*

- *Compact, mixed use development and a balance of land uses so that everyday needs are within walking distance, including schools, parks, jobs, retail and grocery stores.*
- *Streets, paths and public transportation that connect multiple destinations and provide for alternatives to the automobile.*
- *Wide sidewalks, shorter blocks, well-marked crosswalks, on street parking, shaded streets and traffic-calming measures to encourage pedestrian activity.*
- *Walkable commercial areas with doors and windows fronting on the street, street furniture, pedestrian-scale lighting and served by transit when feasible.*
- *Open space, including important habitat, wildlife corridors, and agricultural areas incorporated as community separators and appropriately accessible via non-vehicular pathways*

**WalkSacramento**

Revise LU-28 to read as follows:

*When planning for new development in either new or existing communities, the following features shall be considered for their public health benefits and ability to encourage more active lifestyles:*

- *Compact, mixed use development and a balance of land uses, including schools, parks, jobs, retail and grocery stores, so that everyday needs are within walking distance of homes, ~~including schools, parks, jobs, retail and grocery stores.~~*
- *Grid- or modified grid-pattern Sstreets, integrated pathways and public transportation that connect multiple destinations and provide for alternatives to the automobile.*

LU-34 It is the policy of Sacramento County to ~~design new~~ **support and encourage Transit Oriented Development (TODs) in appropriate areas throughout the county.** ~~Development applications located within 1/2 mile of a transportation corridor transit stop/station shall comply with the TOD development to conform to the density requirements as listed on of Table 8-III-4, except where the Board of Supervisors finds that development at the desired densities is not feasible.~~ **Appropriate locations include transit stops or nodes in commercial corridors, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or Light Rail stations, transit stops in new growth areas, or opportunity sites identified in Regional Transit’s Master Plan. If the Planning Department determines that an application is inconsistent with the intent of this policy, the Board of Supervisors shall be the appropriate hearing body to determine feasibility of consistency.** This policy shall not be applied to prevent, constraint, limit or deter the development of housing affordable to lower income households, in land currently zoned for residential or commercial use. This policy shall not be applied to justify reducing the available acreage for parcels at densities RD-20 and greater. (Modified existing Policy LU-14.)

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-34 to read as follows:

*It is the policy of Sacramento County to support and encourage Transit Oriented Development (TODs) in appropriate areas throughout the county. Development applications within 1/2 mile of a major Light Rail or Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) transit stop/station shall comply with the TOD development requirements as listed on Table 8 where appropriate and feasible. Appropriate locations include transit stops or nodes in commercial corridors, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or Light Rail stations, transit stops in new growth areas, or opportunity sites identified in Regional Transit’s Master Plan. If the Planning Department determines that an application is inconsistent with the intent of this policy, the Board of Supervisors shall be the appropriate hearing body to determine feasibility of consistency (see table 8).*

**GenCorp**

What is the definition of "transit stops"? In the second sentence, we request the word "shall" be replaced with "should". There should be some flexibility in the planning process for Transit Oriented Developments (TODs) to reflect market conditions. Table 8 of the Land Use Element,

with in the Light Rail table, does the 1.5 FAR include structured parking? If not, the minimum FAR is too high and should be lowered. Table 8 of the Land Use Element, within the Bus Rapid Transit and Other Trunk Services, what is the definition of "other trunk service"? The 0.65 FAR appears reasonable in certain major intersections, but to apply a 1/8 mile radius at all Bus Rapid Transit and Other Trunk Services locations does not provide adequate planning flexibility. The policy is too rigid and should be applied on a case-by-case basis;

**George Phillips for Natomas Landowner Group**

Revise LU-34 to read as follows:

*It is the policy of Sacramento County to support and encourage Transit Oriented Development (TODs) in appropriate areas throughout the county. Development applications within 1/2 mile of a major light rail or Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) transit stop/station identified in Regional Transit's Master Plan shall comply with the TOD development requirements as listed on Table 8 where appropriate and feasible. ~~Appropriate locations include transit stops or nodes in commercial corridors, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or Light Rail stations, transit stops in new growth areas, or opportunity sites identified in Regional Transit's Master Plan.~~ If the Planning Department determines that an application is inconsistent with the intent of this policy, the Board of Supervisors shall be the appropriate hearing body to determine feasibility of consistency. ~~(see table 8).~~*

