

II EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report evaluates the three land use alternatives under consideration for Butte County General Plan 2030 with respect to the following issues:

- ◆ Economics
 - Market Viability
 - Fiscal Impacts
 - Jobs/Housing Balance
- ◆ Public Services
 - Fire and Emergency Services
 - Sheriff Services
 - Capacity of School Districts
- ◆ Water
 - Water Supply
 - Groundwater Recharge Potential
- ◆ Wastewater
- ◆ Circulation
 - Proximity to Major Freeways/Major Roadways
 - Bicycle Circulation
 - Transit Service
- ◆ Airport Compatibility Zone Conflicts
- ◆ Potential Loss of Agricultural Land
- ◆ Biological Resources
 - Special-Status Animal and Plant Species
 - Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands
 - Sensitive Habitats
 - Deer Herd Habitat
- ◆ Safety and Hazards
 - Fire Hazards
 - Flood Hazards
 - Geologic Hazards
- ◆ Cultural Resources

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The tables provided in this Executive Summary summarize the evaluation for each study area under the three alternatives. Evaluation of each issue is scored on a four-point scale: A, B, C and D, with A being the highest possible score and D being the lowest. In some cases, the issue is not relevant without development. For example, whether or not a study area is located close to transit is not relevant if no new development would be located there. Therefore, alternatives that would not include any new development were assigned a “zero” for certain subtopics.

The scoring criteria are provided in the following sections. These criteria, as well as the methodology used in the evaluation, are also described in more detail in Appendix B.

A. Economics

1. Market Viability

- A The alternative has strong potential to absorb all planned development within the General Plan time horizon.
- B The alternative would likely experience solid demand for a substantial portion of the planned development, but might not be able to absorb 100 percent during the General Plan time horizon
- C The alternative includes at least one land use that has significant questions in terms of absorption potential
- D There are significant questions about the absorption potential of the bulk of the planned development under the alternative.
- 0 The alternative does not include any development, so absorption potential is not an issue.

2. Fiscal Impacts

- A The alternative has a realistic potential to generate significant fiscal surpluses.
- B The alternative has a realistic potential to generate some fiscal surpluses.
- C The alternative would be unlikely to generate significant surpluses or deficits, either because the fiscal impacts of development under the alternative would be basically neutral, or because the alternative does not include any new development.
- D The alternative is at risk of generating fiscal deficits.
- 0 Not assigned.

3. Jobs/Housing Balance

- A The alternative provides a significant number of new jobs in an area that needs jobs, a significant number or new homes in an area that needs homes, or maintains the jobs/housing balance of an area that currently has a balance.
- B The alternative provides a small number of new jobs in an area that needs jobs or a small number of new homes in an area that needs homes.
- C The alternative would somewhat exacerbate an existing imbalance in either jobs or housing in a particular area; OR
The alternative would add imbalanced development to an area that is currently balanced.
- D The alternative would significantly exacerbate an existing imbalance in either jobs or housing in a particular area; OR
The alternative would add extremely imbalanced development to an area that is currently balanced.

- 0 The alternative does not include any development, so the jobs/housing balance is not an issue.

B. Public Services

1. Fire and Emergency Services

- A The alternative allows a minimal amount of new development, all of which would have adequate fire and emergency service levels.

- B The alternative allows more than a minimal amount of new development, all of which would have adequate fire and emergency service levels; OR

The alternative allows a minimal amount of new development, a majority of which would have adequate service levels; OR

The alternative allows enough development to fund the construction and operation of a new fire station.

- C The alternative allows more than a minimal amount of new development, portions of which would not have adequate fire and emergency service levels; OR

The alternative allows a minimal amount of new development, all of which would not have adequate service levels.

- D The alternative allows more than a minimal amount of new development, the majority of which would not have adequate service levels.

- 0 There would be no new development under the alternative, so fire and emergency services are not an issue.

2. Sheriff Services

- A The study area has quick response times and the alternative allows only minimal new development that would not generate the need to hire a new officer.
- B The study area has quick response times and the alternative allows development that would generate the need to hire between one and five new officers.
- C The study area has quick response times and the alternative allows development that would generate the need to hire six or more new officers; OR
The study area has slow response times and the alternative allows development that would generate the need to hire five or less new officers.
- D The study area has slow response times and the alternative allows development that would generate the need to hire six or more new officers.
- 0 There would be no new development under the alternative, so sheriff services are not an issue.

3. Capacity of School Districts

- A All of the students generated from the study area would be accommodated by the existing capacity of the school district(s) which serves the study area.
- B All of the students generated from the study area would be accommodated by the planned capacity of the school district(s) that serves the study area.
- C There is no planned capacity for new students, but the study area would generate enough students to support the construction of new schools to accommodate those students.

