

## 3.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

This section evaluates whether adoption and implementation of the CLUO, including issuance of subsequent Cannabis Use Permits pursuant to the adopted CLUO, would result in impacts to existing land use plans, policies, and regulations. As required by CEQA, this analysis focuses on consistency with policies adopted for the purpose of reducing environmental impacts. The analysis also evaluates whether implementation of the CLUO would result in the physical division of an established community. Included is an evaluation of population and housing resulting from implementation of the CLUO.

The California Department of Food and Agriculture provided comments on the NOP stating that the CalCannabis Programmatic EIR assumed that issues related to conflicts with any and all local land use plans, ordinances, policies and/or resource programs would be most appropriately evaluated in local regulatory program-level documents or site-specific documents. Residents responding to the NOP expressed concerns regarding buffers and setbacks and land use conflicts with residential areas. Another community member expressed concern about several sections of the ordinance and stated a preference that it does not include residences. NOP comment letters are included in Appendix A. Potential conflicts with land use plans and regulations are discussed below. Other neighborhood or quality of life impacts that are associated with physical environmental impacts (including concerns about increased odors, noise, traffic, and light pollution) are considered throughout this EIR under each relevant technical section.

### 3.11.1 Environmental Setting

The following key sources of data and information were used in the preparation of this section:

- Report E-5: Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, January 1, 2011–2019, with 2010 Benchmark (California DOF 2019);
- Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan (Yolo County 2009a);
- Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan EIR (Yolo County 2009b); and
- Background Report for the Yolo County General Plan Update.

## LAND USE

Yolo County consists of approximately 653,550 acres, which includes four incorporated cities totaling approximately 32,300 acres. The four incorporated cities are Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland. In addition to the incorporated cities, land owned by state and federal agencies, tribal trust land held on behalf of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, and the University of California, Davis, campus have independent land use decision-making authority and are not under the jurisdiction of Yolo County. There are 11 unincorporated towns in the County: Capay, Guinda, Rumsey, Clarksburg, Dunnigan, Esparto, Knights Landing, Madison, Monument Hills, Yolo, and Zamora. These unincorporated towns are under the jurisdiction of the County. Aside from the small unincorporated communities, the unincorporated area of the County is generally rural and composed primarily of agricultural land uses. This includes existing cannabis cultivation operations including outdoor, mixed-light, and indoor cultivation types. As shown in Exhibit 2-2, most of these cultivation sites are located along the State Route (SR) 16 corridor west of the city of Woodland. There are concentrations of cultivation sites near the communities of Rumsey, Guinda, Capay, Esparto, and Dunnigan.

## POPULATION AND HOUSING

Yolo County population was estimated at the end of 2018 to have a total of 222,581 residents and 77,679 dwelling units with 31,200 residents and 7,452 dwelling units located in the unincorporated area of the County (California Department of Finance 2019). The 2018 housing vacancy rate was 5.2 percent countywide (California Department of Finance 2019). Table 3.11-1 provides a summary of population and housing for the region at the end of 2018.

**Table 3.11-1 Regional Housing Characteristics (2018)**

County/City	Population	Total Dwelling Units	Occupied Dwelling Units	Vacancy Rate (%)	Persons per Household
<b>Yolo County</b>	<b>222,581</b>	<b>77,679</b>	<b>73,648</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>2.84</b>
Davis	69,761	26,932	25,841	4.1	2.64
West Sacramento	53,911	20,049	18,632	7.1	2.88
Winters	7,417	2,452	2,365	3.5	3.13
Woodland	60,292	20,794	19,749	5.0	3.01
Unincorporated	31,200	7,452	7,061	5.2	2.92
<b>Sacramento County</b>	<b>1,546,174</b>	<b>574,449</b>	<b>526,804</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>2.89</b>
Citrus Heights	88,095	35,158	32,490	7.6	2.70
Elk Grove	174,025	54,541	51,243	6.0	3.38
Folsom	79,835	28,053	26,614	5.1	2.78
Galt	26,489	8,122	7,650	5.8	3.44
Isleton	871	433	339	21.7	2.57
Rancho Cordova	74,471	28,021	25,344	9.6	2.93
Sacramento	508,172	196,890	178,872	9.6	2.79
Unincorporated	594,216	223,231	204,252	8.5	2.88
<b>Solano County</b>	<b>441,307</b>	<b>159,586</b>	<b>148,301</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>2.90</b>
Benicia	27,570	11,344	10,666	6.0	2.58
Dixon	19,794	6,573	6,174	6.1	3.21
Fairfield	117,149	39,847	37,344	6.3	3.07
Rio Vista	9,415	4,878	4,319	11.5	2.18
Suisun City	29,447	9,559	9,114	4.7	3.23
Vacaville	98,807	35,095	33,136	5.6	2.78
Vallejo	119,544	44,741	40,728	9.0	2.89
Unincorporated	19,580	7,549	6,820	9.7	2.84
<b>Three-County Total</b>	<b>2,210,062</b>	<b>811,714</b>	<b>748,753</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>n/a</b>

Source: California Department of Finance 2019

### 3.11.2 Regulatory Setting

#### FEDERAL

No federal plans, policies, regulations, or laws related to land use or population and housing apply to the project.

## STATE

### State Aeronautics Act

The State Aeronautics Act (Public Utilities Code Section 21001) sets forth requirements for airport land use compatibility planning around public use airports. The *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook* provides guidance for determining consistency between a general plan and an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). The ALUCP contains policies relating to airport noise, the height of structures, trees, and other objects near an airport that affect the use of that airport, and potential safety risks both to people on the ground and to the occupants of aircraft. General plan amendments must be consistent with any applicable ALUCP unless a local governing body overrules the plan by a two-thirds vote and makes specific findings. Prior to amendment of a general plan, a local agency must refer the proposed amendment to the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC).