**Gregory Thatch for South of Elk Grove Owners Group (SEGOG)**

Revise LU-34 to read as follows:

*It is the policy of Sacramento County to support and encourage Transit Oriented Development (TODs) in appropriate areas throughout the County. Development applications within 1/2 mile of a major Light Rail or Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) transit stop/station shall comply with the TOD development requirements as listed on Table 8 where appropriate and feasible. ~~Appropriate locations include major transit stops for or nodes in commercial corridors, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or and Light Rail stations, transit stops in new growth areas, or opportunity sites identified in Regional Transit's Master Plan.~~ If the Planning Department determines that an application is inconsistent with the intent of this policy, the Board of Supervisors shall be the appropriate hearing body to determine ~~feasibility of~~ consistency ~~(see Table 8).~~*

LU-41. Support implementation of the ADA Transitional Plan and the Pedestrian Master Plan to create a network of safe, accessible and appealing pedestrian facilities and environments. (New Policy)

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-41 to read as follows:

*The County should engage the development community to discuss the possible Support implementation of the ADA Transitional Plan and the Pedestrian Master Plan to create a network of safe, accessible and appealing pedestrian facilities and environments, and evaluate the economic feasibility of such improvement standards and policies.*

LU-44. Master planning efforts for new growth areas shall provide for separated sidewalks along all arterials and thoroughfares to make walking a safer and more attractive transportation option. (New Policy)

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-44 to read as follows:

*Master planning efforts for new growth areas ~~shall~~ should, where feasible and appropriate, provide for separated sidewalks along all arterials and thoroughfares to make walking a safer and more attractive transportation option.*

**Gregory Thatch for South of Elk Grove Owners Group (SEGOG)**

Revise LU-44 to read as follows:

*Master planning efforts for new growth areas ~~shall~~ should, where feasible and appropriate, provide for separated sidewalks along all arterials and thoroughfares to make walking a safer and more attractive transportation option.*

**WalkSacramento**

Revise LU-44 to read as follows:

*Master planning efforts for new growth areas shall provide for separated sidewalks along all residential streets, collectors, arterials and thoroughfares to make walking a safer and more attractive transportation option.*

LU-46. Accommodate affordable housing ordinance in land use plans and maximize inclusion of affordable units in new growth areas, as opposed to collecting in-lieu fees. (New Policy)

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-46 to read as follows:

*In order to accommodate the affordable housing ordinance in the various land use plans ~~and~~ maximize inclusion of affordable units in new growth areas, the should provide flexibility by encourage various options including the collection of in-lieu fees.*

LU-48. Mix affordable housing units with market rate units as opposed to building segregated affordable housing developments. (New Policy)

**Building Industry Association**

Delete.

**GenCorp**

This policy should allow for both cases: ability to develop affordable housing units with market rate units and building individual affordable housing developments. The policy as written is too restrictive and may make developing affordable housing more expensive and more difficult to develop.

**Taylor and Wiley for Stonebridge Properties**

The meaning and context of "mix" is not clear in this policy. The policy as written could be interpreted to mean that individual buildings cannot be used solely for affordable housing. Such an interpretation would be inconsistent with the realities of financing affordable housing projects which in most cases do not end up with both affordable and market rate income units in the same building. If the intent is to have affordable housing integrated within the community, then the policy should be reworded.

LU-50. Locate automobile-oriented commercial areas beyond one-half mile of a TOD commercial core area. (Existing unmodified Policy LU-32)

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-50 to read as follows:

*Locate automobile-oriented Commercial areas ~~beyond~~ within one-half mile of a TOD commercial core area should maximize pedestrian-friendly uses.*

**Gregory Thatch for South of Elk Grove Owners Group (SEGOG)**

Delete.