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- D The study area would generate more students than the existing or planned capacity of the school district(s) that serves the study area, but not enough students to support the construction of new schools.
- O There would be no new development under the alternative, so schools are not an issue.

C. Water

1. Water Supply

- A The alternative allows development within the district or sphere of influence of a water provider (except in and around the City of Chico).
- B The alternative allows development that would be located near a water provider (except in and around the City of Chico).
- C The alternative allows development of less than 500 units or 50 acres of retail/industrial uses, and does not have an identified water supply; OR
The alternative allows development near the City of Chico, where there is a known cone of groundwater depression.
- D The alternative allows development of more than 500 units or 50 acres of retail/industrial uses, and does not have an identified water supply.
- O There would be no new development under the alternative, so water supply is not an issue.

2. Groundwater Recharge Potential

- A There would be no new development under the alternative; OR
The alternative allows less than 500 new homes or 50 acres of retail/industrial uses in the Mountain Inventory Unit.
- B The alternative allows more than 500 new homes or 50 acres of retail/industrial uses in the Mountain Inventory Unit.

- C The alternative allows less than 500 new homes or 50 acres of retail/industrial uses in the Valley or Foothill Inventory Units.
- D The alternative allows more than 500 new homes or 50 acres of retail/industrial uses in the Valley or Foothill Inventory Units.
- 0 Not assigned.

D. Wastewater

- A The alternative includes only urban levels of development that can be effectively served by sewers, adequate sewer capacity exists in the area, and the connection fees adequately cover the costs of providing sewer service.
- B The alternative includes reasonably low levels of non-urban development that can effectively be served by septic; OR

The alternative includes only urban levels of development that can be effectively served by sewers, adequate sewer capacity exists in the area, but the connection fees do not adequately cover the costs of providing sewer service; OR

The alternative includes urban levels of development that can be effectively served by sewers, the developable area is adjacent to a sewer system with adequate capacity, and it appears that the development will create the ability to expand the sewer system; OR

The alternative includes urban levels of development that can be effectively served by sewers, and it appears that the development will create the ability to form a new sewer system.
- C The alternative includes urban levels of development that could conceivably be served by septic or package plants, but with difficulty; OR

The alternative includes urban levels of development that can be effectively served by sewers, the developable area is adjacent to a sewer system with adequate capacity, but the development may not create the ability to expand the sewer system;

The alternative includes urban levels of development that can be effectively served by sewers, the developable area is in or adjacent to a sewer system, but the system may not have sufficient capacity to serve additional development.

- D The alternative includes urban levels of development that cannot effectively be served by septic (because it is too numerous or dense), nor with a sewer system (because densities are too low or total numbers are too small).
- 0 There would be no new development under the alternative, so wastewater is not an issue.

E. Circulation

1. Proximity to Freeways and Major Roadways

- A The study area is located on or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.
- B The study area is within ½ mile of a State highway or major roadway.
- C The study area is within 1 mile of a State highway or major roadway.
- D The study area is more than 1 mile of a State highway or major roadway.
- 0 There would be no new development under the alternative, so roadway proximity is not an issue.

2. Bicycle Circulation

- A The study area is on or adjacent to an existing or planned bicycle facility and is located within 1 mile of an existing urban area.
- B The study area is on or adjacent to an existing bike facility but located beyond 1 mile of an existing urban area; OR
The study area is on or adjacent to a planned bike facility and located within 1 mile of an existing urban area.
- C The study area is on or adjacent to a planned bike facility and beyond 1 mile of an existing urban area; OR
The study area is not on or adjacent to planned bicycle facility, but is within 1 mile of an existing urban area.
- D The study area is not on or adjacent to an existing or planned bike facility, and it is located more than 1 mile from an existing urban area.
- 0 There would be no new development under the alternative, so bicycle facilities are not an issue.

3. Transit Service

- A The study area is located on or adjacent an existing transit route.
- B The study area is within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of an existing transit route.
- C The study area is within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of an existing transit route.
- D The study area is more than $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of an existing transit route.
- 0 There would be no new development under the alternative, so transit access is not an issue.

F. Airport Compatibility Zone Conflicts

- A Study area is located within Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones, and land uses would be consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan; OR

Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.
- C Study area is located within Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones, and a portion of the alternative would not be consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.
- D Study area is located within Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones, and the entire alternative would not be consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.
- O Not assigned.

G. Potential Loss of Agricultural Land

- A The study area is located outside of an important farmland area; OR

The alternative does not include any development.
- B There is important farmland within or adjacent to the study area, but development would avoid the important farmland.
- C The alternative would allow 1 to 49 acres of Prime Farmland and/or Farmland of Statewide Significance to be developed, or would allow 1 to 99 acres of Grazing Land to be developed; OR

The alternative would allow the conversion of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Significance or Grazing Land within the North Chico Specific Plan area, which has been identified as a development area.

