Chapter 14 Land Use

14.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the environmental setting, methods of analysis, and impact analysis for land use that would potentially be affected by the construction and operation of the Project. The study area for land use consists of the three-county area of Colusa, Glenn, and Yolo Counties where Project facilities would be constructed.

Although Project activities would also occur in Tehama County and in the city of Willows, these actions would be limited. The sole Project construction activity in Tehama County would be the addition of two new pumps at the RBPP, an existing facility on land currently designated as Industrial and zoned as General Industry. In the city of Willows, the Project activities would consist of upgrades to the GCID Main Canal and adjacent roadways. Because these Project activities would occur at existing facilities, there would be no potential conflict with land use or zoning designations. Therefore, Tehama County and the city of Willows are not discussed further in this chapter.

Tables 14-1a and 14-1b summarize the CEQA determinations and NEPA conclusions for construction and operation impacts between alternatives that are described in the impact analysis.

Table 14-1a. Summary of Construction Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Land Use Resources

Alternative	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact LAND-1: Physical division of an established community			
No Project	NI/NE	-	NI/NE
Alternative 1	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 2	S/SA	No feasible mitigation measures identified	SU/SA
Alternative 3	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Impact LAND-2: Significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect			
No Project	NI/NE	-	NI/NE
Alternative 1	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 2	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 3	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE

Notes:
NI = CEQA no impact
LTS = CEQA less-than-significant impact
S = CEQA significant impact
SU = CEQA significant and unavoidable

NE = NEPA no effect or no adverse effect
SA = NEPA substantial adverse effect

Table 14-1b. Summary of Operations Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Land Use Resources

Alternative	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact LAND-1: Physical division of an established community			
No Project	NI/NE	-	NI/NE
Alternative 1	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 2	S/SA	-	SU/SA
Alternative 3	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Impact LAND-2: Significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect			
No Project	NI/NE	-	NI/NE
Alternative 1	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 2	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE
Alternative 3	LTS/NE	-	LTS/NE

Notes:
NI = CEQA no impact
LTS = CEQA less-than-significant impact
S = CEQA significant impact
SU = CEQA significant and unavoidable
NE = NEPA no effect or no adverse effect
SA = NEPA substantial adverse effect

14.2 Environmental Setting

Project facilities would be constructed in unincorporated Glenn, Colusa, and Yolo Counties. The following subsections discuss the affected communities, existing land uses, land use designations, and zoning designations for the areas where Project components would be located. Descriptions of the land use designations and zoning designations for Glenn, Colusa, and Yolo Counties that are relevant to the Project are provided in Appendix 4A, *Regulatory Requirements*. General plan goals and policies related to specific resources, including agriculture, noise, traffic, biological resources, visual resources, public services, cultural resources, and flooding or surface water resources, are addressed in Chapters 5 through 13 and Chapters 15 through 30 of this Final EIR/EIS.

14.2.1. Glenn County

Existing infrastructure near the GCID Main Canal in Glenn County consists of Interstate 5 (I-5), State Route (SR) 162, and the city of Willows.

14.2.1.1. Communities

There are no communities located in the Glenn County portion of the Antelope Valley, which comprises approximately 2,000 acres of the inundation area. The city of Willows is east of the intersection of I-5 and SR 162. The GCID Main Canal encompasses approximately 9 acres of an unclassified land use area within the Willows city limits.

14.2.1.2. Land Use and Zoning

Information regarding land use and zoning designations in Glenn County was obtained from the Glenn County General Plan Update, 2020 Existing Conditions Report (County of Glenn 2020a), County Code Directory (County of Glenn 2020b), and geographic information system data (County of Glenn Planning Division 2020). Table 14-2 identifies the land use and zoning designations of the areas in Glenn County where permanent Project facilities would be located. Most of these areas are designated as Foothill Agriculture/Forestry, which allows them to be used for grazing, animal raising operations, and harvesting and processing of forest or agricultural products.