## LOCAL

### Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan

The Vision and Principles Chapter identifies that the general objective of the County General Plan is to guide decision-making in the unincorporated areas in the County toward the most desirable future possible. The highest and best use of land within Yolo County is one that combines minimum efficient urbanization with the preservation of productive farm resources and open space amenities.

The following economic, land use and housing policies are relevant to the project. The reader is also referred to Section 3.2, "Agricultural Resources," regarding applicable policies associated with agricultural land uses.

- **Policy AG-1.1:** Protect and enhance the County's four key agricultural sectors. This includes: (1) retaining existing growers and processors of crops; (2) encouraging the growth of emerging crops and value-added processing; (3) supporting small and organic producers and their ability to serve visitors; and (4) enhancing the transfer of new technologies into practical applications for seeds, crops, fuels, alternative energy, food processing, etc.
- **Policy AG-5.1:** Promote markets for locally and regionally grown and/or prepared food and other products and services.
- **Policy AG-3.2:** Allow uses that support agriculture, such as agricultural commercial uses, agricultural industrial uses, direct product sales, processing, farm-based tourism, agricultural research, and farm worker housing, on agricultural land subject to appropriate design review and development standards.
- **Policy AG-3.5:** Encourage the provision of farm worker housing by streamlining permit requirements, reducing fees and requiring inclusionary housing within established communities.
- **Policy AG-3.6:** Strongly encourage cities to share in the responsibility for providing adequate sites to accommodate farm labor housing.
- **Policy AG-3.7:** Support the development of local suppliers for agricultural goods and services, including small-scale and/or mobile processing facilities and distribution centers for locally produced foods.
- **Policy AG-3.8:** Encourage re-use, for agricultural purposes, of agricultural industrial facilities that are no longer needed due to changing economic conditions.
- **Policy AG-3.9:** Support the development of an agricultural marketing and tourism program to coordinate private and public initiatives and to integrate them with County efforts to attract business.

- **Policy AG-3.18:** Allow the location of agricultural commercial, industrial and tourism activities on land designated as Agricultural, consistent with the Land Use and Community Character Element.
- **Policy ED-1.3:** Encourage businesses that promote, provide services, and support farming, with an emphasis on value-added agriculture, agri-tourism, food processing and agricultural suppliers.
- **Policy LU-2.2:** Allow additional agricultural commercial and agricultural industrial land uses in any designated agricultural area, where appropriate, depending on site characteristics and project specifics. Agricultural commercial and/or agricultural industrial development is anticipated as shown in Table LU-7 (Anticipated Agricultural Commercial and/or Agricultural Industrial Growth) and in Figure LU-2 (New Targeted Future Agricultural Commercial and Agricultural Industrial Sites).

Manage agricultural parcels of less than 20 acres, including antiquated subdivisions where appropriate, to create compatibility with surrounding agricultural uses to the greatest extent possible, including: 1) discourage residential development; 2) encourage lot mergers to achieve larger parcel sizes; 3) encourage clustering of units either within parcels or near existing homes on adjoining parcels to preserve farmland and natural resources; 4) encourage transfers of development rights to areas where additional farm dwellings are desired (e.g. organic farms that are labor intensive); 5) encourage deed restrictions, site design and development themes that support the agricultural use of the land; and 6) aggressively limit the impact of residential development where it does occur.

- **Policy LU-2.4:** Vigorously conserve, preserve, and enhance the productivity of the agricultural lands in areas outside of adopted community growth boundaries and outside of city SOIs [spheres of influence].
- **Police LU-3.1:** Direct all of the County’s residential growth to designated areas within the cities and within the growth boundaries of existing unincorporated communities, as depicted on the Land Use Diagram in Figure LU-1 [located in the General Plan], with the exception of individual farm dwellings (houses allowed on agricultural land), other allowed units (e.g. second units, ancillary dwellings, houses allowed in mixed-use commercial areas, etc.) and housing allowed on existing residentially designated land.
- **Policy LU-3.3:** Allow commercial and industrial growth (not including agricultural commercial or agricultural industrial) as shown in Table LU-9 [located in the General Plan], subject to all required County approvals. Within the areas designated for commercial and industrial land uses, where appropriate, the County shall target the following:
  - A. Biotechnology facilities development, including development of “high tech” research and development campuses, as well as regional office, business park and light manufacturing nodes.
  - B. Research and development space to serve private businesses that result from UC Davis research activities.
  - C. Highway-oriented and regional commercial development, particularly along Interstate 5 and Interstate 505 and specialized retail to serve regional populations.
- **Policy LU-3.6:** Maintain the compatibility of surrounding land uses and development, so as not to impede the existing and planned operation of public airports, landfills and related facilities and community sewage treatment facilities.
- **Policy LU-3.8:** The intent of allowing residences in the agricultural areas is to provide dwellings for those directly involved in on-site farming activity, including farm employees, the landowners and their immediate families. All such dwellings shall be encouraged to locate on lands least suited for agricultural use and/or in “clustered” configurations to minimize the conversion of agricultural lands to any other uses.

- **Policy LU-5.1:** Balance land use decisions and land use burdens countywide so that there is not a disproportionate impact to any one group of residents because of age, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, socio-economic status, or other arbitrary factor.
- **Policy LU-5.7:** Support the Community Advisory Committees to ensure direct, local input on land use issues and project applications.
- **Policy CC-1.1:** Encourage private landowners of both residential and commercial properties to maintain their property in a way that contributes to the attractive appearance of Yolo County, while recognizing that many of the land uses in the County, including agriculture and light industry, require a variety of on-site structures, equipment, machinery and vehicles in order to operate effectively.
- **Policy CC-1.7:** Reinforce the growth boundaries for each community through appropriate mechanisms including greenbelts, buffers, conservation easements and other community separators.

