

7 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

7.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides information relevant to public services and utilities impacts under NEPA and CEQA in connection with the Proposed Action (and alternatives. This chapter includes: introduction, environmental and regulatory setting, impact analysis methods and assumptions, significance criteria, environmental effects of the action and alternatives, and mitigation measures to address effects that are identified as significant. For the purposes of this chapter, the public services and utilities analyzed consist of fire protection and emergency medical services; police service; public schools; solid waste; water supply; electricity; and natural gas. Recreation resources, including parks, are addressed in Chapter 8, *Recreation and Open Space*. Stormwater drainage is addressed in Chapter 9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*.

7.1.1 Data Sources

Key sources of information used to prepare this Public Services and Utilities chapter include the following.

- ▲ *Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan* (Yolo County 2009a),
- ▲ *Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan EIR* (Yolo County GP EIR) (Yolo County 2009b),
- ▲ *City of Davis General Plan* (City of Davis 2007),
- ▲ *City of West Sacramento General Plan 2035 Policy Document* (City of West Sacramento 2016a),
- ▲ *City of Winters General Plan* (City of Winters 1992), and
- ▲ *City of Woodland General Plan Update* (City of Woodland 2017).

7.1.2 Definitions

A public service is provided by the government, directly or under contract to a service provider, to people living within its jurisdiction. Public services addressed in this discussion consist of: fire protection, emergency medical services, polices services, and public schools. Utilities are defined as public or private infrastructure and facilities that are used to generate, transport, and/or process water, wastewater, solid waste, electricity, and natural gas.

7.2 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

7.2.1 Environmental Setting

PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire Protection

A number of state and local entities provide fire protection and emergency medical services (EMS) to Yolo County and the cities. At the state level, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) is responsible for fire protection in State Responsibility Areas (SRAs), along with providing some fire protection in Local Responsibility Areas (LRAs). CAL FIRE is required by law to respond to and abate uncontrolled fires that threaten to destroy life, property, or natural resources outside of LRAs. The Yolo County SRA falls under the North Division of CAL FIRE's Sonoma-Lake-Napa Unit. CAL FIRE has staff and

equipment available in Yolo County during fire season (typically May to October). Battalion 1419 operates three single-engine fire stations near Leesville, Wilbur Springs, and Brooks.

There are 11 fire protection districts (FPDs) in Yolo County that provide fire protection, rescue, and emergency medical services within the unincorporated areas of the County: Capay Valley, Clarksburg, Elkhorn, Esparto, Knights Landing, Madison, West Plainfield, Willow Oak, Winters, Yolo, and Zamora. These FPDs rely heavily on volunteer fire fighters for staffing, but a few also have paid staff. In addition, four municipal fire departments are operated by the Cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland. There are mutual aid agreements between most districts and departments to ensure adequate coverage will be provided in the event of a fire.

The Davis Fire Department (DFD) provides emergency response and fire prevention services to the City of Davis and service to three fire protection districts (East Davis County District, Springlake, and “No Man’s Land”). The DFD has three fire stations and 37 shift personnel including nine captains and 28 firefighters (DFD 2014). The City and Davis and UC Davis have a shared management team for the fire chief, deputy chief, and three division chiefs (City of Davis 2016).

The West Sacramento Fire Department (WSFD) provides fire protection services to the City of West Sacramento and the unincorporated area south of the city boundary to Babel Slough Road and across to the old Arcade Station on Jefferson Boulevard. The WSFD has five stations with a combined staffing of 17 personnel on duty (WSFD 2016).

The Winters Fire Department covers 86 square miles that make up the City of Winters and the Winters Fire District. Six career and 50 volunteer personnel provide service from the Winters Fire Station located at 700 Main Street in Winters (Winters Fire Department 2016).

The Woodland Fire Department (WFD) provides fire protection services for the City of Woodland as well as surrounding unincorporated areas (e.g. North Woodland, East Woodland and Speckles). The WFD has a daily staffing of 13 firefighters per day deployed on three fire engines, and one ladder truck. Three engine companies operate with three fire personnel and one truck company operates with four fire personnel (City of Woodland 2015a). There are three fire stations located throughout the City.

Two additional fire departments in Yolo County are the Yocha Dehe Fire Department (YDFD) and the UC Davis Fire Department, which has a shared management team with the City of Davis. There are no HCP/NCCP activities within the jurisdictions of these departments, but they may maintain mutual aid agreements with other departments listed above and therefore are part of the overall fire protection services available in the Plan Area. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation maintains the YDFD and provides fire protection, rescue, and emergency medical services for the Cache Creek Casino Resort and tribal housing. The department runs one station with fourteen firefighter/paramedics, six engineers, six captains, and three battalion chiefs (Yocha Dehe 2015). The UC Davis Fire Department maintains a station that serves the campus. The department presently employs 25 full-time personnel, one part-time administrative assistant, 15 student resident firefighters, and two student administrative support staff. Two captains, two engineers, and three firefighters are working per shift (UC Davis 2015a).

Emergency Medical Services

Emergency medical services in the Plan Area are provided by the FPDs and municipal fire departments. If 911 is called, the initial assessment of whether emergency medical assistance is required (vs. other emergency services) is made by the Yolo County 911 Dispatch Center operated by the Yolo Emergency Communications Agency.

Police Services

Law enforcement in the unincorporated areas of the County is provided by the Yolo County Sheriff’s Department. The Sheriff’s Department is responsible for patrolling the County, administering the County jail and work program, providing security to the Yolo County Court system, providing animal services, and serving as the County coroner. Sheriff headquarters is located in Woodland with satellite offices throughout the County.

In addition, each incorporated city in Yolo County has its own police department.

The City of Davis Police Department is headquartered at 2600 5th Street, Davis and employs 61 sworn officers, 37 civilian support professionals, one canine, and over 60 volunteers. There are four divisions in the department; administration, patrol, investigations, and records & communications (City of Davis 2014).