Table 14-2. Summary of Glenn County Land Use and Zoning Designations

Land Use Designation	Allowable Uses	Zoning Designation	Allowable Uses	Approximate Project Acreage	Total County Acres
Foothill Agriculture/ Forestry	Grazing; animal raising operations; harvesting and processing forest or agricultural products	AP-160, FA-160	AP-160: Single-family dwelling and accessory buildings; agricultural and livestock production FA-160: Single-family dwelling; private farm buildings and uses; agriculture and livestock production	2,250	290,689
Intensive Agriculture	Growing and harvesting field crops; animal raising operations	AE-40, AP-80	AE-40: Single-family dwelling; agricultural and livestock production AP-80: Single-family dwelling and accessory buildings; agriculture and livestock production; game preserves	250	304,743

Note: AP = Agricultural Preserve zone; AE = Exclusive Agricultural zone; FA = Foothill Agricultural zone.
Sources: County of Glenn 2020a, 2020b; County of Glenn Planning Division 2020

14.2.2. Colusa County

Existing infrastructure near the inundation area, GCID Main Canal, TRR East, TRR West, and Funks Reservoir includes towns largely bordering I-5 and Route 45, local roadways, and levees. Most of the land is used for agriculture such as pastureland for grazing, rice fields, and almond and walnut orchards.

14.2.2.1. Communities

The unincorporated community of Sites is in the Antelope Valley, which is relatively undeveloped. Existing land uses are agricultural and rural residential with grazing that primarily occur in the inundation area and to the immediate west, south, and north. Irrigated agriculture occurs to the east. The primary land uses in Sites are grazing and agriculture. Sites Lodoga Road is a narrow roadway consisting of two 11-foot-wide lanes and 1-foot-wide paved shoulders with 1- to 3-foot-wide earthen shoulders. The current roadway alignment extends east to west from I-5 through Maxwell. Maxwell Sites Road/Sites Lodoga Road is classified by Colusa County as a Class III Bike Route.

Approximately 69 people are presumed to be living in Sites, based on an estimated 2.88 persons per household in Colusa County (California Department of Finance 2020). The unincorporated community of Lodoga (a census designated place[1]) is in the foothills to the west of the Antelope Valley. Lodoga has a population of 168 (United States Census Bureau 2019), encompasses 3.39 square miles, and comprises approximately 175 housing units (United States Census Bureau 2012). The housing density of Lodoga is approximately 58 persons per square mile (United States Census Bureau 2012). For purposes of this chapter, Lodoga and Maxwell are collectively treated as an "established community" because students from Lodoga travel to school in Maxwell.

14.2.2.2. Land Use and Zoning

Information pertaining to land use and zoning designations in Colusa County was obtained from the Colusa County General Plan (Colusa County 2012) and Chapter 44 of the County's Zoning Code (Colusa County 2014). Table 14-3 identifies the land use and zoning designations of the areas that would have permanent Project facilities in Colusa County. Most of these areas are designated as Agriculture, and the allowable uses are cultivated agriculture, livestock and animal keeping, and single-family residential dwellings.

[1] "Census designated places" are geographic entities representing closely settled, unincorporated communities that are locally recognized and identified by name. They are the statistical equivalents of incorporated places, with the primary differences being the lack of a legally defined boundary and an active, functioning governmental structure (Federal Register 2018).

Table 14-3. Summary of Colusa County Land Use and Zoning Designations

Land Use Designation	Allowable Uses	Zoning Designation	Allowable Use	Approximate Project Acreage	Total County Acreage
Agriculture	Cultivated agriculture; livestock and animal keeping; single-family residential	Exclusive Agriculture, Foothill Agriculture, Rural Services, Upland Conservation	Agricultural processing; grazing; animal raising; crop production; stables	14,080	578,715
Government (Reclamation)	Funks Dam and Reservoir	Foothill Agriculture; State, Federal and Other Agency Land	Agricultural processing; grazing; animal raising; crop production; stables	460	33,844
Recreational	Park facilities; recreation facilities	Rural Services	Agricultural processing; grazing; accessory structures; nurseries and greenhouses	1	79
Residential	Single-family residential; neighborhood commercial; tourist and recreation commercial; parks and recreation	Rural Services, Exclusive Agriculture	Agricultural processing; grazing; accessory structures; nurseries and greenhouses; animal raising; crop production; stables	25	6,641

Sources: Colusa County 2012, 2014

14.2.3. Yolo County

Existing infrastructure between the end of the TC Canal in Yolo County, the CBD, and Sacramento River consists of roads (e.g., I-5, Road 99W), levees, and a commercial auction yard. The Richie Bros. Auction Yard is a large, unpaved lot between I-5 and Road 99W. Most of the lands between the TC Canal and the Sacramento River are used for agriculture that is primarily rice production.