LU-54. New industrial uses using large amounts of material and with low employment densities, such as warehousing, shall be located outside new growth areas **and targeted commercial corridors** along primary transportation routes such as Interstate facilities, airports, railroads, or navigable waterways. (Modified existing Policy LU-36.)

**Taylor and Wiley for Stonebridge Properties**

This policy should be modified to allow for new industrial uses using large amounts of material and with low employment densities within a new growth area if that use is within an Airport CLUP zone that requires low employment densities.

LU-76 Expansion of urban uses in rural areas shall be limited to the established Delta communities of Freeport, Hood, Courtland, Locke, and Walnut Grove and to specific small expansions that support the agriculturally and recreationally based economies of the Delta. (Unmodified existing Policy LU-59.)

**George Phillips for Natomas Landowner Group**

Revise LU-76 to read as follows:

*Expansion of urban uses in the Delta ~~rural~~ areas shall be limited to the established ~~Delta~~ communities of Freeport, Hood, Courtland, Locke, and Walnut Grove and to specific small expansions that support the agriculturally and recreationally based economies of the Delta.*

LU-80. The County generally supports Agricultural-Residential uses adjacent to the inside of the USB to both establish a smooth transition from urban uses within the USB to the rural uses found outside the USB, as well as to reinforce the integrity of the USB by limiting the potential for urban uses to reach beyond it. (New Policy)

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-80 to read as follows:

*The County shall encourage compatible uses generally supports Agricultural Residential uses adjacent to the inside of the USB to both establish a smooth transition from urban uses within the USB to the rural uses found outside the USB, as well as to reinforce the integrity of the USB by limiting the potential for urban uses to reach beyond it.*

**Gregory Thatch for South of Elk Grove Owners Group (SEGOG)**

Revise LU-80 to read as follows:

*The County shall encourage compatible uses generally supports Agricultural Residential uses adjacent to the inside of the USB to both establish a smooth transition from urban uses within the USB to the rural uses found outside the USB, as well as to reinforce the integrity of the USB by limiting the potential for urban uses to reach beyond it."*

LU-87. The County supports Agricultural-Residential expansion outside the USB when it is determined by the Board of Supervisors to be necessary to meet demand levels. The County shall establish a program that determines the methodology for Ag-Res expansion and criteria for small-scale expansion. (Existing unmodified Policy LU-67B from the Agricultural-Residential Study and resulting Agricultural Expansion Program for lands located outside of the Urban Service Boundary.)

**Draft EIR Mitigation Measure LU-5**

Modify Policy LU-87 as follows:

*The County supports Agricultural-Residential expansion outside the USB when it is determined by the Board of Supervisors to be necessary to meet demand levels for agricultural-residential lands. The County shall establish a program that determines the methodology for Ag-Res expansion and criteria for small-scale expansion. Expansion pursuant to this policy shall not be allowed until the program and methodology is established.*

**Rick Bettis for Natural Resources Voters of Sacramento County**

This policy should be modified to read that the expansion of Agricultural residential land use should be discouraged and reduce where possible. I believe that there is already an excessive amount of land zoned for this use.

**George Phillips for Natomas Landowner Group**

Retain Policy LU-87 as written in Draft Plan.

LU-113. Annexations should only be advocated which:

- ensure provisions and demonstrate maintenance for adequate municipal services;
  - are consistent with state law and LAFCO standards and criteria;
  - provide for equitable distribution, based on region-wide analysis, of social services and low income housing needs;
  - are consistent with General Plan and Community Plan policies; and
  - preserve community identity.
- (Existing unmodified Policy LU-71.)