## Yolo County Community Plans

In addition to the Countywide General Plan, the following local plans provide further area-specific policy provisions, land use, and design standards and guidelines for residential, commercial, and industrial land uses:

### Esparto Community Plan (2019)

- **Policy E-LU.2:** The comprehensible and compact scale of the town shall be maintained with businesses, schools, parks and social centers within walking distance of residences.
- **Policy E-LU.7:** Residential density around the town center and along Fremont Street shall be increased to encourage the creation of smaller, more affordable lots.
- **Policy E-LU.28:** Local organizations including the New Season Community Development Corporation, Capay Valley Vision, and the Esparto Chamber of Commerce, shall actively promote, pursue, and attract appropriate industrial development. Of special interest is industry related to agriculture such as meat processing or nut hulling.

### Town of Knights Landing Community Plan (1999)

- Open Space for Managed Resource Production Areas
  - **Policy 1:** To avoid the premature conversion of agricultural lands within and outside of the Town limits, residential expansion shall occur only on lands designated for such expansion.

### Capay Valley Area Plan (2010)

- **Agriculture Policy 1:** The County shall maintain, encourage, and actively support agricultural use within the Capay Valley Area Plan planning area.
- **Agriculture Policy 5:** The County shall pursue all options, as allowed by law, to eliminate or deter the development of antiquated subdivisions.
- **Agriculture Policy 6:** The County shall retain parcel sizes in agriculturally zoned areas that are large enough to support viable agricultural production.
  - **Implementation Measure 3:** Yolo County shall review future land use proposals in order to encourage the continuation of viable agricultural units.
- **Agriculture Policy 7:** The County shall require that land uses in areas designated for agricultural use shall be limited to those directly related to agricultural production or support of agriculture.

- **Agriculture Policy 8:** The County shall encourage the establishment of small-scale agriculture uses, such as specialty crops, organic farming, cottage industries and specialized animal facilities where small parcels of land presently exist in agricultural areas with suitable soils.
  - **Implementation Measure 1:** Yolo County shall encourage specialty farming areas that contain sufficient restrictions to assure that such areas do not become rural residential or ranchette developments.
  - **Implementation Measure 2:** Yolo County shall recognize the potential for commercial agriculture, such as direct sales, processing, agri-tourism, and other ancillary activities that are compatible with the rural quality of life and unique community character of the Capay Valley.
- **Agriculture Policy 9:** Yolo County, to the extent allowed under State law, shall prevent the subdivision of agricultural land except when the subdivision is beneficial to agriculture.
- **Land Use Goal 1 Policy 1:** The County shall ensure land uses are compatible with the rural agricultural quality of life.
- **Land Use Goal 3 Policy 1:** Goods and services supplied shall support the agricultural base of the community.

#### Clarksburg Area Community Plan (2015)

- **Policy A1:** Support expanded productivity, conservation, enhancement, and economic viability of privately owned agricultural land.
- **Policy A2:** Support agricultural (including production, processing, distribution, industrial and marketing operations), rural recreation, and open space land uses that sustain and create demand for commercial services within the Clarksburg town area.
- **Policy A4:** Development of agricultural support uses outside the Clarksburg town area should continue to be the focus and direction of the Clarksburg community when considering changes in land use.

#### Dunnigan Community Plan (2001)

- **Policy D-LU20:** New agriculture related industrial development may be allowed from County Road 8 to Bird Creek on the east side of I-5, west of the Southern Pacific Railroad and County Road 99W. Examples of such uses include farm machinery sales and repair, agricultural processing facilities, product or equipment warehousing, and farm supply stores.
- **Policy D-LU23:** Except for those areas designated as expansion in this plan, agricultural lands in and surrounding the Dunnigan planning area shall be protected from the encroachment of urban development. The conversion of agricultural land to urban uses may only occur on lands within the Plan Area Boundary contiguous to existing development and phased for future urban use on an adopted General Plan map.

### **Yolo County Zoning Regulations**

Yolo County zoning and associated land use/development standards are provided under Title 8, "Land Development and Zoning," of the Yolo County Code. These code provisions set forth regulations relating to minimum lot size, maximum building height and setback from property lines, as well as the uses that are principally permitted and those that require a use permit.

### **Delta Protection Commission Land Use and Resource Management Plan**

The Land Use and Resource Management Plan was adopted in 2010 for the Primary Zone of the Delta that includes a portion of Yolo County. The specified goals for the plan are to "protect, maintain, and where possible, enhance and restore the overall quality of the Delta environment, including but not limited to

agriculture, wildlife habitat, and recreational activities; assure orderly, balanced conservation and development of Delta land resources and improve flood protection by structural and nonstructural means to ensure an increased level of public health and safety” (Delta Protection Commission 2010).

### **Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan**

The Yolo County ALUCP for Yolo County Airports was adopted in 1999 by SACOG serving as the Yolo County ALUC. The ALUCP sets forth the criteria and policies that the ALUC uses in assessing the compatibility between the public use airports and land use development in the areas surrounding them. State law requires that the County, because of its authority over land uses within the ALUC planning area, modify the general plan and any affected specific plans to be consistent with the ALUCP.

There are four airports within Yolo County: Borges-Clarksburg, Watts-Woodland, Yolo County, and University of California Davis airport. The Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for the Watts-Woodland Airport was adopted in 1988, and the Borges-Clarksburg Land Use Compatibility Plan was adopted in 1994.