14.2.3.1. Communities

The community of Dunnigan is a census designated place in Yolo County adjacent to I-5 and to the west of the CBD. The community of Knights Landing is also a census designated place in Yolo County adjacent to the Sacramento River. Knights Landing is approximately 14 miles to the southwest of the Sacramento River discharge location.

14.2.3.2. Land Use and Zoning

Information on land use and zoning designations in Yolo County was obtained from the 2030 Yolo Countywide General Plan (County of Yolo 2009) and Title 8 of the Yolo County Code (County of Yolo 2014). Table 14-4 identifies the land use and zoning designations of the areas in Yolo County where permanent Project facilities would be located. These areas are primarily designated as Agriculture, which allows them to be used for cultivated agriculture, grazing, agricultural industrial uses, and agricultural commercial uses.

Table 14-4. Summary of Yolo County Land Use and Zoning Designations

Land Use Designation	Allowable Uses	Zoning Designation	Allowable Uses	Approximate Project Acreage	Total County Acreage
Agriculture	Cultivated agriculture; grazing; agriculture industrial uses; agriculture commercial uses	Agricultural Extensive; Agricultural Intensive	Livestock and ranching operations; dry land farming; grazing and pasture land; intensive agricultural production	130	603,544
Commercial General	Retail; offices; agricultural commercial uses	Highway Services Commercial	Auto and truck service stations and repair; vehicle and boat equipment sales; hotels/motels; restaurants, small retail	20	2,381

Source: County of Yolo 2009, 2014

14.3 Methods of Analysis

The analysis describes Project consistency with land use designations and zoning and anticipated amendments. The general plans for Glenn, Colusa, and Yolo Counties were also reviewed for applicable goals and policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental

effects. County general plan goals and policies were also reviewed for specific identification of the Project, even if the goal or policy was not adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. If a goal or policy is related to the Project, it is also included below.

As described in Appendix 4A, *Regulatory Requirements*, the Authority is considered a local agency pursuant to California Government Code sections 53090(a) and 65402(c). As such, certain major Project facilities as well as other facilities that are integral to the storage or transmission of water or electricity may be exempted from county and city zoning. In addition, the Authority can overrule county general plan policies under certain circumstances. This analysis discusses all relevant county general plan policies, designations, and zoning ordinances equally, without distinguishing among Project facilities that will be, may be, or will not be directly subject to those policies and ordinances.

Project components that would be constructed at existing facilities are not discussed further in the land use impact analysis. These construction activities would not result in a permanent change to land use or zoning designations or cause a permanent conflict with existing goals and policies. Instead, these activities would occur in areas where facilities exist that are already consistent with these designations, goals, and policies. These facilities include the RBPP and TC Canal in Tehama County, GCID Main Canal head gate at Hamilton City Pump Station, and the GCID system upgrades in Glenn County and Willows.

As described in Chapter 1, *Introduction*, Reclamation is the federal lead agency for the Project for compliance with NEPA and other applicable federal regulations. Please see Chapter 4, *Regulatory and Environmental Compliance: Project Permits, Approvals, and Consultation Requirements*, for Reclamation's roles/responsibilities related to anticipated federal permitting and approvals, which would not involve local permits or approvals and therefore are not discussed further in this chapter.

Policies, plans, and regulations specifically related to agriculture, noise, traffic, biological resources, visual resources, public services, cultural resources, and flooding or water resources are addressed as appropriate in the corresponding resource chapters of this Final EIR/EIS (Chapters 5 through 13 and Chapters 15 through 30 of this Final EIR/EIS).

14.3.1. Thresholds of Significance

An impact on land use would be considered significant if the Project 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.

According to CEQA, policy conflicts do not, in and of themselves, constitute a significant environmental impact. A policy inconsistency is considered to be a significant adverse environmental impact when it is related to a policy adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and it is anticipated that the inconsistency would result in a significant adverse physical impact. Any such physical impacts associated with resources (e.g., noise, air quality, and transportation) are discussed in Chapters 5 through 13 and Chapters 15

through 30 of this Final EIR/EIS, which identify specific policies that guide the determination of environmental impact significance (e.g., noise thresholds and traffic levels of service).