The City of West Sacramento Police Department is staffed with 70 sworn officers and 23 civilian full-time employees. The Department is organizationally divided into three offices, Administration, Support Services, and Field Operations. There is one main police station on Jefferson Boulevard and one service center on Lake Washington Boulevard (City of West Sacramento 2015).

The Winters Police Department (WPD) provides police protection to the entire city with headquarters located at 702 Main Street. WPD is staffed with 11 sworn positions, consisting of a chief, a sergeant, two corporals and seven patrol officers (WPD 2015).

The City of Woodland has one station at 1000 Lincoln Avenue with 63 sworn officers and 15 support employees. The Department has four divisions, Administration, Operations, Support Services, and Special Operations. The Special Operations Division houses the Investigations and Gang Suppression Units which include: gang suppression, Yolo County Narcotics Enforcement Team, and School Resource Officers (City of Woodland 2015b).

The University of California, Davis has its own police department, the University of California Davis Police Department (UCDPD). There are no HCP/NCCP activities within the jurisdiction of the UCDPD, but they may maintain mutual aid agreements with other departments listed above and therefore are part of the overall police services available in the Plan Area. Patrol operations on the UC Davis Campus is managed by a patrol lieutenant and patrol teams (University of California 2016).

Public Schools

School services and facilities in the Plan Area include seven school districts (Table 7-1) that run a total of 79 schools, including special-education and continuation schools. In addition, the County has 17 private and parochial schools located primarily in the unincorporated cities.

Table 7-1 School District Enrollment and Facilities

District	Area Served	Schools	Approximate Enrollment	Approximate Capacity
Davis Joint Unified School District	City of Davis and surrounding area	Nine elementary schools, four junior high schools, two high schools, six alternative schools	8,626	10,000
Esparto Unified School District	Capay Valley and Madison	One elementary school, one middle school, one high school, one alternative high school	976	850
Pierce Joint Unified School District	Southern Colusa County and northern Yolo County	One K-5 elementary school, one K-6 elementary school, one junior high school, one high school, one continuation high school	1,443	1,470
River Delta Joint Unified School District	Clarksburg area and Solano and Sacramento Counties	Five elementary schools, two middle schools, three high schools, one adult school	2,404	3,040
Washington Unified School District	Eastern Yolo County	Nine elementary schools, one middle school, two high schools, two charters, one independent program	7,978	7,160
Winters Joint Unified School District	In and around the City of Winters	One elementary school, one intermediate school (grades 4-5), one middle school (grades 6-8), one high school, one continuation school.	1,521	2,545
Woodland Joint Unified School District	City of Woodland and surrounding areas	Twelve elementary schools, two middle schools, two high schools, one continuation high school, one adult school	10,055	13,520

Enrollment Source: California Department of Education 2015.

Yolo County is served by two Community College Districts. Woodland Community College is a campus of the Yuba Community College District. The Los Rios Community College District has two satellite campuses, one in Davis and one in West Sacramento. UC Davis, although not part of the Yolo HCP/NCCP and no HCP/NCCP activities would occur on the campus, is a source of bachelors, graduate, and post graduate level education opportunities in the Plan Area.

EXISTING PUBLIC UTILITIES

Water

Water demands in Yolo County and the cities are met through a variety of sources including the Sacramento River, Cache Creek, Putah Creek, and groundwater. According to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) per person water use in unincorporated Yolo County is approximately 0.274 acre-feet of water per year (244 gallons a day). In addition, based on DWR data, the unincorporated County uses approximately 790,000 acre-feet of water annually for agriculture. Total water use in the County (cities, unincorporated areas, municipal use, agricultural use, etc.) is approximately 960,000 acre-feet annually. Water demand is associated with three major sectors in Yolo County: agricultural, urban (municipal and industrial), and environmental. Agricultural use comprises the majority of water demand, consisting of approximately 88 percent of water consumption in the county, approximately 40 percent of which is derived from groundwater. As much of water for domestic supplies comes from unmetered private groundwater wells, and groundwater is also used by farmers to irrigate crops, actual water use is assumed to be underestimated (Yolo County 2009a, WDCWA 2016).

Yolo County relies on both surface and ground water supplies. Surface water sources in Yolo County include the Sacramento River, Knights Landing Ridge Cut, Putah Creek, and Willow Slough Bypass. Until recently, urban water demand was primarily groundwater (80 percent), and the City of West Sacramento was the only urban community that obtained the majority of water supply from surface water sources (Yolo County 2005). Beginning in June 2016, groundwater supplies in Woodland and Davis were largely replaced with surface water supplies from the Sacramento River, effectively serving more than two-thirds of the urban populations of Yolo County including UC Davis. Groundwater supplies are still available when demand for water cannot be met with surface water supplies alone (WDCWA 2016). Agricultural operations rely on groundwater for approximately 40 percent of their supply in a normal year, and more heavily on groundwater during drought years (WRA 2007).

There are numerous administrative bodies responsible for delivering water to the Plan Area, including: the Cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland; community services districts for Cacheville, Esparto, Knights Landing, and Madison; county service areas of El Macero, North Davis Meadows, Wildwings, and Willowbank; and Reclamation Districts 108, 150, 787, 999, 2035, and 2068.

Wastewater

Overall, wastewater treatment in Yolo County is provided by three types of treatment systems, wastewater treatment plants (WWTP), community wastewater treatment systems, and on-site wastewater treatment systems (OWTs) (i.e., individual septic systems). West Sacramento wastewater is diverted to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant via the Lower Northwest Interceptor, a regional pipeline operated by the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD). The Cities of Davis, Winters, and Woodland each have municipal WWTPs that treat city-generated wastewater. While a few unincorporated areas are served by community wastewater treatment systems and WWTPs, most of the wastewater in unincorporated portions of the County is treated through the use of OWTs. OWTs generally rely on septic tanks and on-site disposal using leach fields.