Land use compliance and safety are addressed through implementation of the CLUPs and County Code Section 8-2.903(f) (Airport Overlay Zones) and the development requirements in Section 8-2.906(f) and the CLUPs that address density, building heights, and hazards associated with electrical interference and bird strikes. The reader is referred to Section 3.9, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials,” for an analysis of airport land use compatibility and hazards associated with the CLUO.

## **3.11.3 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

### **METHODS AND ASSUMPTIONS**

Evaluation of potential land use and population and housing impacts from implementation of the CLUO is based on a review of documents, including the General Plan, the Yolo County Code, and various community plans. Impacts related to population and housing were determined by comparing the expected number of new employees from assumed cannabis uses to existing population and housing conditions in the region (see Table 3.11-1). Evaluation of potential conflicts with existing communities and adopted land use plans, policies, and regulations is based on the assumed extent of cannabis uses under each alternative (see Table 2-4 and Appendix D) in comparison of the CLUO provisions with the General Plan, community plans, and County Code requirements.

The magnitude of potential impacts is determined based on the following thresholds of significance, listed in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. Under the CEQA Guidelines, preparation of an EIR is required if substantial evidence indicates the environmental effects of a project will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly (CEQA Guidelines Section 15065(a)(4)). Potential environmental effects on humans are discussed in this EIR in Sections 3.3 (“Air Quality and Odor”), 3.9 (“Hazards and Hazardous Materials”), and 3.12 (“Noise”).

Chapter 4, “Cumulative Impacts and Overconcentration,” contains a separate detailed analysis of the potential for cumulative effects not otherwise identified in this section, and effects from concentrations or clusters of multiple cannabis uses located in distinct subregions of the County.

### **THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. The project would result in a significant land use and planning/population and housing impact if it would:

- physically divide an established community;

- cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or
- induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

As described in Section 3.0, “Approach to the Environmental Analysis,” implementation of the CLUO would not result in the substantial displacement of housing or displace people. Therefore, this impact issue area is not further evaluated.

## IMPACT ANALYSIS

### Impact LU-1: Physically Divide an Established Community

---

Adoption and Implementation of the proposed CLUO, including subsequent Cannabis Use Permits pursuant to the adopted CLUO would allow for the development of cannabis cultivation and noncultivation uses on individual parcels within the unincorporated area of the County. Cannabis uses could include buildings and features that are similar to other agricultural, commercial, and industrial activities that occur in the County and would not include features that would physically divide an established community. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant** for all the alternatives.

---

Adoption and implementation of the proposed CLUO under each of the five alternatives, including subsequent Cannabis Use Permits under the adopted CLUO, would introduce land disturbance and buildings; however, implementation of the CLUO would require cannabis sites to meet County building and site design standards, screen outdoor cultivation, and maintain site conditions. Cannabis cultivation and noncultivation sites may include buildings that range in size from 1,000 square feet to over 140,000 square feet that are similar in scale to buildings commonly used in agricultural, commercial, and industrial activities (barns, equipment storage, greenhouses, processing facilities, and temporary hoop houses). Cannabis uses would likely include fencing along the perimeter of the operations that may be noticeable to the public (the reader is referred to Section 3.1, “Aesthetics,” for a further analysis of visual impacts of cannabis uses). These features would not create new barriers or physical features (e.g., new highways or land use types that would obstruct existing public access and movement) that could physically divide an established community because construction and operation would be contained on parcels permitted for cannabis uses.

The CLUO includes the following performance standards that address potential nuisance and compatibility concerns that could be perceived as physical divisions within a community:

- Section 8-2.1407. Development Regulations: These regulations limit what zones cannabis uses may be placed. No commercial cannabis uses would be allowed in residential zoned areas and only noncultivation uses would be permitted in commercial and industrial zones.
- Section 8-2.1408(E). Buffers: Buffers are required from outdoor cannabis uses from off-site residences, residentially designated lands, licensed day cares, public parks, recognized places of worship, public or licensed private schools, licensed treatment facilities for drugs or alcohol, federal lands held in trust or proposed before CLUO adoption to be taken into trust for a federally recognized tribe, and licensed youth centers.
- Section 8-2.1408(U). Good Neighbor Communication: Permittees shall make available to property owners and residents/tenants within 1,000 feet of the property line an operable method of communication with a local or on-site responsible party having prompt access to the site/operation/activities. The purpose of this requirement is to facilitate communication between neighbors related to conditions at and operation of the activity.



- Section 8-2.1408(CC). Nuisance: Cannabis uses shall not create a public nuisance or adversely affect the health or safety of nearby residents or businesses by, among other things, creating dust, light, glare, heat, noise, noxious gases, odor, smoke, traffic, vibration, unsafe conditions, or other impacts, in excess of allowable thresholds, or be hazardous due to the use or storage of materials, processes, products, runoff, unauthorized releases or illegal disposal of wastes.
- Section 8-2.1408(PP). Site Maintenance: Permittee shall at all times maintain, manage, and operate the site, all improvements and alterations, and all structures, in good repair, acceptable in appearance, and in reasonably safe condition, including securing all necessary licenses and permits for this work. The site shall be kept free of litter, clutter, and graffiti. The permittee shall prevent and eliminate conditions that constitute a public nuisance.

Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5 assume that personal use outdoor cultivation may occur in any zoning district on a parcel with a legal residence. Personal use outdoor cultivation of up to six plants is assumed to occur within pots or garden areas on the grounds of the parcel. Alternative 4 would limit personal use cultivation to indoor only. These activities would likely involve no more than 100 square feet of land area and would be required to be outside of front yard and side yard setback areas. CLUO Section 8-2.1408(GG) requires that personal outdoor cultivation not be visible from public rights-of-way. Given these CLUO requirements, no significant land use impacts are expected.