- D The alternative would allow 50 or more acres of Prime Farmland and/or Farmland of Statewide Significance to be developed, or would allow 100 or more acres of Grazing Land to be developed.
- 0 Not assigned.

H. Biological Resources

1. Special-Status Plants and Animals

- A The study area has no known occurrences of special-status species.
- B There are special-status species in the study area, but development could be configured to avoid all known occurrences of special-status species.
- C Development would occur in an area with potential habitat for special-status species, and likely could not be configured to avoid that potential habitat; OR
Agriculture or resource conservation uses would occur in an area with known occurrences of special-status species.
- D Development would occur in an area with known occurrences of special-status species.
- 0 Not assigned.

2. Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands

- A The study area does not include Critical Habitat or other protected lands.
- B The study area includes Critical Habitat or other protected lands, but development would preserve all existing Critical Habitat or other protected lands.
- C Development would occur on a small amount of Critical Habitat or other protected lands; OR

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Agriculture or resource conservation uses would occur on Critical Habitat or other protected lands.

- D Development would occur on a substantial amount of Critical Habitat or other protected lands.
- 0 Not assigned.

3. Sensitive Habitat

- A The study area does not include sensitive habitat.
- B The study area includes areas of sensitive habitat, but development would preserve all sensitive habitats.
- C Development would occur on a small area of sensitive habitats; OR
Agriculture or resource conservation uses would occur on sensitive habitat areas.
- D Development would occur on a substantial area of sensitive habitats.
- 0 Not assigned.

4. Deer Herd Habitat

- A The study area does not include any deer range habitat, OR
The alternative allows only non-timber agricultural uses.
- B The study area includes areas of deer range habitat, but development would preserve all deer range habitat.
- C Development, timber operations, or resource conservation uses would occur on Intermediate or Winter Range deer habitat.
- D Development, timber operations, or resource conservation uses would occur on Critical Winter Range deer habitat.
- 0 Not assigned.

I. Safety and Hazards

1. Fire Hazards

- A The study area is located outside of a high or very high fire hazard area;
OR
The alternative does not include any development.
- B The study area includes a high or very high fire hazard area, but development would avoid the fire hazard area.
- C The alternative would allow 1 to 24 acres of development in a very high fire severity area, or 1 to 49 acres of development in a high fire severity area.
- D The alternative would allow 25 or more acres of development in a very high fire severity area, or 50 or more acres of development in a high fire severity area.
- 0 Not assigned.

2. Flood Hazards

- A The study area is outside of a FEMA floodplain; OR
The alternative does not include any development.
- B The study area includes a FEMA floodplain, but development would avoid the floodplain.
- C The alternative would allow 1 to 24 acres of development in a 100-year floodplain, or 1 to 49 acres of development in a 500-year floodplain.
- D The alternative would allow 25 or more acres of development in a 100-year floodplain, or 50 or more acres of development in 100-year and 500-year floodplains.
- 0 Not assigned.

3. Geologic Hazards

- A The study area is outside of a geologic hazard area; OR
The alternative does not include any development.
- B The study area includes a geologic hazard area, but development would avoid it; OR
The alternative would allow development on or near a Pre-Quaternary fault. (Pre-Quaternary faults do not show any evidence of displacement in the last 1.6 million years and therefore are not considered to present a high risk of fault rupture.)
- C The alternative would allow 1 to 99 acres of development in a very highly constrained geologic hazard area, or 1 to 199 acres of development in a highly constrained geologic hazard area.
- D The alternative would allow 100 or more acres of development in a very highly constrained geologic hazard area, 200 or more acres of development in a highly constrained geologic hazard area, or any development on or near the Cleveland Hills fault.
- O Not assigned.

J. Cultural Resources

- A The alternative includes only Resource Conservation uses; OR
The alternative includes only an agriculture designation that would likely be used for grazing, which has little impacts on cultural resources.
- B The alternative includes only rural residential or very low density residential development, which could likely be configured to avoid impacts to cultural resources; OR

The alternative includes only an agriculture designation that would likely be used for timber, which can be harvested in a way that avoids impacts to cultural resources, OR

The alternative includes development or agricultural cultivation in:

- ◆ Up to 30 percent of a medium-sensitivity area
- ◆ Up to 50 percent of a low-sensitivity area

C The alternative includes development or agricultural cultivation in:

- ◆ Up to 50 percent of a high-sensitivity area
- ◆ 31 to 60 percent of a medium-sensitivity area
- ◆ 51 to 70 percent of a low-sensitivity area

D The alternative includes development or agricultural cultivation in:

- ◆ Over 50 percent of a high-sensitivity area
- ◆ Over 60 percent of a medium-sensitivity area
- ◆ Over 70 percent of a low-sensitivity area