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-113 to read as follows:

*Annexations should only be advocated which:*

- *ensure provisions and demonstrate maintenance for adequate municipal services;*
- *are consistent with state law and LAFCO standards and criteria;*
- *provide for equitable distribution, based on region-wide analysis, of social services and low income housing needs;*
- ~~*are consistent with General Plan and Community Plan policies; and*~~
- *preserve community identity.*

**George Phillips for Natomas Landowner Group**

Revise LU-113 to read as follows:

*Annexations should only be advocated which:*

- *ensure provisions and demonstrate maintenance for adequate municipal services;*
- *are consistent with state law and LAFCO standards and criteria;*
- *provide for equitable distribution, based on region-wide analysis, of social services and low income housing needs;*
- ~~*are consistent with General Plan and Community Plan policies; and*~~
- *preserve community identity.*

**Gregory Thatch for South of Elk Grove Owners Group (SEGOG)**

Remove bullet that reads “are consistent with General Plan and Community Plan policies”

LU-116. It is the policy of Sacramento County that development and open space preservation in the Natomas Joint Vision Overlay Area occur in a responsible and cohesive manner that best addresses land use, economic development and environmental opportunities and challenges in Natomas. (New Policy)

**Building Industry Association**

Policy LU-116 talks about the NNJVA occur through the collaborative process to develop an "overlay area"; however, the area is within neither the USB or UPA.

**George Phillips for Natomas Landowner Group**

Revise LU-116 to read as follows:

*It is the policy of Sacramento County that development and open space preservation in the Natomas Joint Vision Overlay Area occur in a comprehensive, responsible and cohesive manner that best addresses land use, economic development and environmental opportunities and challenges in Natomas.*

LU-120. Except as permitted by LU-60 42, the County shall not accept applications to amend the General Plan Land Use Diagram from a designation in Column A to a designation in Column B for property located outside of the Urban Policy Area but within the Urban Service Boundary unless:

- The property adjoins property designated for urban land uses and its shape and extent comprise a logical extension of infrastructure and services; and
- There is clear evidence that infrastructure capacity and service availability exist or can be easily extended to the property; and
- **The amendment is consistent with draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plans; and**
- The Board finds that the unincorporated area land supply within the Urban Policy Area contains an insufficient land supply to accommodate a 15 year supply of growth; or
- The Board determines that the property represents a minor and logical extension of the Urban Policy Area for the purpose of preparation of a Specific Plan or other development request. (Modified existing Policy LU-75.)

**Draft EIR Mitigation Measure LU-3**

Modify Policy LU-120 as follows:

*Except as permitted by LU-60, the County shall not accept private applications to amend the General Plan Land Use Diagram from a designation in Column A to a designation in Column B for property located outside of the Urban Policy Area but within the Urban Service Boundary unless:*

- *The property adjoins property ~~designated for~~ substantially developed with urban land uses and its shape and extent comprise a logical extension of infrastructure and services; and*
- *There is clear evidence that infrastructure capacity and service availability exist or can be easily extended to the property; and*
- *The amendment is consistent with draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plans; and*
- *The Board finds that the unincorporated area land supply within the Urban Policy Area contains an insufficient land supply to accommodate a ~~15~~5 year supply of growth.*
- *~~The Board determines that the property represents a minor and logical extension of the Urban Policy Area for the purpose of preparation of a Specific Plan or other development request.~~*

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-120 to read as follows:

*Except as permitted by LU-60, the County shall not ~~accept applications to~~ amend the General Plan Land Use Diagram from a designation in Column A to a designation in*

*Column B for property located outside the Urban Policy Area but within the Urban Services Boundary unless:*

- *The property adjoins property designated for urban land uses and its shape and extent comprise a logical extension of infrastructure and services; and*
- *There is clear evidence that infrastructure capacity and service availability exist or can be easily extended to the property; and*
- *The amendment is consistent with ~~draft or~~ County of Sacramento adopted Habitat Conservation Plans; and*
- *The Board finds that the unincorporated area land supply within the Urban Policy Area contains an insufficient land supply to accommodate a ~~15~~ 25 year supply of growth; or*
- *The board determines that the property represents a ~~minor and~~ logical extension of the Urban Policy Area for the purpose of preparation of a Specific Plan or other development request.*

**George Phillips for Natomas Landowner Group**

Retain Policy LU-120 as written in Draft Plan.