**Alternative 1: Cultivation (Ancillary Nurseries and Processing Only) with Existing Limits (Existing Operations with CLUO) (CEQA Preferred Alternative)**

Nine of the 78 existing and eligible cannabis cultivation sites are assumed to relocate under Alternative 1 due to compliance with zoning standards of the CLUO but no expansion of cannabis cultivation uses would occur.

Existing and relocated cultivation sites would be subject to CLUO standards that are expected to result in improved land use conditions as compared to existing conditions through required site maintenance and good neighbor communication that would avoid nuisance issues (Sections 8-2.1408[U], 8-2.1408[CC], and 8-2.1408[PP]). The reader is referred to Chapter 4, “Cumulative Impacts and Overconcentration,” for a further discussion of land use impacts associated with concentrated cannabis uses.

This impact would be **less than significant** under Alternative 1.

**Alternative 2: All License Types with Moderate Limits**

Exhibit 2-5 identifies the assumed distribution of new cannabis uses in the County that consists of 52 new cannabis uses (see Table 2-4). Alternative 2 is also assumed to result in the relocation of 30 of the 78 existing and eligible cannabis cultivation sites due to compliance with zoning and buffer requirements between outdoor cannabis uses and defined sensitive receptors.

As described in Section 3.0, “Approach to the Environmental Analysis,” and Appendix D, two new cultivation uses are assumed to be vertically integrated with new cannabis noncultivation uses on a single parcel approximately 40 acres in size. Cannabis noncultivation uses would be a new land use that does not currently exist in the County. Alternative 2 assumes that 47 new noncultivation sites would be located on agriculturally zoned land, while 5 sites are assumed to be located within commercial and industrial zoned areas (see Appendix D).

All cannabis uses would be subject to CLUO standards that are expected to address potential land use conflicts that could be perceived to divide a community through buffering (1,000-foot buffers under this alternative) and required site maintenance and good neighbor communication that would avoid nuisance issues (Sections 8-2.1408[E], 8-2.1408[U], 8-2.1408[CC], and 8-2.1408[PP]). The reader is referred to Chapter 4, “Cumulative Impacts and Overconcentration,” for a further discussion of land use impacts associated with concentrated cannabis uses.

This impact would be **less than significant** under Alternative 2.

**Alternative 3: All License Types with High Limits**

As shown in Exhibit 2-6, Alternative 3 assumes 186 new cannabis uses would be generally spread throughout the County though 40 new cannabis uses are to be sited along the SR 16 corridor west of the City of Woodland. This alternative is also assumed to result in the relocation of nine of the 78 existing and eligible cannabis cultivation sites due to compliance with zoning requirements under the CLUO.

As described in Section 3.0, “Approach to the Environmental Analysis,” and Appendix D, 25 new cultivation uses are assumed to be vertically integrated with new cannabis noncultivation uses on a single parcel approximately 40 acres in size. Cannabis noncultivation uses would be a new land use that does not currently exist in the County. Alternative 3 assumes that 94 new noncultivation sites would be located on agriculturally zoned land, while 10 sites are assumed to be located within commercial and industrial zoned areas.

All cannabis uses would be subject to CLUO standards that are expected to address potential land use conflicts that could be perceived to divide a community through buffering (75-foot buffers under this alternative) and required site maintenance and good neighbor communication that would avoid nuisance issues (Sections 8-2.1408[E], 8-2.1408[U], 8-2.1408[CC], and 8-2.1408[PP]). The reader is referred to Chapter 4, “Cumulative Impacts and Overconcentration,” for a further discussion of land use impacts associated with concentrated cannabis uses.

This impact would be **less than significant** under Alternative 3.

**Alternative 4: Mixed-Light/Indoor License Types Only with Moderate Limits, No Hoop Houses or Outdoor Types**

Exhibit 2-7 identifies the assumed distribution of new cannabis uses in the County that consists of 54 new cultivation and noncultivation uses under Alternative 4 (see Table 2-4). Alternative 4 is assumed to result in the relocation of nine of the 78 existing and eligible cannabis cultivation sites due to compliance with zoning standards. It was also assumed that 75 of the existing and eligible cannabis sites with outdoor cultivation would convert entirely to indoor or mixed-light (greenhouse) cultivation.

As described in Section 3.0, “Approach to the Environmental Analysis,” and Appendix D, two new cultivation uses are assumed to be vertically integrated with new cannabis noncultivation uses on a single parcel approximately 40 acres in size. Cannabis noncultivation uses would be a new land use that does not currently exist in the County. It assumed that 47 new noncultivation sites would be located on agriculturally zoned land, while the 5 sites are assumed to be located within commercial and industrial zoned areas.

All cannabis uses would be subject to CLUO standards that are expected to address potential land use conflicts that could be perceived to divide a community through required site maintenance and good neighbor communication that would avoid nuisance issues (8-2.1408[U], 8-2.1408[CC], and 8-2.1408[PP]). The reader is referred to Chapter 4, “Cumulative Impact and Overconcentration,” for a further discussion of land use impacts associated with concentrated cannabis uses.

This impact would be **less than significant** under Alternative 4.

**Alternative 5: All License Types with Moderate Limits, within Agricultural Zones Only, No Retail**

Exhibit 2-8 identifies the assumed distribution of new cannabis uses in the County that consists of 50 cultivation and noncultivation uses (see Table 2-4). Alternative 5 is also assumed to result in the relocation of 30 of the 78 existing and eligible cannabis cultivation sites due to compliance with zoning and buffer requirements between outdoor cannabis uses and defined sensitive receptors.