Solid Waste

Solid waste and recycling services in the unincorporated County are provided by the Yolo County Division of Integrated Waste Management. The City of Davis has an exclusive franchise waste agreement with a local private hauler, Davis Waste Removal. Davis Waste Removal collects trash, recyclables, and yard materials

within the city limits (City of Davis 2016). The City of West Sacramento Public Works Department is responsible for curbside services for solid waste, recycling, and yard waste (City of West Sacramento 2016b). The City of Winters and the City of Woodland contract with Waste Management for garbage collection and recycling to residents and businesses (Waste Management 2016a, 2016b).

Most solid waste collected in the Plan Area is delivered to the County's Central Landfill, a 722-acre facility equipped to handle Class III solid waste. Maximum disposal is 1,800 tons per day. At the current waste disposal rate, the landfills closure date is estimated to be January 1, 2081, an operational life of approximately 65 years more (CalRecycle 2008). Several other waste disposal facilities in the County include: Esparto Convenience/Transfer & Recycling Center, Northern Recycling Compost in Zamora, and the Davis Waste Removal Green Material Facility.

Electricity and Natural Gas

Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) supplies most of Yolo County with electricity and natural gas. PG&E operates electricity and natural gas infrastructure in the County and throughout Northern California, including power lines, powerhouses, pipelines, and substations. Private companies provide service for some of the unincorporated areas of the County not covered by PG&E.

7.2.2 Regulatory Setting

FEDERAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS

No federal regulations related to public services or utilities are applicable to the proposed Plan.

STATE LAWS AND REGULATIONS

California Public Utilities Commission

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) regulates privately owned telecommunications, electric, natural gas, water, railroad, rail transit, and passenger transportation companies. The CPUC is responsible for assuring California utility customers have safe, reliable utility service at reasonable rates, protecting utility customers from fraud, and promoting the health of California's economy. The CPUC establishes service standards and safety rules, and authorizes utility rate changes as well as enforcing CEQA for utility construction. The CPUC also regulates the relocation of power lines by public utilities under its jurisdiction, such as PG&E. The CPUC works with other state and federal agencies in promoting water quality, environmental protection, and safety.

LOCAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan

The goals and policies of the Public Facilities and Services element of the Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan seek to ensure that infrastructure and services will be sufficient to support existing and new development in Yolo County. Policies related to public services and utilities and potentially relevant to the Plan are:

- ▲ **Policy PF-4.1.** Ensure the provision of appropriate law enforcement service and facilities to serve existing and planned land uses.
- ▲ **Policy PF-4.2.** Strive to maintain an average response time of 12 minutes for 90 percent of priority law enforcement calls in the rural areas.

- ▲ **Policy PF-5.5.** Encourage fire districts to maintain an overall fire insurance (ISO) public protection classification (PPC) rating of Rural 7 or better for fire protection service within the unincorporated communities.
- ▲ **Policy PF-5.9.** The County shall require, and applicants must provide, a will-serve letter from the appropriate fire district/department confirming the ability to provide fire protection services to the project, prior to each phase. (DEIR MM PUB-1).
- ▲ **Policy PF-5.10.** Reduce vegetation and other wildland fuels on County-owned land within the State Responsibility Area to reduce the intensity of fires, consistent with biological, scenic, and recreational considerations.
- ▲ **Policy PF-11.1.** Encourage the development of power generating and transmission facilities in appropriate alignments and locations, sufficient to serve existing and planned land uses.
- ▲ **Policy PF-11.3.** Require utility lines to follow field edges to minimize impacts on agricultural operations.

City of Davis General Plan

The City of Davis General Plan contains the following policies related to public services and utilities that are potentially relevant to the Plan:

- ▲ **Policy POLFIRE 1.2:** Develop and maintain the capacity to reach all areas of the City with emergency police and fire service within a five-minute emergency response time, 90% of the time. Response time includes alarm processing, turnout time, and travel time.
- ▲ **Policy POLFIRE 3.1:** Provide adequate infrastructure to fight fires in Davis.
- ▲ **Policy POLFIRE 3.2:** Ensure that all new development includes adequate provision for fire safety.
- ▲ **Policy WATER 2.1:** Provide for the current and long-range water needs of the Davis Planning Area, and for protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater resources.
- ▲ **Policy WATER 2.2:** Manage groundwater resources so as to preserve both quantity and quality.
- ▲ **Policy WATER 2.3:** Maintain surface water quality.
- ▲ **Policy Y&E 9.1:** It shall be the policy of the City to take all legally permissible steps to ensure the full mitigation of impacts of new development on school facilities.
- ▲ **Policy MAT 2.1:** Plan for the long-term waste disposal needs of Davis.
- ▲ **Policy WATER 4.1:** Research, monitor and participate in issues in Yolo County and the area of origin of the City's groundwater that affect the quality and quantity of water.

City of West Sacramento General Plan

The City of West Sacramento General Plan contains the following goals and policies that relate to public services and utilities and that may be applicable to the analysis of the HCP/NCCP:

Goal PFS-1. To ensure the provision of adequate and efficient facilities and services that maintain service levels, are adequately funded, and strategically funded.

- ▲ **Policy PFS-1.1. Maintain Existing Levels of Services.** The City shall give priority to providing services to existing urban areas in order to prevent the deterioration of existing levels of service.

- ▲ **Policy PFS-1.6. Neighborhood Compatibility.** The City shall ensure that public facilities, such as utility substations, water storage and treatment plants, and pumping stations are located, designed, and maintained so that noise, light, glare, or odors associated with these facilities will not adversely affect nearby land uses. The City shall require these facilities to use building and landscaping materials that are compatible with or screen them from neighboring properties.
- ▲ **Policy PFS-1.7. Clustering.** The City shall promote the clustering of public and quasi-public facilities (e.g., schools, parks, libraries, child care facilities, community activity centers), the joint-use of these facilities, and agreements for sharing costs and operational responsibilities among public service providers.
- ▲ **Policy PFS-1.8. Adaptive Infrastructure.** The City shall monitor expected impacts of climate change on the city's infrastructure and services and make appropriate adaptive facility and service modifications and upgrades.

Goal PFS-2. To maintain an adequate level of service in the City's water system to meet the needs of existing and future development while improving water system efficiency.