14.4 Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measures

Impact LAND-1: Physical division of an established community

No Project

No physical division of established communities would occur under the No Project Alternative because no Project facilities would be constructed or operated. Because the No Project Alternative would not construct or operate new facilities, it would not result in the temporary or permanent physical division of established communities.

Significance Determination

The No Project Alternative would not result in the physical division of established communities, either directly or indirectly, because county governments would continue to apply the land use polices in their respective general plans. There would be no impact/no effect.

Alternatives 1 and 3

Construction and Operation

Alternatives 1 and 3 would require demolition of structures and relocation of residents in the unincorporated community of Sites, as well as the relocation of cemeteries. While the Sites community would be inundated and displaced, it would not be physically divided (see Chapter 25, *Population and Housing*, for additional information regarding displacement).

The community of Lodoga, located west of the inundation area in Colusa County, would not be physically divided from the town of Maxwell because a bridge would be constructed over Sites Reservoir to provide access between the two towns. Other components of Alternatives 1 and 3 (i.e., TRR East, access road improvements, TC Canal intake, and CBD outlet) would also not create physical divisions within established communities because there are none where these facilities would be constructed.

CEQA Significance Determination and Mitigation Measures

Construction and operation of Alternatives 1 and 3 would not result in the physical division of established communities. While the Sites community would be inundated and displaced, the community would not be physically divided. There would be no physical division between the communities of Lodoga and Maxwell because a bridge would be built under Alternatives 1 and 3 that would connect Lodoga to Maxwell. No other components would create physical divisions within established communities because there are none where these components would be constructed. This impact would be less than significant.

NEPA Conclusion

Construction and operation effects would be the same as described above for CEQA. Construction and operation of Alternative 1 or 3 would not physically divide the established community of Lodoga to Maxwell relative to the No Project Alternative. There would be no adverse effect.

Alternative 2

Construction and Operation

Impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to those under Alternatives 1 and 3 except for the physical division of Lodoga from Maxwell. Under Alternative 2, the South Road would provide local access between Lodoga and Maxwell (instead of the bridge across Sites Reservoir under Alternatives 1 and 3). While the South Road would provide local access between Lodoga and Maxwell, the road would be considerably longer and have more curves than the current route. The South Road would increase in curves and elevation as compared to the existing road and the bridge under Alternatives 1 and 3 (AECOM 2020). It currently takes approximately 30 minutes to drive between Maxwell and Lodoga. The South Road would add approximately 20 minutes to the drive time. Therefore, the South Road would physically separate the established community of Lodoga from Maxwell and the I-5 corridor.

Impacts under Alternative 2 with respect to demolition and inundation of the Sites community would be the same as described for Alternatives 1 and 3. Other components of Alternative 2 (e.g., TRR West, access road improvements, TC Canal intake, and Sacramento River discharge) would not create physical divisions in established communities because there are none where these facilities would be constructed.

CEQA Significance Determination and Mitigation Measures

Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would result in the physical division of established communities. While the Sites community would be inundated and displaced, the community would not be physically divided. There would be a physical division for the community of Lodoga, even though the South Road would connect Lodoga to Maxwell, because the new access route would substantially increase travel time. There are no feasible mitigation measures for this impact. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.

NEPA Conclusion

Construction and operation effects would be the same as described above for CEQA. Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would result in the physical division of established communities relative to the No Project Alternative because the new South Road would substantially increase travel time between Lodoga and Maxwell, thereby physically dividing these two communities. Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would have a substantial adverse effect.

Impact LAND-2: Significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect

No Project

No conflicts with land use plans, policies, or regulations would occur under the No Project Alternative because no Project facilities would be constructed or operated. Because the No Project Alternative would not construct or operate new facilities, it would not result in conflicts with any land use plan, policy, or regulation.

Significance Determination

The No Project Alternative would not result in significant environmental impacts due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, either directly or indirectly, because county governments would continue to apply the land use policies in their respective county general plans. There would be no impact/no effect.

Alternatives 1 and 3

Table 14-5 summarizes the land use designations, zoning designations, and approximate acreages for the components of Alternatives 1 and 3 that would be constructed in Glenn, Colusa, and Yolo Counties. Temporary acreage is the area that would be temporarily disturbed during construction and restored after construction.