0 Not assigned.

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 2 (NORTH CHICO SPECIFIC PLAN)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Strong market area. Full absorption questionable under all alternatives, but generally viable uses	B	B	B
Fiscal Impacts	Good revenue potential. Large amounts of retail can be served by existing services.	B	B	B
Jobs/Housing Balance	All alternatives would generate jobs/housing ratios of greater than 1.0.	C	C	C
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternative 1 allows more than minimal development, the majority of which would not have adequate service levels. Alternatives 2 and 3 would support a new fire station.	D	B	B
Sheriff	Response times are relatively quick to this study area. Alternatives 1 and 2 would generate the need for more than five new officers. Alternative 3 would generate the need for about 5 new officers.	C	C	B
Schools	Study area is served by the Chico Unified School District. Alternatives 1 and 2 would support new schools. Alternative 3 could be accommodated by planned capacities.	C	C	B
Water				
Water Supply	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow development near the California Water Service Company (Chico District), where there is a known cone of groundwater depression.	C	C	C
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow significant development.	D	D	D
Wastewater	Study area is adjacent to the City of Chico's municipal sewer service. Development under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 could support the expansion of the sewer system. However, development under Alternatives 1 and 2 may require a new sewer interceptor line, for which the City's sewer impact fees may not be adequate.	C	C	B
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a state highway or major roadway.	A	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area.	B	B	B
Transit	Within ¼ mile of an existing transit line.	B	B	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 2 (NORTH CHICO SPECIFIC PLAN) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is within the Chico Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones. Portions of Alternatives 1, 2 and 3, mainly outside of the village core, are not compatible with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.	C	C	C
Agriculture	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would convert 480 acres of Prime Farmland and 805 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses. However, the NCSP was adopted to provide for a mixed-use residential development plan, and an EIR has accounted for the loss of agricultural land.	C	C	C
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	Under all alternatives, development would occur in areas that provide suitable habitat for special-status plants and animals.	C	C	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	Under all alternatives, development would occur in Vernal Pool Core Recovery Area.	D	D	D
Sensitive Habitats	Under all alternatives, development would occur in over half of the vernal swale complex in the study area.	D	D	D
Deer Herd Habitat	There is no deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within fire hazard areas.	D	D	D
Flooding	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within flooding hazard areas.	D	D	D
Geologic Hazards	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located in areas with erosion, subsidence and expansive soil hazards.	D	D	D
Cultural Resources	There are 12 previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area, four of which are eligible for listing in the NRHP. All of the alternatives include significant development and none provide for Resource Conservation land use designations that could be used to protect significant cultural resources.	D	D	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 3 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 3 (BELL MUIR)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Alternative 2 receives a B due to more aggressive absorption requirements.	A	B	A
Fiscal Impacts	Good revenue potential with service efficiencies.	B	B	B
Jobs/Housing Balance	No jobs to balance new housing.	C	C	C
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow more than minimal new development, all of which would have adequate service levels.	B	B	B
Sheriff	Response times are relatively quick to this study area. Alternatives 1 and 3 would not generate the need for new officers. Alternative 2 would generate the need for more than five new officers.	A	C	A
Schools	Study area is served by the Chico Unified School District. Alternatives 1 and 3 could be accommodated by existing capacity. Alternative 2 would support a new school.	A	C	A
Water				
Water Supply	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow development near the California Water Service Company (Chico District), where there is a known cone of groundwater depression.	C	C	C
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternatives 1 and 3 allow minor development, and Alternative 2 allows significant development.	C	D	C
Wastewater	Study area is adjacent to the City of Chico's municipal sewer service. Alternative 1 could effectively be served by septic. Alternative 2 could support the expansion of the sewer system, but may not be adequately covered by the City's impact fees. Alternative 3 cannot effectively be served by septic or sewer.	B	C	D
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	Near a State highway or major roadway.	B	B	B
Bicycle Circulation	Near a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area,	B	B	B
Transit	Within ¼ mile of an existing transit line.	B	B	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 3 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 3 (BELL MUIR) CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would convert 270 acres of Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses.	D	D	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	There are no known occurrences or potential habitat of special-status species in this study area.	A	A	A
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There are no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	There are no sensitive habitats in this study area.	A	A	A
Deer Herd Habitat	There is no deer habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	This study area is located outside of fire hazard areas.	A	A	A
Flooding	This study area is located outside of a FEMA floodplain.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	This study area is located outside of geologic hazard areas.	A	A	A