- ▲ **Policy PFS-2.1. Surface Water Priority.** The City shall continue to use treated surface water from the Sacramento River as the principal source of domestic water for the city, relying on treated groundwater only to supply the port pressure zone and as an emergency backup to the surface water source. The City shall pursue as expeditiously as possible, acquisition of additional surface water rights necessary to accommodate projected water demand.
- ▲ **Policy PFS-2.2. Expand to Meet Needs.** The City shall continue to expand and develop water treatment, distribution, and storage facilities to accommodate the needs of existing and planned development.

Goal PFS-3. To maintain an adequate level of service in the City's wastewater collection and conveyance system to meet the needs of existing and future development.

- ▲ **Policy PFS-3.3. Service New and Existing Development.** The City shall ensure the provision of adequate wastewater service to all new development and support the extension of wastewater service to existing developed areas where this service is lacking.
- ▲ **Policy PFS-3.4 New Treatment Facilities.** The City shall work as a member of the Sacramento County Regional Sanitation District (SRCSD) to expand and develop new wastewater treatment and disposal facilities to accommodate the needs of existing and planned development.

Goal PFS-5. To minimize the generation of waste, increase recycling, and provide for the collection and disposal of solid waste.

- ▲ **Policy PFS-5.3.** The City shall continue to coordinate with Yolo County concerning the City's continuing use of the Yolo County Central Landfill and its capacity projections.

Goal PFS-6. To ensure the provision of adequate utilities including gas, electric, and broadband communication services to West Sacramento residents and businesses, and ensure utilities are constructed in a fashion that minimizes their impacts on surrounding development and maximizes energy efficiency.

- ▲ **Policy PFS-6.1 Adequate Utility Facilities and Services.** The City shall work with utility providers to ensure the provision of adequate gas, electric, and broadband communications services and facilities to serve the needs of existing and future residents and businesses.

Goal PFS-7. To provide for the educational and literacy needs of West Sacramento residents.

- ▲ **Policy PFS-7-1. New School Sites.** The City shall assist the Washington Unified School District and others in locating and reserving appropriate sites for new schools.

- ▲ **Policy PFS-7-2. School Location and Size Standards.** The City shall use standards established by the Washington Unified School District in determining the number and location of new school sites.
- ▲ **Policy PFS-7-3. New Elementary/K-8 School Locations.** The City shall encourage new elementary/K-8 schools to be located on collector streets *within* residential areas. Elementary schools should be sited to avoid barriers such as railroad tracks and arterial streets that would separate them from the surrounding neighborhoods.
- ▲ **Policy PFS-7-4. Schools in Urban Areas.** The City shall explore the use of existing smaller sites in urban areas to accommodate lower enrollments, and/ or higher intensity facilities (e.g., multi-story buildings, underground parking, and playgrounds on roofs).
- ▲ **Policy PFS-7.13 Library Locations.** The City shall encourage the location of new libraries in areas easily accessible by walking, bicycling, and public transit.

Goal PFS-8. To maintain an adequate level of police service as new development occurs to protect residents, visitors, and property.

- ▲ **Policy PFS-8-2. Adequate Facilities.** The City shall strive to provide new and expanded law enforcement facilities and services to adequately meet the needs of existing and future development.
- ▲ **Policy PFS-8.3. Police Response Standards.** The City shall, through adequate staffing and patrol arrangements, endeavor to maintain the minimum feasible response times for police calls. The goal for average response time for Priority 1 (emergency) calls shall be five minutes.

Goal PFS-9. To prevent loss of life, injury, and property damage due to wildland and structural fires, while ensuring an adequate level of fire protection service is maintained for all.

- ▲ **Policy PFS-9.1. Adequate Facilities.** The City shall provide new and expanded fire department facilities to adequately serve the needs of existing and future development.
- ▲ **Policy PFS-9.2. Fire Response Standards.** The City shall strive to achieve and maintain a fire insurance (ISO) rating of 3 or better in the developed areas of the City. The goal for average response time for Priority 1 (emergency) calls shall be five minutes for 90 percent of the calls.
- ▲ **Policy PFS-9.3. Optimal Siting.** The City shall require that fire stations are strategically located to ensure optimal response time and physical barriers are considered in the siting of new stations.
- ▲ **Policy PFS-9.10 New Development.** The City shall require that new development provides all necessary water service, fire hydrants, and roads consistent with Fire Department standards.

City of Winters General Plan

The following policies of the City of Winters General Plan related to public services and utilities are potentially applicable to the Plan.

- ▲ **Policy IV.A.1.** The City shall ensure, insofar as possible, that public facilities and services are developed and operational as they are needed to serve new development.
- ▲ **Policy IV.A.2.** The City shall regularly monitor current levels of service in Winters' public facilities and services.
- ▲ **Policy IV.B.1.** The City shall continue to use groundwater as the principal source of domestic water for the foreseeable future. The City shall also pursue acquisition of surface water rights in order to decrease the city's dependence on groundwater.

- ▲ **Policy IV.B.7.** The City shall make preservation of groundwater recharge areas a high priority.
- ▲ **Policy IV.F.1.** The City shall, through adequate staffing and patrol arrangements, endeavor to maintain the minimum feasible response times for police calls. The goal for average response time for Priority 1 (emergency) calls shall be three minutes.
- ▲ **Policy IV.G.1.** The City shall encourage the Fire Protection District to maintain an overall fire insurance (ISO) rating of five or better for the city of Winters, but in no event should the ISO rating be allowed to fall below 6. The goal for average response time for Priority 1 (emergency) calls should be five minutes.
- ▲ **Policy IV.H.1.** The City shall assist the School District in locating and reserving appropriate sites for new schools.
- ▲ **Policy IV.H.2.** The City shall work cooperatively with the School District in monitoring housing, population, and school enrollment trends to plan for future school facility needs.
- ▲ **Policy IV.H.4.** The City shall cooperate with the School District in an effort to ensure adequate financing for new school facilities. To this end, the City shall cooperate with the School District in the collection of school facility development fees from new residential and non-residential development.