Table 14-5. Summary of Alternatives 1 and 3 Components in Glenn, Colusa, and Yolo Counties

Project Components	Land Use Designation	Zoning Designation	Alternatives 1 and 3 Temporary Acreage	Alternatives 1 and 3 Permanent Acreage
Glenn County				
Sites Reservoir; Saddle Dams 1, 3, 5, 6, 8A, and 8B;b, and Saddle Dikes 1 and 2, Saddle Dam Roads; North Road	Foothill Agriculture/Forestry	AP-160, FA-160	143	2,101
Road 68, Road 69, Road D, Road F, McDermott Road, Saddle Dams Rock Processing and Haul Road	Intensive Agriculture	AE-40, AP-80,	59	139

Project Components	Land Use Designation	Zoning Designation	Alternatives 1 and 3 Temporary Acreage	Alternatives 1 and 3 Permanent Acreage
Colusa County				
Sites Reservoir, Funks Pipelines, Funks and TRR East Easement, TRR East, Huffmaster Road, Sites Lodoga Road, Quarry, Rock Processing, Day-Use Boat Ramp, Peninsula Hills Recreational Road Access, Peninsula Hills Recreation Area, Stone Corral Creek Recreation Area, Saddle Dams 1 and 2, Saddle Dam Access Roads, I/O Works, Golden Gate Dam, Sites Dam, McDermott Road	Agriculture	Exclusive Agriculture, Foothill Agriculture, Rural Services, Upland Conservation	700	13,364
Huffmaster Road, Access Road C1, Funks Pipelines, Funks Reservoir, Funks Storage Tank, PGP, Substation	Government (Reclamation)	Foothill Agriculture; State, Federal and Other Agency Land	433	29
Sites Reservoir	Recreational	Rural Services	0	1
Sites Reservoir, McDermott Road, TRR East	Residential	Rural Services, Exclusive Agriculture	0	27
Yolo County				
TC Canal Intake, Dunnigan Pipeline, CBD Outlet	Agriculture	Agricultural Extensive; Agricultural Intensive	105	1
Dunnigan Pipeline	General Commercial	Highway Services Commercial	1	0

Construction and Operation

Consistency with Plans, Policies, and Regulations

For Yolo and Glenn Counties, there are no land use plans, policies, or regulations directly related to avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect that would be relevant to the facilities located in these particular counties other than those addressed in Chapters 5 through 13, and 15 through 30 of the EIR/EIS.

The Colusa County General Plan (Colusa County 2012) has three relevant goals and polices related to the following facilities for Alternatives 1 and 3 that would be in the county: 13,650

acres of the inundation area, Golden Gate Dam, Sites Dam, the recreation areas, all of the roads, and the associated regulating reservoirs (i.e., Funks and TRR East) and conveyance complex. The Colusa County General Plan Land Use Element (Goal LU-4 and associated objectives and policies) provides for the construction of Sites Reservoir, including action items to create a Sites Area Plan and the County's active participation in the Authority. The Colusa County General Plan Open Space and Recreation Element (Goals OSR-2 and OSR-3 and associated objectives and policies) provides for the increase, support, and creation of recreational opportunities in open space and existing communities. One of the primary objectives of the Project is to provide local and regional amenities, such as developing recreational facilities. Alternatives 1 and 3 include the development of two recreational areas with multiple amenities and one day-use boat ramp. The development of these recreational amenities is consistent with Goal LU-4 and would provide increased opportunities for recreation activities in open space and existing communities.

Consistency with Land Use and Zoning Designations

In Yolo County, facilities for Alternatives 1 and 3 would include the TC Canal intake, Dunnigan Pipeline, and CBD outlet, which would encompass approximately 106 acres. Most of these facilities would be located underground and would not conflict with existing land use or zoning designations; 1 acre would be aboveground and located in Agricultural and Agricultural Intensive and Extensive land use and zoning designations, respectively. These land uses/zoning do not prohibit this type of infrastructure.

In Glenn County, the existing land use designations and zoning for the inundation area, saddle dams, and saddle dikes are Foothill Agriculture/Forestry and Intensive Agriculture, neither of which specifically allows the construction of a reservoir and associated facilities. The County of Glenn may need to amend its general plan and zoning.