As described in Section 3.0, “Approach to the Environmental Analysis,” and Appendix D, two new cultivation uses are assumed to be vertically integrated with new cannabis noncultivation uses on a single parcel approximately 40 acres in size. Cannabis noncultivation uses would be a new land use that does not currently exist in the County. This alternative assumes that all new cannabis uses are located on agriculturally zoned land.

All cannabis uses would be subject to CLUO standards that are expected to address potential land use conflicts that could be perceived to divide a community through buffering (1,000-foot buffers under this alternative) and required site maintenance and good neighbor communication that would avoid nuisance issues (Sections 8-2.1408[E], 8-2.1408[U], 8-2.1408[CC], and 8-2.1408[PP]). The reader is referred to Chapter 4, “Cumulative Impact and Overconcentration,” for a further discussion of land use impacts associated with concentrated cannabis uses.

This impact would be **less than significant** under Alternative 5.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.

## Impact LU-2: Cause a Significant Environmental Impact Due to a Conflict with any Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation Adopted for the Purpose of Avoiding or Mitigating an Environmental Effect

The adoption and implementation of the proposed CLUO, including subsequent Cannabis Use Permits pursuant to the adopted CLUO, would include amending the General Plan to acknowledge cannabis, and identifying cannabis operations as permitted uses within specific land use designations. Adoption and implementation of the CLUO would be consistent with General Plan policies related to agricultural, industrial, and commercial land uses and incorporates performance standards that implement environmental protections identified in the General Plan policies and Yolo County Code. This impact would be **less than significant** for all the alternatives.

As described in Section 2.5, “General Plan Amendment,” of Chapter 2, “Description of Preferred Alternative and Equal Weight Alternatives,” amendments to the General Plan are proposed to acknowledge cannabis as an agricultural activity and a legal commercial crop, among other things. These amendments would not alter or conflict with General Plan policy provisions that promote and protect agricultural land uses.

Implementation of the General Plan amendments and the CLUO would support the growth of an emerging market and promote activities related to agricultural products consistent with General Plan and community plan policies (General Plan policies: AG-3.2, AG-3.4, AG-3.7, AG-3.8, AG-3.16, AG-5.1, ED-1.3, and LU-2.2, Esparto Community Plan Policy E-LU.28, Capay Valley Area Plan Agriculture Policy 8, Clarksburg Area Community Plan Policy A2, and Dunnigan Community Plan Policy D-LU20) (consistent with General Plan policies AG-3.2, AG-3.7, AG-3.18, AG-5.1, and LU-2.2).

The CLUO performance standards incorporate environmental protection measures that are based on General Plan policies and Yolo County Code requirements. These include but are not limited to the following referenced sections. The reader is referred to each technical section of the draft EIR for a further analysis of CLUO consistency with County policies and regulations.

- Sections 8-2.1408(KK) and 8-2.1408(RR) of the CLUO include visual screening and tree preservation measures that implement General Plan policies related to the preservation of the rural and agricultural character of the County and scenic roadways (General Plan Policies CC-1.2, CC-1.5, CC-1.8, CC-1.12, CC-1.15, CC-1.16, CC-1.17, CC-1.19, and CC-4.15). (The reader is referred to Section 3.1, “Aesthetics,” and Section 3.4, “Biological Resources.”)
- Sections 8-2.1408(F), 8-2.1408(Z), and 8-2.1408(OO) of the CLUO implement General Plan policies associated with nighttime lighting controls and restrictions (General Plan Policies CC-1.3 and CC-4.12). (The reader is referred to Section 3.1, “Aesthetics.”)
- Sections 8-2.1406(K), 8-2.1408(D), and 8-2.1408(RR) of the CLUO require cannabis sites to comply with General Plan policies and with the policies and provisions of the Yolo Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan, and Yolo County Oak Woodland Conservation and Enhancement Plan. (The reader is referred to Section 3.4, “Biological Resources.”)

- Section 8-2.1408(H) of the CLUO requires that a site survey be conducted to determine the potential for historical and archaeological resources and development of a mitigation plan to protect identified resources in accordance with General Plan Actions CO-A63 and CO-A64 before the issuance of permits. (The reader is referred to Section 3.5, “Cultural Resources.”)
- Section 8-2.1408(V) of the CLUO requires soil stability and grading plan approvals that are consistent with Title 7 of the Yolo County Code. (The reader is referred to Section 3.7, “Geology and Soils.”)
- Sections 8-2.1408(K), 8-2.1408(Q), and 8-2.1408(FF) of the CLUO require compliance with County and fire district requirements, codes, and fire access requirements and consistency with General Plan Policies PF-4.1, PF-4.2, PF-5.5, PF-5.9, and PF-5.10. (The reader is referred to Section 3.9, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials,” and Section 3.13, “Public Services and Recreation.”)
- Sections 8-2.1408(LL) and 8-2.1410(D) require the provision of on-site security and implementation of a security plan that would assist law enforcement services consistent with law enforcement provisions of General Plan Policies PF-4.1 and PF-4.2. (The reader is referred to Section 3.13, “Public Services and Recreation.”)
- Sections 8-2.1408(J) and 8-2.1408(V) of the CLUO require incorporation of water quality controls into cannabis sites that are consistent with General Plan Policy CO-5.6 and Yolo County Code Section 10-9.303. (The reader is referred to Section 3.10, “Hydrology and Water Quality.”)
- Sections 8-2.1408(F) and 8-2.1408(NN) of the CLUO require cannabis site development to be conducted in compliance with the requirements of Yolo County Code Sections 8-4.501, 8-4.502 and 8-4.506, which identify flood control and protection standards. (The reader is referred to Section 3.10, “Hydrology and Water Quality.”)