City of Woodland General Plan

The City of Woodland General Plan contains the following policies related to public services and utilities potentially applicable to the Plan.

- ▲ **Policy 5.A.1 Response Time.** Strive to maintain a high level of police service to the community by achieving the following response times:
 - Priority 1 (Major Crimes) – 5 Minutes. Dispatch time: 1 minute; Police response time: 4 minutes
 - Priority 2 (Minor Crimes) – 6 minutes. Dispatch time: 1 minute; Police response time: 5 minutes
 - Priority 3 (Major Crimes Cold) – 25 minutes. Dispatch time: 15 minutes; Police response time: 10 minutes
 - Priority 4 (Minor Crimes Cold) – 40 minutes. Dispatch time 30 minutes; Police response time: 10 minutes
 - Priority 5 (Service Calls) – 45 minutes. Dispatch time: 35 minutes; Police response time: 10 minutes
- ▲ **Policy 5.B.1: Response Time and Service Standards.** Strive to maintain a high level of fire protection service to the community by achieving the following response times:
 - Emergency medical service calls: 60 seconds turnout time, at least 90 percent of the time.
 - Fire and special operations response: 80 seconds turnout time, at least 90 percent of the time.
 - Arrival at fire suppression incident: 4 minutes or less travel time of the first arriving engine, at least 90 percent of the time.
 - Deployment of an initial full alarm assignment: 8 minutes or less travel time, at least 90 percent of the time.
 - Arrival at an emergency medical incident: 4 minutes or less travel time, at least 90 percent of the time.
 - Dispatch call answering time: 15 seconds or less, at least 95 percent of the time, and 40 seconds or less, at least 99 percent of the time.
 - Dispatch call processing time: 60 seconds or less, 90 percent of the time, and 90 seconds or less, 99 percent of the time.
- ▲ **Policy 5.B.3: ISO Target.** Strive to maintain an ISO rating of 3 or better for the city.
- ▲ **Policy 5.E.2: School Location and Site Design.** Coordinate with the Woodland Joint Unified School District, private schools, and higher education institutions on site location and design to ensure that adequate

educational facilities are available to meet the community's needs, are consistent with the General Plan and other City development regulations, and are integrated with neighborhoods.

- ▲ **Policy 5.F.1:** New Development. Ensure through the development review process that adequate public facilities and services are available to serve new development. Require that new development pay its fair share of the costs of constructing new public utilities; the costs of providing new public services; and the costs of upgrading of all existing facilities it uses, based on the demand for these facilities attributable to the new development. Exceptions may be made when new development generates significant public benefits (e.g., low-income housing, primary-wage-earner employment) and when alternative sources of funding can be obtained to offset foregone revenues.
- ▲ **Policy 5.I.4:** Low Impact Development. Require new development and redevelopment projects to incorporate site design and low impact development runoff requirements, in accordance with the Municipal Code to reduce runoff rates, filter out pollutants, and facilitate groundwater infiltration. Such features may include, but are not limited to:

 - Canopy trees or shrubs to absorb rainwater;
 - Grading that lengthens flow paths over permeable surfaces and increases runoff travel time to reduce the peak hour flow rate and the number of required drain inlets;
 - Partially removing curbs and gutters from parking areas where appropriate to allow stormwater sheet flow into vegetated areas;
 - Use of permeable paving in parking lots and other areas characterized by significant impervious surfaces;
 - On-site stormwater detention, use of bioswales and bioretention basins to facilitate infiltration;
 - Integrated or subsurface water retention facilities to capture rainwater for use in landscape irrigation and other non-potable uses; and
 - Innovative engineering practices that allow for compact, connected, and walkable urban design.
- ▲ **Policy 5.J.4:** Compliance with State Law. Pursue programs to maintain conformance with the Solid Waste Management Act of 1989 or as otherwise required by law and mandated diversion goals.
- ▲ **Policy 5.J.7:** Promote Waste Reduction. Promote solid waste reduction, recycling, and composting to Woodland residents and business as an important way to conserve limited natural resources. Encourage businesses to use recycled products in their manufacturing processes and consumers to buy recycled products.
- ▲ **Policy 5.K.2:** Coordinate with Government Agencies. Work with Yolo County and other agencies to coordinate planning for telecommunication and other utilities infrastructure on a regional basis.
- ▲ **Policy 7.A.1:** Surface Water Project. Continue to cooperate with the City of Davis and UC Davis to operate the Surface Water Project in order to balance the groundwater supply and protect against aquifer overdrafts and water quality degradation.

7.3 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

7.3.1 Methodology and Significance Criteria

METHODS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The evaluation of potential impacts to public services and utilities is based on a review of existing facilities, anticipated future facilities, and plans and policies pertaining to the Plan Area described above in Section 7.2.2, *Regulatory Setting*. The impact analysis considers the potential for increases in demand for public services and utilities and potential effects to existing public services and utilities within the Plan Area. The

analysis below does not address the expanded Plan Area along the south side of Putah Creek in Solano County. The land is primarily used for agriculture and this land use would continue. Therefore, there would be no additional demand for public services or utilities and, as such, this area is not addressed further.

As described in Section 3.3, the issuance of ITPs by the Wildlife Agencies for take of 12 covered species associated with five categories of covered activities—together with subsequent adoption and implementation of the Plan by the Applicants consistent with the Permits—is the Proposed Action considered in this EIS/EIR. Issuance of permits by the Wildlife Agencies only provides compliance with the FESA and NCCPA.

All Covered Activities are subject to the approval authority of one or more of the Applicants with jurisdiction over such projects, and HCP/NCCP approval and permit issuance for take of covered species does not confer or imply approval from any entity other than the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to implement the Covered Activities. Rather, as part of the standard approval process, individual projects will be considered for further environmental analysis and generally will receive separate, project-level environmental analysis review under CEQA and, in some cases, NEPA for those projects involving federal Agencies.