In Colusa County, the unincorporated community of Sites in the inundation area is generally identified as Residential and Agriculture. When Colusa County adopted its current General Plan in 2012 (Colusa County 2012) and Zoning Code in 2014 (Colusa County 2014), the County anticipated it would modify the applicable general plan and zoning designations if the reservoir were built, as indicated by Action LU-4A (Colusa County 2012). Colusa County may need to process a General Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment to address the changes to land uses under Alternatives 1 and 3.

CEQA Significance Determination and Mitigation Measures

Construction and operation of Alternative 1 or 3 would not conflict with the Yolo County or Glenn County land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect because there are no pertinent county land use plans, policies, or regulations related to facilities for Alternatives 1 and 3 in these counties. Construction and operation of Alternative 1 or 3 would be consistent with Colusa County land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of supporting the Project. Coordination between the Authority and Glenn and Colusa Counties would occur regarding general plans and/or zoning ordinances. Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Conclusion

Construction and operation effects would be the same as described above for CEQA. Construction and operation of Alternative 1 or 3 would not conflict with existing land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect as compared to the No Project Alternative because either there are no pertinent county land use plans, policies, or regulations or construction and operation activities would generally be consistent. Construction and operation of Alternative 1 or 3 would have no adverse effect.

Alternative 2

Table 14-6 summarizes the land use designations and zoning designations for the various components that would be constructed in Glenn, Colusa, and Yolo Counties under Alternative 2, as well as approximate acreages and acreage differences as compared to Alternatives 1 and 3.

Table 14-6. Summary of Alternative 2 Components in Glenn, Colusa, and Yolo Counties

Project Components	Land Use Designation	Zoning Designation	Alternative 2 Temporary (Acreage)	Difference between Alternatives 1 and 3 and Alternative 2 (Acreage)	Alternative 2 Permanent (Acreage)	Difference between Alternatives 1 and 3 and Alternative 2 (Acreage)
Glenn County						
Saddle Dams 3, 5, 8A, and 8B, and Saddle Dike 3, Saddle Dam Roads, North Road, Sites Reservoir	Foothill Agriculture/ Forestry	AP-160, FA-160	139	-4	1,865	-236
Road 68, Road 69, Road D, Road F, North Road, McDermott Road, Saddle Dams Rock Processing and Haul Road	Intensive Agriculture	AE-40, AP-80,	59	0	139	0
Colusa County						
Sites Reservoir, Funks Pipelines, Funks and TRR West Easement, TRR West, South Road, Huffmaster Road, Sites Lodoga Road, Quarry, Rock Processing, Day-Use Boat Ramp, Peninsula Hills Recreational Road Access, Peninsula Hills Recreation Area, Stone Corral Creek Recreation Area, Saddle Dams 1 and 2, Saddle Dikes 1 and 2, Saddle Dam Access Roads, I/O Works, Sites Dam, McDermott Road	Agriculture	Exclusive Agriculture, Foothill Agriculture, Rural Services, Upland Conservation	651	-49	13,095	-269
Huffmaster Road, Access Road C1, Funks Pipelines, Funks Reservoir, Funks Storage Tank, PGP, Substation	Government (Reclamation)	Foothill Agriculture; State, Federal and Other Agency Land	433	0	462	0
Sites Reservoir	Recreational	Rural Services	0	0	1.34	0

Project Components	Land Use Designation	Zoning Designation	Alternative 2 Temporary (Acreage)	Difference between Alternatives 1 and 3 and Alternative 2 (Acreage)	Alternative 2 Permanent (Acreage)	Difference between Alternatives 1 and 3 and Alternative 2 (Acreage)
Sites Reservoir, McDermott Road, TRR West	Residential	Rural Services, Exclusive Agriculture	0	0	23.19	-4
Yolo County						
TC Canal Intake, Dunnigan Pipeline, Sacramento River Discharge	Agriculture	Agricultural Intensive	232	+229	3	+2
Dunnigan Pipeline	General Commercial	Highway Services Commercial	1	0	0	0

Construction and Operation

Consistency with Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be similar to those described for Alternatives 1 and 3. Fewer acres would be affected in Glenn and Colusa Counties because of the smaller Sites Reservoir footprint, and more acres would be affected in Yolo County due to a longer Dunnigan Pipeline. Similar to Alternatives 1 and 3, Colusa County General Plan (Colusa County 2012) has policies that support Alternative 2 facilities.