LU-121. The Urban Policy Area is intended to provide a ~~25~~ 20-year supply of developable land sufficient to accommodate projected growth. The UPA shall also include additional lands to ensure an appropriate supply. It is the policy and intent of the County to expand the UPA at a minimum of five year intervals to maintain a constant adequate supply of land.

Guidelines to be considered by the Board in determining the expansion of the Urban Policy Area include:

- Buildout rates by type of use, unit type and density for the previous 5-year period.
- Infill trends and opportunities.
- Population and job growth projections as reflected by a minimum of three independent sources.
- Evidence that the infrastructure capacity and service availability exist or can be extended to the property.
- **Evidence that the proposed expansion is consistent and complies with draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan goals and objectives.**

(Modified existing Policy LU-76)

**Draft EIR Mitigation Measure LU-4**

Modify Policy LU-121 as follows:

*The Urban Policy Area is intended to provide a 25-year supply of developable land sufficient to accommodate projected growth. The UPA shall also include additional undevelopable lands to ensure an appropriate supply of open space. It is the policy and intent of the County to ~~expand~~ update the UPA at a minimum of five year intervals, to determine if an expansion is needed to maintain a constant adequate supply of land.*

*Guidelines to be considered by the Board in determining the expansion of the Urban Policy Area include:*

- *Buildout rates by type of use, unit type and density for the previous 5-year period.*
- *Infill trends and opportunities.*
- *Population and job growth projections as reflected by a minimum of three independent sources.*
- *Evidence that the infrastructure capacity and service availability exist or can be extended to the property.*
- *Evidence that the proposed expansion is consistent and complies with draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan goals and objectives.*

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-121 to read as follows:

*The Urban Policy Area is intended to provide a 25-year supply of developable land sufficient to accommodate projected growth. The UPA shall also include additional lands to ensure an appropriate supply. It is the policy and intent of the County to expand the UPA at a minimum of five year intervals to maintain a constant adequate supply of land. Guidelines to be considered by the Board in determining the expansion of the Urban Policy Area include:*

- *Buildout rates by type of use, unit type and density for the previous 5-year period.*
- *Infill trends and opportunities.*
- *Population and job growth projections as reflected by a minimum of three independent sources.*
- *Evidence that the infrastructure capacity and service availability exist or can be extended to the property.*
- *Evidence that the proposed expansion is consistent and complies with draft or County of Sacramento adopted Habitat Conservation Plans goals and objectives.*

**Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS), Sierra Club and Friends of the River**

Revise LU-121 to read as follows:

*The Urban Policy Area is intended to provide a 25-year supply of developable land sufficient to accommodate projected growth. The UPA shall also include additional preserve lands to ensure an appropriate supply of open space. It is the policy and intent of the County to evaluate the UPA at a minimum of five year intervals to determine if an expansion is needed to maintain a constant adequate supply of land.*

*Guidelines to be considered by the Board in determining the expansion of the Urban Policy Area include:*

- *Buildout rates by type of use, unit type and density for the previous 5-year period*
- *Infill trends and opportunities*
- *Population and job growth projections as reflected by a minimum of three independent sources*
- *Evidence that the infrastructure capacity and service availability exist or can be extended to the property*
- *Evidence that the proposed expansion is consistent and complies with draft or adopted habitat conservation Plan goals and objectives*

- Evidence that important natural resource lands, agricultural lands that should be maintained for their productivity, and land with important open space and/or aesthetic values will be protected and integrated

**George Phillips for Natomas Landowner Group**

Revise LU-121 to read as follows:

*It is the policy of Sacramento County that development and open space preservation in the Natomas Joint Vision Overlay Area occur in a comprehensive, responsible and cohesive manner that best addresses land use, economic development and environmental opportunities and challenges in Natomas.*

*The Urban Policy Area is intended to provide a 25-year supply of developable land sufficient to accommodate projected growth. The UPA shall also include additional lands to ensure an appropriate supply. It is the policy and intent of the County to expand the UPA at a minimum of five year intervals to maintain a constant adequate supply of land.*