The assessment of potential effects on public services and utilities in the Plan Area is based on the anticipated changes in land cover and land uses over 50 years, corresponding to the permit term under the Proposed Action Alternative.

Anticipated changes in land cover/land use for each alternative are described in Chapter 2, Proposed Action and Alternatives. See Chapter 3, Approach to the Analysis, for a description of the methodology used across all resource chapters for the analysis of cumulative effects.

As described in Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*, the Conservancy has proposed a number of changes to the HCP/NCCP since the release of the Draft on June 1, 2017. These changes are described and Characterized in Section 2.3.2, *Alternative B – Proposed Action Alternative (Permit Issuance/Plan Implementation)*, of Chapter 2.

These proposed changes fall into several categories;

- ▲ Copy edits such as correction of spelling errors,
- ▲ Minor text clarifications and corrections such as providing or correcting cross references to other parts of the document,
- ▲ Minor numeric corrections, such as small adjustments to acreages of particular land cover types,
- ▲ Providing updated information since publication of the Draft HCP/NCCP such as including information from the City of Woodland General Plan Update 2035, which was adopted after the Draft HCP/NCCP was published,
- ▲ Clarifications or enhancements to particular plan elements such as new or updated Avoidance and Minimization Measures (AMMs),
- ▲ Increased details on plan implementation such as providing additional information on the content of the Implementation Handbook, and
- ▲ Changes in assumptions regarding costs and funding to reflect updated information.

These proposed changes have been analyzed to determine whether they would result in any changes to the impact analysis or conclusions reached in the Draft EIS/EIR. This analysis is provided in Section 24.2, *Evaluation of Proposed Modifications to the Draft HCP/NCCP*. The analysis substantiates that the proposed

changes to the HCP/NCCP do not alter the analysis or impact conclusions provided in the Draft EIS/EIR for public services and utilities. Therefore, no changes to the analysis provided below are merited.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Effects would be significant if an alternative would result in the following:

- ▲ result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for:
 - fire protection
 - police protection,
 - schools,
 - parks, or
 - other public facilities.
- ▲ exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board;
- ▲ require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;
- ▲ require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;
- ▲ have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed;
- ▲ result in the determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments;
- ▲ be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or
- ▲ comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

ISSUES NOT EVALUATED FURTHER

As stated above in Section 7.2.1, *Environmental Setting*, the County's Central Landfill has an estimated operational life of 65 more years under current disposal rates. There is sufficient permitted capacity to meet the County's existing and future solid waste disposal needs well beyond the permit term, therefore this issue is not evaluated further in this chapter.

7.3.2 Effects of Proposed Action and Alternatives

ALTERNATIVE A—NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE (NO PERMIT/NO PLAN IMPLEMENTATION)

Environmental Consequences/Environmental Effects

As described previously in Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*, under the No Action Alternative (Alternative A), take associated with development would occur over the 50-year study period consistent with the local general plans and other applicable planning documents (e.g., community plans, specific plans,

recreation plans). As also described in Chapter 2, for purposes of this analysis, development and related activities (e.g., operations and maintenance) under the No Action Alternative are considered using the same organizational categories identified in the Yolo HCP/NCCP; urban projects and activities; rural projects and activities, which includes rural public services, infrastructure, and utilities, agricultural economic development, and open space; and public and private operations and maintenance. Under the No Action Alternative, the Plan would not be approved and implemented and no Endangered Species Act authorizations would be issued by USFWS or CDFW related to the Plan. Endangered species permitting and mitigation would continue on an individual project-by-project basis. Environmental effects from the development of new public services and utility facilities associated with each development category under the No Action Alternative are addressed in each chapter within this EIS/EIR. For example, the analysis of effects on biological resources resulting from the No Action Alternative provided in Chapter 4, *Biological Resources*, encompasses the effects of public services and utilities infrastructure included in each development category. Therefore, descriptions of the physical impacts associated with the development of new public services and utility infrastructure are not repeated in detail here.

Under the No Action Alternative, development in rural and urban areas within the Plan Area would occur as planned by the plan participants, and would result in the need for expanded and additional public services and utilities infrastructure. However, provision of public services and utilities, and the infrastructure needed to provide service is included in general plans, area plans, and other applicable planning documents. Environmental effects associated with providing additional public services and facilities are assumed to be encapsulated within the overall environmental effects of the proposed development. For example, development that generates the need for a new fire station is assumed to include the needed fire station within the overall development footprint. Where facilities are needed outside a project footprint, additional environmental effects could occur, depending on the location and type of public service or utility infrastructure needed. Environmental impacts associated with the construction of public services and utility facilities would be addressed on a project-by-project basis. Mitigation measures would be proposed to reduce environmental impacts to the degree feasible. The development of new or expanded public services and utilities capacity would be consistent with the requirements of current local plans and policies regarding the provision of these services and are assumed to be sufficient to meet any growing demand as required by these plans and policies

Activities under the rural public services, infrastructure, and utilities category include construction and/or expansion of facilities to provide increased water supply, treatment, storage, and distribution facilities; wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal facilities; energy generation and distribution facilities; municipal services and facilities; landfills, collection facilities, and transfer stations; and other services, infrastructure, and utilities that serve planned land uses that are consistent with local general plans. These new facilities would respond to the demand for public services capabilities and utilities supplies generated by other development categories. Other activities under this development category, such as public and private roadways and bridges; bikeways, bike lanes, and multi-use trails would generally not increase demand on public services and utilities or involve construction of new infrastructure or facilities.

Activities under the agricultural economic development category could result in relatively large structures being constructed in a rural/agricultural area (e.g., processing plants). These projects would include infrastructure needed to support these facilities, including water, wastewater, and energy requirements. Activities under the open space category could result in campsites, picnic areas, swimming facilities, and barbeque areas. Any needed expansions of infrastructure for these projects would be minimal and limited to pipelines and other minor modifications. Substantial infrastructure projects, such as construction of new water and wastewater facilities, are not anticipated. Generally, the demand for public services would not increase substantially through implementation of these types of projects because these facilities would include project-level infrastructure to serve project-level needs (e.g. on-site septic and water systems, and populations would not substantially increase (i.e., no related increase in residential uses).