Consistency with Land Use and Zoning Designations

In Yolo County, facilities for Alternative 2 would include the TC Canal intake, Dunnigan Pipeline, and Sacramento River discharge, which would collectively encompass approximately 236 acres. Approximately 233 acres of facilities would be located underground and would not conflict with existing land use designations or zoning; roughly 3 acres would be aboveground and located in Agriculture and Agricultural Intensive land use and zoning designations, respectively. These land uses/zoning do not prohibit this type of infrastructure.

In Glenn County, the existing land use designations and zoning for the inundation area, saddle dams, and saddle dikes are Foothill Agriculture/Forestry and Intensive Agriculture, neither of which specifically allows the construction of a reservoir and associated facilities. The County of Glenn may need to amend its general plan.

In Colusa County, the unincorporated community of Sites in the inundation area is generally identified as Residential and Agriculture. When Colusa County adopted its current General Plan in 2012 (Colusa County 2012) and Zoning Code in 2014 (Colusa County 2014), the County anticipated it would modify the applicable General Plan and zoning designations if the reservoir were built, as indicated by Action LU-4A (Colusa County 2012). Colusa County may need to process a General Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment to address the changes to land uses under Alternative 2.

CEQA Significance Determination and Mitigation Measures

Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not conflict with the Yolo County or Glenn County land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect because there are no pertinent county land use plans, policies, or regulations related to Alternative 2 facilities in these counties. Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would be consistent with Colusa County land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of supporting the Project. Coordination between the Authority and Glenn and Colusa Counties would occur regarding general plans and/or zoning ordinances. Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Conclusion

Construction and operation effects would be the same as described above for CEQA. Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not conflict with existing land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect as compared to the No Project Alternative because either there are no pertinent county land use

plans, policies, or regulations or construction and operation activities would generally be consistent. Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would have no adverse effect.

14.5 References

14.5.1. Printed References

AECOM. 2020. Roads and Bridge Technical Memorandum. August.

California Department of Finance. 2020. *Forecasting. Demographics. Estimates. E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2010-2020, with 2010 Census Benchmark.* Last revised: May 2020. Available: http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-5/ Accessed: October 14, 2020.

Colusa County. 2012. *Colusa County General Plan*. Land Use Element and Conservation Element. Adopted July 31, 2012. Prepared by De Novo Planning Group for County of Colusa. Available: https://www.countyofcolusa.org/137/General-Plan Accessed: October 12, 2020.

Colusa County. 2014. Chapter 44, Zoning Code. Available: https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/ColusaCounty/#!/ColusaCounty44.html. Accessed: October 16, 2020.

County of Glenn. 2020a. Glenn County General Plan Update: Existing Conditions Report 2020. Prepared by De Novo Planning Group for County of Glenn. Available: https://glenncounty.generalplan.org/s/GlennCounty-ECR-Final-Feb2020.pdf. Accessed: October 28, 2020.

County of Glenn. 2020b. County Code Directory. Available: https://www.countyofglenn.net/govt/county-code/title-15. Accessed: November 12, 2020.

County of Glenn Planning Division. 2020. GIS Data for Glenn County, California. Purchased on November 4, 2020.

County of Yolo. 2009. 2030 Countywide General Plan. Land Use and Community Character Element. Adopted November 2009.

County of Yolo. 2014. Yolo County Community Services Department, Zoning Code (Title 8 of the Yolo County Code). Adopted July 2014. Available: https://www.yolocounty.org/home/showpublisheddocument?id=65510. Accessed November 12, 2020.

Federal Register. 2018. *Census Designated Places (CDPs) for the 2020 Census – Final Criteria*. Available: https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2018/11/13/2018-24571/census-designated-places-cdps-for-the-2020-census-final-criteria. Accessed December 4, 2020.

United States Census Bureau. 2012. California: 2010 Population and Housing Unit Counts, 2010 Census of Population and Housing. Available: https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/cph-2-6.pdf Accessed: November 6, 2020.

United States Census Bureau. 2019. Lodoga CDP, California. Available: https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?g=1600000US0642230 Accessed: October 21, 2020.