*Guidelines to be considered by the Board in determining the expansion of the Urban Policy Area include:*

- *Buildout rates by type of use, unit type and density for the previous 5-year period.*
- *Infill trends and opportunities.*
- *Population and job growth projections as reflected by a minimum of three independent sources.*
- *Evidence that the infrastructure capacity and service availability exist or can be extended to the property.*
- *Evidence that the proposed expansion is consistent ~~and complies~~ with ~~draft or~~ Sacramento County-adopted Habitat Conservation Plans ~~goals and objectives~~.*

LU-122. Before granting approval of an amendment to the Land Use Diagram, the Board of Supervisors shall find that:

- the request is consistent with the objectives and policies of the General Plan;
- **the request is consistent with the goals and objectives of draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plans;**
- approval of the proposal will not adversely affect the fiscal resources of the County;
- the project will be consistent with the performance standards in this Plan and, for urban uses in urban growth areas, the project complies with the requirements of LU-8 14. (Existing modified Policy LU-77.)

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-122 to read as follows:

*Before granting approval of an amendment to the Land Use diagram, the Board of Supervisors shall find that:*

- *The request is consistent with the objectives and policies of the General Plan;*
- *The request is consistent with ~~the goals and objectives of draft or~~ County of Sacramento adopted Habitat Conservation Plans;*
- *Approval of the proposal will not adversely affect the fiscal resources of the County;*

- *The project will be consistent with the performance standards in this Plan and, for urban uses in urban growth areas, the project complies with the requirements of LU-14.*

**Taylor and Wiley for Stonebridge Properties**

This policy should be modified because, as written, it would require a request for a Land Use Diagram change to be consistent with the goals and objectives of a "draft" HCP. This requirement in effect implements an HCP (which is supposed to be a voluntary participation plan) before the HCP has gone through the public adoption process, including the required CEQA and NEP A analysis.

**George Phillips for Natomas Landowner Group**

Revise LU-121 to read as follows:

*Before granting approval of an amendment to the Land Use Diagram, the Board of Supervisors shall find that:*

- *the request is consistent with the objectives and policies of the General Plan;*
- *the request is consistent with ~~the goals and objectives of draft or~~ Sacramento County-adopted Habitat Conservation Plans;*
- *approval of the proposal will not adversely affect the fiscal resources of the County;*
- *the project will be consistent with the performance standards in this Plan and, for urban uses in urban growth areas, the project complies with the requirements of LU-14.*

LU-123. The County may modify the Urban Policy Area independent of changes in General Plan land use designations provided that the area encompassed by the changes meets the requirements of Policy LU-~~120~~ **75**, or the County has adopted a Community Plan which provides for extending urban services to existing agricultural-residential areas. (Existing Policy LU-78.)

**Draft EIR Mitigation Measure LU-4**

Modify Policy LU-121 as follows:

*The County may modify the Urban Policy Area independent of changes in General Plan land use designations provided that the area encompassed by the changes meets the requirements of Policy LU-120, or the County has adopted a Community Plan which includes plans to ~~provides for extending~~ urban services to existing agricultural-residential areas.*

**George Phillips for Natomas Landowner Group**

Retain Policy LU-123 as written in Draft Plan.

LU-124. The County shall not accept applications to amend the Land Use Diagram from a designation in Column A to a designation in Column B of Table ~~11 H-7~~ **11 H-7** for property outside of the Urban Service Boundary unless consistent with Policy LU-~~59~~ **76**. (Existing Policy LU-79.)

**Building Industry Association**

Delete.

LU-126. The County shall not expand the Urban Service Boundary unless:

- There is inadequate vacant land within the USB to accommodate the projected **25** 20-year demand for urban uses; and
  - The proposal calling for such expansion can satisfy the requirements of a master water plan as contained in the Conservation Element; and
  - The proposal calling for such expansion can satisfy the requirements of the Sacramento County Air Quality Attainment Plan; and
  - The area of expansion does not incorporate open space areas for which previously secured open space easements would need to be relinquished; and
  - The area of expansion does not include the development of important natural resource areas, aquifer recharge lands or prime agricultural lands;
  - **The area of expansion does not preclude implementation of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan;**
- OR
- The Board approves such expansion by a 4/5ths vote based upon on finding that the expansion would provide extraordinary environmental, social or economic benefits and opportunities to the County. (Existing modified Policy LU-81.)