The impact descriptions provided above primarily relate to permanent changes in demand for, and provision of public services and utilities. Construction of new facilities and public and private operations and

maintenance activities have the potential to result in temporary disruptions in utilities to accommodate activities such as pipeline replacement. These types of disruptions would occur for limited periods of time, and would not result in long-term effects on utilities or public services.

As the development and other activities described above are implemented as part of the No Action Alternative, impacts to threatened and endangered species and other biological resources would occur, requiring mitigation. Mitigation measures are likely to include on-site areas of preservation within a specific project site, and smaller, non-contiguous areas of preservation lands throughout Yolo County, or nearby sites outside the county with authorization from the permitting agencies. Generally, these required mitigation actions under the No Action Alternative would either retain lands in their existing condition (i.e., preserve habitat), or convert lands to a more natural state (i.e., habitat restoration or creation), which would not increase the demand for public services and utilities.

Cumulative Effects

Expansion of development in urban and rural areas (i.e., Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, Woodland) over the past century has resulted in an increase in demand for public services and utilities to accommodate increased populations. The capacity to provide public services and utilities has typically increased as needed to meet demand.

Projects and activities included within the categories of urban and rural development would continue the trend of increasing the demand for public services and utilities and could combine other projects within the county to result in a larger cumulative increase in demand for the associated resources. Consistent with the general plans of Yolo County and the Cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland, further development of public services and utility infrastructure and facilities would occur as planned development proceeds under the No Action Alternative. Individual projects would be required to determine the increase in demand and need for new and expanded facilities, as necessary, and either provide these facilities directly, or work with service providers to fund or otherwise support provision of needed facilities.

In addition, it is anticipated that future development implemented under the No Action Alternative, as well as any other projects in the Plan Area, would comply with the policies set forth in city and county general plans. Development in unincorporated portions of the county would be subject to policies under the Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan that provide guidelines for law enforcement response time (Policy PF-4.2) and fire and emergency support to enhance the protection of life and property (Policy PF-5.5, PF-5.9, and PF-5.10). In addition, the general plans of the Cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland contain policies applicable to utility availability and adequate public services. It is assumed that compliance with general plan policies, described above under Section 7.2.2, would direct future development of utility and public services facilities and infrastructure consistent with the demand for these resources within each jurisdiction. In addition, some reasonably foreseeable future projects, such as wind and solar energy generation facilities, could assist in meeting cumulative utility demand.

As identified above in the alternative specific impact discussion, required biological resources mitigation actions under the No Action Alternative would either retain lands in their existing condition (i.e., preserve habitat), or convert lands to a more natural state (i.e., habitat restoration or creation), which would generally not contribute to demand for public services and utility resources either individually or cumulatively.

ALTERNATIVE B—PROPOSED ACTION (PERMIT ISSUANCE/PLAN IMPLEMENTATION)

Environmental Consequences/Environmental Effects

The Proposed Action Alternative (Alternative B) incorporates the same development-related activities identified for the No Action Alternative (urban projects and activities, rural projects and activities, and public and private operations and maintenance), with the HCP/NCCP providing a mechanism for the Wildlife Agencies to provide incidental take authorization for these lawfully undertaken covered activities. Public

services and utilities impacts as a result of these activities would be the same as those described under the No Action Alternative.

Where the Proposed Action Alternative differs from the No Action Alternative is in the implementation of the Yolo HCP/NCCP, including its conservation strategy and neighboring landowner protection program, as well as the required use of Avoidance and Minimization Measures during implementation of covered activities. Components of the conservation strategy include but are not limited to habitat assessment surveys and population surveys; habitat management; restoration, enhancement, and creation of habitats; conversion of agricultural lands to create habitat; construction of facilities necessary for management and maintenance; and monitoring; and control of invasive nonnative species. The following impact discussions focus on the elements of the Proposed Action Alternative that differ from the No Action Alternative. However, the primary result of the neighboring landowner protection program, from a public services and utilities perspective, would be the general preservation of existing conditions on lands adjacent to reserve system lands. The voluntary neighboring landowner protection program is described in more detail in Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*. Because the program would not change the demand for, or provision of public services and utilities, it would not have an effect on these issue areas, and is not evaluated further in the impact discussions below.

Effect PSU-1: Changes in the Demand for, or Provision of, Public Services and Utilities.

Implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would involve natural resources conservation through the preservation of natural and seminatural landscapes and maintenance of ecological integrity of large habitat blocks. These activities would result in continuation of existing agricultural operations or the preservation of existing open space, and therefore would not directly or indirectly place additional demands on the existing utilities or public services in the Plan Area.

Where existing agricultural lands are put into conservation easements, this will “fix” the types of crops that can be cultivated on the land, thereby also limiting the range of possible water demand to that needed to support the allowable crops. Without the easement, it is possible that over time, the land in question could be used to cultivate various crop types that use more water, or less water, than existing conditions. It would be speculative to conclude that placing the land under a conservation easement as part of the Plan would have an effect of either permanently increasing or decreasing water demand relative to the conditions with no easement, because absent the easements, crop patterns would change based on the individual decisions of farmers based on unknown future agricultural economic conditions, making it impossible to predict future water demand.

The conservation strategy included in the Proposed Action Alternative also includes habitat enhancement, where existing habitat conditions and values to covered species would be improved in an area, and habitat restoration and creation where an existing natural or semi-natural land cover type would be converted to a different natural land cover type (e.g., restoration of riparian habitat on land that once supported riparian habitat, but currently contains annual grassland vegetation). Vegetation plantings associated with habitat enhancement, restoration, and/or creation may require irrigation to support vegetation establishment. If the land where plantings are undertaken does not already have irrigation available, water delivery and irrigation infrastructure may need to be installed, and the irrigation would constitute a new water demand. However, irrigation needs for habitat enhancement/restoration/creation are typically relatively modest compared to more intensive land uses, and are often on the scale that water delivery can be achieved with water trucks if needed. Irrigation needs are also temporary, typically occurring for 1-3 years until plantings are established. Therefore, any effects related to water supply and water infrastructure would be minimal.