Cultural Resources	There are no previously recorded cultural resource sites in the study area. Because the study area is of low sensitivity and Alternatives 1 and 3 result in few new dwelling units and low density residential development, they are given a C despite not having a Resource Conservation designation that could be used to protect significant cultural resources. Alternative 2 will result in more new residential units and some retail development.	B	D	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 4 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 4 (FOREST RANCH)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Buildout of retail components of all 3 is questionable during General Plan time horizon. Alternative 1 is mitigated by more viable residential component.	C	D	D
Fiscal Impacts	Good revenue potential in this study area. Alternatives 2 and 3 are all retail.	C	D	D
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternative 1 does not add enough jobs to offset residential. Alternatives 2 and 3 are all jobs and no housing.	C	A	A
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternative 1 allows more than minimal development, and Alternatives 2 and 3 allow minimal development. No development would have adequate service levels.	D	C	C
Sheriff	Response times are slow to this study area. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would generate the need for less than six new officers.	C	C	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Chico Unified School District. Alternative 1 could be accommodated by planned capacity.	B	0	0
Water				
Water Supply	There is no identified water supply for the study area. Alternative 1 allows significant development, and Alternatives 2 and 3 allow minor development.	D	C	C
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternative 1 allows significant development, and Alternatives 2 and 3 allow minor development.	D	C	C
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternative 1 could be served by sewer with difficulty. Development under Alternatives 2 and 3 can effectively be served by septic.	C	B	B
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and more than 1 mile from an urban area.	C	C	C
Transit	More than 1 mile from an existing transit line.	D	D	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 4 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 4 (FOREST RANCH) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Approximately 180 acres of Grazing Land would be converted to non-agricultural uses under Alternative 1.	D	B	B
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	Under Alternative 1, much of the study area would be developed, potentially impacting 2 known occurrences of special-status plants. However, because the housing is low-density, these occurrences could be avoided. Alternatives 2 and 3 would not allow significant new development and would retain the existing character of the study area.	B	B	B
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There is no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	There are no sensitive habitats in this study area.	A	A	A
Deer Herd Habitat	Alternative 1 would allow a significant number of dwelling units in Winter Habitat for deer herd. Alternatives 2 and 3 would not allow significant new development but would allow timber harvest that could impact Winter Range deer habitat.	C	C	C
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	Much of the study area that would be developed is located within a high fire severity zone.	D	C	C
Flooding	The study area is not located within a 100-year or 500-year FEMA flood zone.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	Much of the study area is limited by potential erosion hazards. Alternatives 2 and 3 would include about 1 acre of development that would be constrained by significant geologic hazards.	D	C	C
Cultural Resources	There are no previously recorded cultural resource sites in the study area. None of the alternatives include designated Resource Conservation land uses that could be used to protect significant cultural resources. Alternative 1 would provide for high density residential development and a large number of new homes, and therefore has the greatest potential to impact cultural resources. Timber harvesting designated in Alternatives 2 and 3 poses fewer potential impacts to cultural resources because areas can be avoided.	D	B	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 5 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 5 (MAGALIA/PARADISE PINES)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Full absorption of Alternative 1 retail is doubtful. Alternative 2 includes no new development; Alternative 3 likely to buildout fully.	C	0	A
Fiscal Impacts	Large amount of retail development in Alternative 1, but unlikely to fully absorb in General Plan time horizon. Reasonable revenue potential and service efficiency for Alternative 3.	B	C	B
Jobs/Housing Balance	Because large retail component in Alternative 1 is unlikely to fully build out in General Plan time horizon, potential jobs/housing balance benefits may not be realized. Alternative 2 would not add any jobs. Alternative 3 lacks jobs to balance housing.	C	0	C
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1 and 3 allow more than a minimal amount of new development. Portions of the development under Alternative 1 and all of the development under Alternative 3 would have adequate service levels.	C	0	B
Sheriff	Response times are relatively quick to this study area. Alternatives 1 and 3 would generate the need for between one and five new officers.	B	0	B
Schools	Study area is served by the Paradise Unified School District, which has significant capacity beyond current enrollment. Alternatives 1 and 3 could be accommodated by the existing capacity.	A	0	A
Water				
Water Supply	The majority of the study area is served by the Del Oro Water Company.	B	0	B
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternative 1 allows significant development, and Alternative 3 allows minor development. There would be no new development under Alternative 2.	D	A	C
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternative 1 could be served by septic or package plants, but with difficulty. Development under Alternative 3 cannot effectively be served by septic or sewer.	C	0	D
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	0	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area.	B	0	B
Transit	On or adjacent to an existing transit line.	A	0	A