**Building Industry Association**

Revise LU-126 to read as follows:

*The County shall not expand the Urban Service Boundary unless:*

- *There is inadequate vacant land within the USB to accommodate the projected 25 year demand for urban uses; and*
- *The proposal calling for such expansion can document adequate water supply consistent with the requirements of Senate Bills 221 and 610 satisfy the requirements of a master water plan as contained in the Conservation Element; and*
- *The proposal calling for such expansion can satisfy the requirements of the Sacramento County Air Quality Attainment Plan then in effect; and*
- *The area of expansion does not incorporate open space areas for which previously secured permanent open space easements would need to be relinquished; and*
- *The area of expansion does not include the development of important natural resource areas or aquifer recharge lands or prime agricultural lands;*
- *The area of expansion does not preclude implementation of an County of Sacramento adopted Habitat Conservation Plan; OR*
- *The Board approves such expansion by a 4/5ths vote based upon on finding that the expansion would provide extraordinary environmental, social or economic benefits and opportunities to the County.*

<b>REQUESTS TO ADD NEW POLICIES</b>
-------------------------------------

**Draft EIR Mitigation Measures That Would Add Policies to the Draft Land Use Element**

- SE-2.** The following policy shall be added to the General Plan: *Extension or modification of trunk or interceptor sewer systems that are required for new developments shall be consistent with sewer facility plans and shall participate in an established funding mechanism. New development that will generate wastewater for treatment at the SRWTP shall not be approved if treatment capacity at the SRWTP is not sufficient to allow treatment and disposal of wastewater in compliance with the SRWTP's NPDES Permit.*
- WS-1.** The following policy shall be added to the General Plan: *New development that will generate additional water demand shall not be approved or building permits shall not be issued if sufficient water supply is not available.*
- WS-2.** The following policy shall be added to the General Plan: *Prior to approving any new development in the Jackson and Grant Line East New Growth Areas, a water supply plan shall be approved that demonstrates that the sustainable yield of the Central Groundwater Basin will not be exceeded by the proposed growth.*
- CC-1.** The following policy shall be added to the General Plan: *It is the goal of the County to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020. This shall be achieved through a mix of State and local action.*
- CC-2.** The following shall be included as implementation measures to the policy required by CC-1:
- A. *The County shall adopt a first-phase Climate Action Plan, concurrent with approval of the General Plan update, that contains the following elements and policies:*
    - a. *The County shall complete a GHG emissions inventory every three years to track progress with meeting emission reduction targets.*
    - b. *The County shall adopt a Green Building Program, which shall be updated a minimum of every 5 years.*
    - c. *The County shall enact a Climate Change Program that includes the following:*
      - i. *A fee assessed for all new development projects for the purpose of funding the ongoing oversight and maintenance of the Climate Action Plan.*
      - ii. *Reduction targets that apply to new development.*
    - d. *A section on Targets that discusses the 2020 reduction target.*
  - B. *The County shall adopt a second-phase Climate Action Plan within one year of adoption of the General Plan update that includes economic analysis and detailed programs and performance measures.*

- C. *The County shall update the Energy Element of the General Plan to include policies related to alternative energy production within the County, which may include a General Plan Land Use Diagram overlay designation reflecting prime or allowable areas for alternative energy production (such as solar or wind farms).*

**Child Care Coalition**

Add new policies as follows:

- *Support the location on ancillary employee services, including child care at major employment centers for the purpose of reducing mid-day vehicle trips.*
- *Continue to enforce Design Guidelines which require a minimum of one on-site amenity for multifamily development. These amenities may include child care centers, clubhouses, or other recreational facilities.*
- *Encourage developers of larger commercial and office projects to provide for on-site ancillary uses that would allow employees and residents to make non-work- related trips (e.g. child care) without having to use their automobiles.*
- *Encourage and support efforts to provide support services such as child care and health services near employment centers.*