The General Plan amendment and performance standards of the CLUO would apply equally to all five alternatives. As demonstrated above, adoption and implementation of the CLUO would implement County policy provisions for environmental issues. This impact would be **less than significant** impact under all the alternatives.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.

## Impact LU-3: Induce Substantial Unplanned Population Growth in an Area, Either Directly or Indirectly

Adoption and implementation of the proposed CLUO under each of the five alternatives, including subsequent Cannabis Use Permits pursuant to the adopted CLUO, would result in the development of cannabis cultivation and noncultivation sites that would generate new employment opportunities in the County. The potential increase in employees could result in new residents in the County or region. There is currently adequate housing available and planned in the region to accommodate this potential employment growth and the potential increase in population from new employees to the County is within the projected buildout in the General Plan. This impact would be **less than significant** for all alternatives.

Implementation of the CLUO under each of the five alternatives would result in the development of cannabis cultivation and noncultivation sites that would employ people for cultivation, nursery operations, cultivation operations, and processing, manufacturing, testing, distribution and retail activities. Table 3.11-2 summarizes the employment estimates for each alternative included in Table 2-4 in Chapter 2, “Description of Preferred Alternative and Equal Weight Alternatives.”

Construction would include the temporary employment of individuals when new buildings and associated infrastructure are constructed. Because the employment would be temporary and would typically be filled by existing workforce, it would not induce unplanned population growth. Therefore, the following discussions focus on operational impacts.

Operational activities would include permanent and seasonal employment of workers, as explained above and included in Table 3.11-2.

Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5 assume that personal use outdoor cultivation may occur in any zoning district on a parcel with a legal residence. Personal use outdoor cultivation of up to six plants is assumed to occur within pots or garden areas on the grounds of the parcel. Alternative 4 would limit personal use cultivation to indoor only. These activities would likely involve no more than 100 square feet of land area and would be required to be outside of front yard and side yard setback areas. Personal use outdoor cultivation would be an ancillary use to the parcel maintained by the resident. No additional employment would be generated.

**Table 3.11-2 Employment Generation by Alternative**

Feature	Alternative				
	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Cultivation Uses</b>					
<b>Outdoor Cultivation</b>					
Total Number of Full-Time-Equivalent Employees	284	288	576	n/a	288
Total Number of Seasonal Employees	1,197	1,216	2,432	n/a	1,216
<b>Mixed-Light Cultivation</b>					
Total Number of Full-Time-Equivalent Employees	364	392	756	1,904	392
<b>Indoor Cultivation</b>					
Total Number of Full-Time-Equivalent Employees	35	35	88	211	35
<b>Cultivation Totals</b>					
Total Number of Full-Time-Equivalent Employees	683	715	1,420	2,115	715
Total Number of Seasonal Employees	1,197	1,216	2,432	n/a	1,216
<b>Noncultivation Uses</b>					
<b>Nurseries</b>					
Total Number of Full-Time-Equivalent Employees	n/a	360	720	360	360
<b>Processing</b>					
Number of Full-Time-Equivalent Employees	n/a	13	25	13	13
Total Number of Seasonal Employees	n/a	20	40	20	20
<b>Manufacturing</b>					
Number of Full-Time-Equivalent Employees	n/a	200	400	200	200
<b>Testing</b>					
Number of Full-Time-Equivalent Employees	n/a	30	60	30	30
<b>Distribution</b>					
Number of Full-Time-Equivalent Employees	n/a	20	40	20	20
<b>Retail</b>					
Number of Full-Time-Equivalent Employees	n/a	32	64	32	n/a
<b>Microbusiness</b>					
Number of Full-Time-Equivalent Employees	n/a	45	90	45	45
<b>Noncultivation Totals</b>					
Total Number of Full-Time-Equivalent Employees	n/a	700	1,399	700	668
Combined Total Employees	1,197	1,916	3,831	2,815	1,884

Note: Assumptions for employment projections are provided in Table 2-4.

Source: Prepared by Ascent Environmental in 2018

**Alternative 1: Cultivation (Ancillary Nurseries and Processing Only) with Existing Limits (Existing Operations with CLUO) (CEQA Preferred Alternative)**

As shown in Table 3.11-2, existing cultivation sites assumed under Alternative 1 have approximately 683 full-time-equivalent employees and 1,197 seasonal employees. This alternative does not allow for additional cultivation or new noncultivation uses that could generate new employees that could require housing.

Therefore, implementation of Alternative 1 would not directly result in a substantial population growth from employment in the County. **No impact** would occur under Alternative 1.

**Alternative 2: All License Types with Moderate Limits**

As shown in Table 3.11-2, this alternative is assumed to result in a total of 715 full-time-equivalent employees for cannabis sites (existing and new cultivation sites) and 700 full-time-equivalent employees for noncultivation sites. Alternative 2 also is also assumed to generate 1,216 seasonal employees that would assist during harvest activities.