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 5 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 5 (MAGALIA/PARADISE PINES) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	There is no identified Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Grazing Land located in the study area.	A	A	A
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	There are occurrences and potential habitat for special-status species in this study area. There is potential to avoid development in these areas under Alternatives 2 and 3.	D	B	B
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There is critical habitat which would not be affected in this study area.	C	C	C
Sensitive Habitats	Sensitive riparian habitats associated with creeks, lakes, and reservoirs exist in this study area.	C	C	C
Deer Herd Habitat	Intermediate and Winter Range deer herd habitat is present on the edges of this study area. There is potential to avoid development in deer herd habitat under Alternatives 2 and 3.	C	C	C
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	A large portion of the land proposed for development under Alternatives 1 and 3 is located in high and very high fire severity areas.	D	A	D
Flooding	The study area is not within the 100-year or 500-year FEMA flood zones.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	Alternative 1 development would be limited by potential erosion and expansive soil hazards. Approximately 2 acres of land that would be developed under Alternative 3 has high potential for landslides.	D	A	D
Cultural Resources	There are 66 previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area, seven of which are eligible for listing in the NRHP. Alternative 1 has the highest potential impact because it involves the most development and does not include any Resource Conservation land use designations that could be used to protect significant cultural resources. Because grazing and timber harvesting can have minimal impacts on cultural resources, Alternative 2 is the least likely to cause impacts to significant cultural resources. Alternative 3 is assigned a D despite the low density of development because of the extremely high sensitivity of this study area for cultural resources.	D	C	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 6 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 6 (UPPER STILSON)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Alternative 1 is likely to be fully absorbed. Alternative 2 is all Resource Conservation, so absorption potential is not a concern. Residential strong but retail questionable under Alternative 3.	A	0	C
Fiscal Impacts	Alternative 1 includes minimal development and would be fiscally neutral. Alternative 2 includes no development and would be fiscally neutral. Service inefficiency is a concern under Alternative 3.	C	C	D
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternatives 1 and 2 have no impact on jobs/housing. Retail component balances out residential component of Alternative 3 during General Plan time horizon.	0	0	B
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1 and 3 allow more than a minimal amount of new development, the majority of which would not have adequate service levels.	D	0	D
Sheriff	Response times are relatively quick to this study area. Alternative 1 would not generate the need for new officers. Alternative 3 would generate the need for about two new officers.	A	0	B
Schools	Study area is served by the Chico Unified School District. Alternative 1 could be accommodated by the existing capacity. Alternative 2 could be accommodated by the planned capacity.	A	0	B
Water				
Water Supply	There is no identified water supply for the study area. Alternative 1 allows minor development, and Alternative 3 allows significant development.	C	0	D
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternative 1 allows minor development, and Alternative 3 allows significant development. There would be no new development under Alternative 2.	C	A	D
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternative 1 cannot effectively be served by septic or sewer. Development under Alternative 3 could support a new sewer system.	D	0	B
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	0	0	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and more than 1 mile from an urban area.	0	0	C
Transit	More than 1 mile from an existing transit line.	0	0	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 6 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 6 (UPPER STILSON) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Over 1,000 acres of Grazing Land would be converted to non-agricultural uses under Alternatives 1 and 3.	D	A	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	There is one special-status plant occurrence and potential habitat for several special-status species in this study area. Although Alternatives 1 and 3 would impact this potential habitat, it is widespread in the region.	D	C	D
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There are no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	Oak woodlands are common in the study area and would be impacted by development under Alternatives 1 and 3.	D	C	D
Deer Herd Habitat	Almost the entire study area is within Critical Winter Range for deer herd.	D	D	D
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	High and very high fire severity zones would impact development under Alternatives 1 and 3.	D	A	D
Flooding	Approximately 13 acres of land designated for development under Alternatives 1 and 2 is located within a 100-year FEMA floodplain.	C	C	B
Geologic Hazards	An unnamed fault in the southwest of the study area would limit development under Alternative 1.	D	A	B
Cultural Resources	There are three previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area. Alternative 1 does not provide for Resource Conservation land use designations that could be used to protect significant cultural resources. There is no designated development and 4,244 acres of Resource Conservation land use under Alternative 2. Alternative 3 would result in the largest number of new residential units, but includes designated Resource Conservation land use areas that may be used to protect significant cultural resources.	D	A	C