**Robert Willitt**

Add the following policy:

*Notwithstanding any provision of this General Plan to the contrary, sidewalks shall not be required in the Arden Park and Arden Oaks subdivisions. Further, no dwelling in the Arden Park and Arden Oaks areas shall exceed two stories. The only exception to this height limitation shall be if the structures are presently of greater height when the General Plan is adopted. Any amendment to this section shall not be effective unless adopted by a four-fifths vote at the Board of Supervisors.*

**WalkSacramento**

**Add Implementation Measure to Commercial Corridors section:**

*B. Develop form-based codes for transit corridors whenever feasible to concentrate on form and function of development to encourage mixed use, pedestrian and transit-friendly environments.*

**Add New Policy:**

*The County will promote phasing that discourages scattered development within Master Plan areas, and provides walkable and bikeable access to a mix of commercial, employment, parks, and school uses over the entire development lifecycle.*

**Add New Policy:**

*Consider transportation energy when planning new growth.*

**CLEAN-UP ITEMS RELATED TO APPROVAL OF EASTON PLACE AND GLENBOROUGH AT EASTON**

**GenCorp**

- On page 4 of the Land Use Element within the "Special Planning Areas", we would like to add a sentence and a table that illustrates the Easton Place and Glenborough at Easton (referred to as "Easton" throughout the General Plan Update) Land Use Master Plans were adopted in 2009;
- On page 9 of the Land Use Element within the "Urban Development Area", we would like to delete the words "Easton area (south of Highway 50 between Rancho Cordova and Folsom)". Easton Place and Glenborough at Easton (referred to as "Easton" throughout the General Plan Update) was approved earlier this year;
- On page 32 of the Land Use Element within the first paragraph, we would like to add "Easton Place and Glenborough at Easton" to the list of existing planned communities located within the Policy Area;
- On page 34 Figure 5 of the Land Use Element, we would like to add the "Easton Place and Glenborough at Easton" to the exhibit of Planned Communities;
- On page 40 of the Land Use Element, the two references to the Easton Planning Area should be deleted. This project is already approved. In addition, the land use statistics within the "Easton Planning Area" paragraph are incorrect. If this section is reproduced to another area within the General Plan, we can provide revised land use statistics;
- On page 45 Figure 7 of the Land Use Element, remove the "Easton Planning Area" from the "New Growth Areas". The Project was approved and should be illustrated on the Figure 5 "Planned Communities" exhibit. The same exhibit appears on page 11 Figure 2 of the Conservation Element;
- The portion of Aerojet property shown as an "Active Williamson Contract" on page 17. Figure 2 should be shown as "Nonrenewal".

**OTHER ITEMS**

**George Phillips for Barton Ranch**

Revise language explaining Resource Conservation Area overlay designation as follows:

*The purpose of the Resource Conservation combining designation is to identify areas with special resource management needs. The designation targets certain natural resources as*

*being important on the Land Use Diagram while recognizing the validity of the underlying land use designation. The intent is to develop programs and incentives to assist landowners with resource protection and enhancement. Compliance with the Resource Conservation designation will rely on the voluntary support of landowners who seek cooperative conservation agreements with the County. The Resource Conservation combining land use category may be combined with Recreation, Natural Preserve, Agricultural-Cropland, General Agriculture/80 acre, and General Agriculture/20 acre Land Use Designations in suitable areas outside the Urban Service Boundary. Designated natural resource conservation areas on the Diagram may be somewhat generalized, and target resources may not exist on all property within the delineated area. Surface mining consistent with the Zoning Code is allowed within designated Resource Conservation Areas subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit and compliance with CEQA. Resource Conservation areas address vernal pools, wetland creation, waterfowl management, peat soil conservation, and Blue Oak woodland harvesting.*