NEPA Level of Significance: As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is **less than significant**. Demand for public services and utilities resulting from covered activities under the Proposed Action Alternative would not be appreciably different from those under the No Action Alternative. Specific to the generation of demand for public services and utilities, the biological resources mitigation actions under the No Action Alternative would have a very similar result as the conservation strategy under the Proposed Action Alternative

CEQA Level of Significance: As compared to Existing Conditions, this impact is **less than significant**. Overall, with implementation of the conservation strategy included in the Proposed Action Alternative, there would be no new or expanded water or wastewater facilities and no changes in treatment capacity. Any potential increases in water demand would be minor for reserve establishment and management activities. Substantial speculation would be required to attempt to predict any changes in water demand that might be attributable to agricultural conservation easements included in the conservation strategy. Implementation of the conservation strategy would not generate population increases that could result in the need for new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities. Potential effects from establishment and management of a reserve system under the Proposed Action Alternative would not result in significant impacts to public services or utilities.

Cumulative Effects

The existing cumulative condition in the Plan Area resulting from past and present projects are described above for the No Action Alternative and remains the same for the Proposed Action Alternative.

As described above, implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would not directly or indirectly place additional demands on existing utilities or public services in the Plan Area. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative effect on public services and utilities. In terms of contributions to cumulative impacts, the Proposed Action Alternative would be the same as the No Action Alternative.

NEPA Level of Significance: As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is **less than significant**.

CEQA Level of Significance: As compared to Existing Conditions, this impact is **less than significant**.

ALTERNATIVE C—REDUCED TAKE ALTERNATIVE

Environmental Consequences/Environmental Effects

The Reduced Take Alternative (Alternative C) would include the same categories of covered activities as the Proposed Action Alternative (Alternative B); however, under the Reduced Take Alternative, there are eight areas designated for development under the Proposed Action Alternative in which no activities that would result in take of covered species would be permitted. See Chapter 2, Section 2.3.3, *Alternative C-Reduced Take Alternative* for more information on this alternative. Impacts to public services and utilities as a result of implementation of the Reduced Take Alternative would be similar to those discussed above for the No Action and the Proposed Action Alternatives. New development provided incidental take authorization by the Plan would place increased demands on public services and utilities, but these demands would be responded to consistent with applicable regulations and policies, and environmental effects of any new facilities would be consistent for those described for the No Action Alternative in other chapters of this EIS/EIR. However, impacts could be slightly less for the Reduced Take Alternative because of the reduced level of development, depending on the location and extent of any development that might be displaced from the eight areas where take of covered species is prohibited. Reserves established under the Reduced Take Alternative would be maintained as open space and would not place any substantial new demand on utilities or public services. Thus, with implementation of the reserve system, there would be no new or expanded water or wastewater facilities, demand for these services, or treatment capacity, or population increases that could result in the need for new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities.

Overall, effects on public services and utilities under the Reduced Take Alternative would not be appreciably different from those described for the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action Alternative.

NEPA Level of Significance: As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is similar and is **less than significant**.

CEQA Level of Significance: As compared to the Proposed Action Alternative, this impact is similar and remains **less than significant**.

No mitigation is required.

Cumulative Effects

The existing cumulative condition in the Plan Area resulting from past and present projects is described above for the No Action Alternative and remains the same for the Reduced Take Alternative. The individual effects on public services and utilities under the Reduced Take Alternative are not substantially different from those described for the Proposed Action Alternative. Therefore, implementation of the Reduced Take Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative effect on public services and utilities. The Reduced Take Alternative would make the same contribution to any potential adverse cumulative effects compared as the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action Alternative.

NEPA Level of Significance: As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is similar and is **less than significant**.

CEQA Level of Significance: As compared to the Proposed Action Alternative, this impact is similar and remains **less than significant**.

ALTERNATIVE D- REDUCED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative D) would include the same categories of covered activities as the Proposed Action Alternative (Alternative B), but under the Reduced Development Alternative, development within a portion of the west side of the Dunnigan area, and the Elkhorn Specific Plan Area, would not be covered activities. There are no immediate plans to develop these areas in the near term, but some type of development could potentially occur within the term of the permit. If such development were to occur, it would not be considered a covered activity under the HCP/NCCP. (See Chapter 2, Section 2.3.4, *Alternative D-Reduced Development Alternative* for more information on this alternative).

Impacts to public services and utilities as a result of implementation of the Reduced Development Alternative would be similar to those discussed above for the No Action and the Proposed Action Alternatives. Since the two areas that would not be covered by the HCP/NCCP could be developed some time in the future, the overall development scenario may ultimately not differ from the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action Alternative. Relative to demand for, and provision of, public services and utilities, the conservation/mitigation actions for all three action alternatives also would not appreciably differ.

Overall, effects on public services and utilities under the Reduced Development Alternative would not differ in any meaningful way from those described for the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action Alternative.

NEPA Level of Significance: As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is similar and is **less than significant**.

CEQA Level of Significance: As compared to the Proposed Action Alternative, this impact is similar and remains **less than significant**.

No mitigation is required.

Cumulative Effects

The existing cumulative condition in the Plan Area resulting from past and present projects is described above for the No Action Alternative and remains the same for the Reduced Development Alternative. The individual effects on public services and utilities under the Reduced Development Alternative are not substantially different from those described for the Proposed Action Alternative. Therefore, implementation of the Reduced Development Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a

significant cumulative effect on public services and utilities. The Reduced Development Alternative would make the same contribution to any potential adverse cumulative effects compared to the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action Alternative.

NEPA Level of Significance: As compared to the No Action Alternative, this impact is similar and is **less than significant**.

CEQA Level of Significance: As compared to the Proposed Action Alternative, this impact is similar and remains **less than significant**.