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 7 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 7 (CONCOW)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Housing in Alternatives 1 and 3 may be viable over General Plan time horizon. Retail viability in all alternatives is questionable due to lack of market.	C	C	C
Fiscal Impacts	Service inefficiency and limited revenue generating potential.	C	C	C
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternatives 1 and 3 do not provide enough jobs to offset new residential.	D	C	D
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1 and 3 allow more than minimal development. Portions of the development under Alternative 1 and all of the development under Alternative 3 would not have adequate service levels. Alternative 2 allows minimal development, all of which would not have adequate service levels.	C	C	D
Sheriff	Response times are slow to this study area. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would generate the need for less than six new officers.	C	C	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Golden Feather Union Elementary and Oroville Union High School Districts. Alternatives 1 and 3 could be accommodated by the existing capacities.	A	0	A
Water				
Water Supply	There is no identified water supply for the study area. Alternative 1 allows significant development, and Alternatives 2 and 3 allow minor development.	D	C	C
Recharge Potential	Study area is unlikely to serve as a potential recharge area. Alternative 1 allows significant development, and Alternatives 2 and 3 allow minor development.	B	A	A
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternatives 1 and 3 cannot effectively be served by septic or sewer. Development under Alternative 2 can be effectively served by septic.	D	B	D
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	More than 1 mile from a state highway or major roadway.	D	D	D
Bicycle Circulation	More than 1 mile from an existing or planned bike facility and from an urban area.	D	D	D
Transit	More than 1 mile from an existing transit line.	D	D	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 7 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 7 (CONCOW) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternative 1 would convert 210 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses. Alternative 2 assumes there are 4 acres of grazing land in this study area. Alternatives 2 and 3 would convert less than 100 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	D	C	C
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	There are known occurrences and potential habitat in this study area.	D	C	D
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There is no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	There is riparian habitat associated with creeks, lakes, and reservoirs and possibly serpentine-derived soils.	D	C	D
Deer Herd Habitat	There is Critical Winter Range and Winter Range deer herd habitat.	D	D	D
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is partially located in areas of very high fire severity. Under Alternative 2, only approximately 5 acres of land would be developed within the very high severity zone.	D	C	D
Flooding	The study area is not located within a 100-year or 500-year FEMA flood zone.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1 and 3 is located with erosion and landslide hazard areas. Approximately 1 acre of land that would be developed under Alternative 1 has high potential for expansive soils. Approximately 5 acres of land that would be developed under Alternative 2 has high potential for landslides.	D	C	D
Cultural Resources	There are 11 previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area, one of which is eligible for listing in the NRHP. All the alternatives include designated Resource Conservation land use areas that could be used to protect significant cultural resources. Alternative 1 provides for the most acreage in residential development and the most new residential units. Alternative 2 proposes that the entire study area be designated Resource Conservation. Alternative 3 would result in less than 3 percent of the study area in residential or non-residential development other than Resource Conservation.	C	A	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 8 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 8 (BERRY CREEK)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Isolation makes residential absorption questionable, and lack of sufficient market support makes retail under Alternative 1. Since Alternatives 2 and 3 do not include new development, absorption is not an issue.	D	0	0
Fiscal Impacts	Service inefficiencies are a concern under Alternative 1. Since Alternatives 2 and 3 do not include new development, fiscal impacts are not an issue.	D	C	C
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternative 1 jobs not likely during General Plan time horizon due to lack of market for retail component. Alternatives 2 and 3 include no new development.	D	0	0
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternative 1 allows more than minimal development, portions of which would not have adequate service levels.	C	0	0
Sheriff	Response times are slow to this study area. Alternative 1 would generate the need for approximately one new officer.	C	0	0
Schools	Study area is served by the Pioneer Union Elementary and Oroville Union High School Districts. Alternative 1 could be accommodated by the existing capacities.	A	0	0
Water				
Water Supply	There is no identified water supply for the study area. Alternative 1 allows minor development.	C	0	0
Recharge Potential	Study area is unlikely to serve as a potential recharge area. Alternative 1 allows minor development, and there would be no new development under Alternatives 2 and 3.	A	A	A
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternative 1 cannot effectively be served by septic or sewer.	D	0	0
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	More than 1 mile from a state highway or major roadway.	D	0	0
Bicycle Circulation	More than 1 mile from an existing or planned bike facility and from an urban area.	D	0	0
Transit	More than 1 mile from an existing transit line.	D	0	0