The General Plan EIR estimated that buildout of the General Plan by 2030 would result in a population in the unincorporated County of 64,700, approximately 22,061 residential units, and approximately 53,154 jobs. As described in Chapter 4.0, "Cumulative Impacts and Overconcentration" the Yolo County Board of Supervisors made significant amendments in 2017 to remove much of this planned growth. The population of unincorporated Yolo County in January 2019 was approximately 31,200. New cultivation and noncultivation sites under Alternative 2 would be spread countywide (see Exhibit 2-5). These employees can be assumed to come from the surrounding areas with some employees needing to move into the area, which would result in population growth in the County. Because the overall number of new residents would be within the expected buildout population of the General Plan and because they would be spread out in the unincorporated areas, population growth under Alternative 2 would not be substantial. As shown in Table 3.11-1, Yolo, Sacramento, and Solano Counties combined have approximately 63,000 existing unoccupied dwelling units. Housing vacancy rates have increased in Yolo County from 4.3 percent in 2017 to 5.2 percent in 2019 (Yolo County, 2019a and 2019b). This alternative assumes that new employees would be able to seek housing in the region without necessitating the construction of housing in the County. Cannabis-related employment may be accommodated by existing County employees that already work for other agricultural uses (permanent and seasonal employees). Further, several of the local jurisdictions in the region have reasonably foreseeable residential development communities (e.g., West Sacramento has the Yarbrough, Liberty Specific Plan, and River Park developments that would provide up to 7,200 new residential units combined and are in some stage of the entitlement process; City of Davis and University of California at Davis approved housing project and plans [i.e., UC Davis Long Range Development Plan]; and Woodland has approved the Country Oaks Subdivision, and the previously-approved Spring Lakes Specific Plan is being built out). Other jurisdictions, such as the City of Winters, are incorporating suggestions from the SACOG Housing Policy Tool Kit to address the availability of housing, such as the allowance for pre-manufactured buildings and accessory dwelling units in the zoning code and the adoption of regulations for support of farmworker housing and transitional housing. Thus, adequate housing opportunities in the region are considered to be available to accommodate the employment generated under this alternative. Additionally, the overall number of employees would be within the expected buildout conditions of the General Plan.

This impact would be **less than significant** under Alternative 2.

**Alternative 3: All License Types with High Limits**

As shown in Table 3.11-2, this alternative is assumed to result in a total of 1,420 full-time-equivalent employees for cannabis sites (existing and new cultivation sites) and 1,399 full-time-equivalent employees for noncultivation sites. Alternative 3 is also assumed to generate 2,432 seasonal employees that would assist during harvest activities.

As shown in Table 3.11-1, Yolo, Sacramento, and Solano Counties combined have approximately 63,000 unoccupied dwelling units. This alternative assumes that new employees would be able to seek housing in the region without necessitating the construction of housing in the County. As described under Alternative 2, several of the local jurisdictions in the region have reasonably foreseeable residential development

communities (e.g., West Sacramento has the Yarbrough, Liberty Specific Plan, and River Park developments that would provide up to 7,200 new residential units combined and are in some stage of the entitlement process; City of Davis and University of California at Davis approved housing project and plans [i.e., UC Davis Long Range Development Plan]; and Woodland has approved the Country Oaks Subdivision, and the previously-approved Spring Lakes Specific Plan is being built out), Other jurisdictions, such as the City of Winters, are incorporating suggestions from the SACOG Housing Policy Tool Kit to address the availability of housing. Thus, adequate housing opportunities in the region are considered to be available to accommodate the employment generated under this alternative. Additionally, the overall number of employees would be within the expected buildout conditions of the General Plan.

This impact would be **less than significant** under Alternative 3.

**Alternative 4: Mixed-Light/Indoor License Types Only with Moderate Limits, No Hoop Houses or Outdoor Types**

As shown in Table 3.11-2, this alternative is assumed to result in a total of 2,115 full-time-equivalent employees for cannabis sites (existing and new cultivation sites) and 700 full-time-equivalent employees for noncultivation sites.

As shown in Table 3.11-1, Yolo, Sacramento, and Solano Counties combined have approximately 63,000 unoccupied dwelling units. This alternative assumes that new employees would be able to seek housing in the region without necessitating the construction of housing in the County. As described under Alternative 2, several of the local jurisdictions in the region have reasonably foreseeable residential development communities (e.g., West Sacramento has the Yarbrough, Liberty Specific Plan, and River Park developments that would provide up to 7,200 new residential units combined and are in some stage of the entitlement process; City of Davis and University of California at Davis approved housing project and plans [i.e., UC Davis Long Range Development Plan]; and Woodland has approved the Country Oaks Subdivision, and the previously-approved Spring Lakes Specific Plan is being built out), Other jurisdictions, such as the City of Winters, are incorporating suggestions from the SACOG Housing Policy Tool Kit to address the availability of housing. Thus, adequate housing opportunities in the region are considered to be available to accommodate the employment generated under this alternative. Additionally, the overall number of employees would be within the expected buildout conditions of the General Plan.

This impact would be **less than significant** under Alternative 4.

**Alternative 5: All License Types with Moderate Limits, within Agricultural Zones Only, No Retail**

As shown in Table 3.11-2, this alternative is assumed to result in a total of 715 full-time-equivalent employees for cannabis sites (existing and new cultivation sites) and 668 full-time-equivalent employees for noncultivation sites. Alternative 5 is also assumed to generate 1,216 seasonal employees that would assist during harvest activities.

As shown in Table 3.11-1, Yolo, Sacramento, and Solano Counties combined have approximately 63,000 unoccupied dwelling units. This alternative assumes that new employees would be able to seek housing in the region without necessitating the construction of housing in the County. As described under Alternative 2, several of the local jurisdictions in the region have reasonably foreseeable residential development communities (e.g., West Sacramento has the Yarbrough, Liberty Specific Plan, and River Park developments that would provide up to 7,200 new residential units combined and are in some stage of the entitlement process; City of Davis and University of California at Davis approved housing project and plans [i.e., UC Davis Long Range Development Plan]; and Woodland has approved the Country Oaks Subdivision, and the previously-approved Spring Lakes Specific Plan is being built out), Other jurisdictions, such as the City of Winters, are incorporating suggestions from the SACOG Housing Policy Tool Kit to address the availability of housing. Thus, adequate housing opportunities in the region are considered to be available to accommodate the employment generated under this alternative. Additionally, the overall number of employees would be within the expected buildout conditions of the General Plan.

This impact would be **less than significant** under Alternative 5.

## **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.