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 8 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 8 (BERRY CREEK) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Land that would be developed under Alternative 1 would convert approximately 175 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	D	A	A
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	There are occurrences of special-status species and potential habitat. Development under Alternative 1 is very low density and could avoid sensitive resources.	B	C	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There is no critical habitat in this study area. National Forest Service parcels in this study area would not be affected by development.	B	B	B
Sensitive Habitats	There are sensitive habitats in the study area. Development under Alternative 1 is very low density and could avoid sensitive resources.	B	C	C
Deer Herd Habitat	The entire study area is within Critical Winter Range for deer herd. Alternative 1 allows very low density development that could impact deer range. Alternatives 2 and 3 allow timber harvest, which would impact deer range.	D	D	D
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	Land that would be developed under Alternative 1 is partially located within a high and very high fire severity zones. Alternative 2 assumes there are 4 acres located within a very high fire severity area.	D	A	A
Flooding	Land that would be developed under Alternative 1 is partially located within a 100-year FEMA flood zone.	C	A	A
Geologic Hazards	Land that would be developed under Alternative 1 is partially located in areas of severe erosion hazard, high potential for soil expansion and high landslide potential.	D	A	A
Cultural Resources	There are 32 previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area. None of the alternatives provide for Resource Conservation land use designations that could be used to protect significant cultural resources. However, Alternative 1 would allow extensive very low density residential development, which could be located to avoid cultural resources, and Alternatives 2 and 3 would allow for agriculture/timber operations, which can be conducted in a way that avoids resources.	B	B	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 9 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 9 (DOE MILL/HONEY RUN)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Absorption potential is not a concern under Alternative 1. Strong potential for full absorption for both Alternatives 2 and 3.	0	A	A
Fiscal Impacts	With no new development, Alternative 1 would have neutral fiscal impacts. Alternative 3 is more attractive than Alternative 2 due to retail potential.	C	B	A
Jobs/Housing Balance	Not enough new jobs to offset new housing under Alternatives 2 and 3.	0	C	C
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 2 and 3 allow more than minimal development, the majority of which would not have adequate service levels.	0	D	D
Sheriff	Response times to this study area are quick. Alternative 2 would generate the need for more than five new officers. Alternative 3 would generate the need for about five new officers.	0	C	B
Schools	Study area is served by the Chico Unified School District. Alternative 2 would support a new school. Alternative 3 could be accommodated by the planned capacity.	0	C	B
Water				
Water Supply	Alternatives 2 and 3 allow development near the California Water Service Company (Chico District), where there is a known cone of groundwater depression.	0	C	C
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. There would be no new development under Alternative 1. Alternatives 2 and 3 allow significant development.	A	D	D
Wastewater	Study area is adjacent to the City of Chico's municipal sewer service. Development under Alternatives 2 and 3 could support the expansion of the sewer system. However, development under Alternative 2 may require a new sewer interceptor line, for which the City's sewer impact fees may not be adequate.	0	C	B
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	0	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area.	0	B	B
Transit	Within ½ mile of an existing transit line.	0	B	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 9 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 9 (DOE MILL/HONEY RUN) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 2 and 3 would convert significant amounts of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	A	D	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	There are known occurrences and potential habitat.	C	D	D
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There is Vernal Pool Core Recovery Area throughout the study area.	C	D	D
Sensitive Habitats	Vernal swale complexes and oak woodlands.	C	D	D
Deer Herd Habitat	There is Winter Range deer herd habitat on the extreme eastern border of this study area but development is presumed to avoid it.	A	C	C
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	No land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 or 3 is located in a fire hazard area. Alternative 2 assumes there are 2 acres, not for development, that are located within a high fire severity area.	A	B	B
Flooding	No land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 or 3 is located in a FEMA floodplain. Alternatives 2 and 3 assume there is 1 acre of land that would be developed, located in a 100-year flood zone.	A	B	B
Geologic Hazards	No land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 or 3 is located in a geologic hazard area.	A	B	B
Cultural Resources	There are three previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area. Alternative 1 does not provide for Resource Conservation land use designations that could be used to protect significant cultural resources. Alternatives 2 and 3 may impact significant cultural resources, depending on the type and level of activities conducted within designated Resource Conservation land use areas.	A	B	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 10 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 10 (SKYWAY/NEAL ROAD)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	With no new development, market viability is not a concern under Alternative 1. Alternative 2 would likely capture adequate market support. Full absorption of industrial under Alternative 3 is questionable.	0	A	C
Fiscal Impacts	With no new development, Alternative 1 would have is neutral fiscal impacts. Alternative 2 could achieve fiscal benefits if able to take advantage of existing service capacities. Alternative 3 would likely trigger need for a new fire station.	C	B	D
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternative 1 has no impact on jobs/housing. Alternative 2 lacks jobs. Alternative 3 would be a strong job generator.	0	C	B
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Portions of the development under Alternatives 1 and 2 would not have adequate service levels. The majority of the development under Alternative 3 would not have adequate service levels.	C	C	D
Sheriff	Study area has quick response times. Alternatives 1 and 2 would not generate the need for new officers. Alternative 3 would generate the need for one to five new officers.	A	A	B
Schools	Study area is served by the Paradise Unified School District, which has significant capacity beyond current enrollment. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 could be accommodated by the existing capacity.	A	A	A
Water				
Water Supply	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow development near the Paradise Irrigation District.	B	B	B
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternatives 1 and 2 allow minor development, and Alternative 3 allows significant development.	C	C	D
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternatives 1 and 2 can effectively be served by septic. Development under Alternative 3 can support a new sewer system.	B	B	B
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area.	B	B	B
Transit	On or adjacent to an existing transit line.	A	A	A

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 10 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 10 (SKYWAY/NEAL ROAD) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Under Alternative 1, 85 acres of Grazing Land would be converted to non-agricultural uses. Under Alternative 2, 270 acres of Grazing Land would be converted to non-agricultural uses.	C	D	B
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	There are occurrences of special-status plants and small areas of potential habitat in this study area.	B	D	D
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	Part of the study area is within Vernal Pool Core Recovery Area. Under Alternative 3 a golf course would be located in this study area.	B	B	D
Sensitive Habitats	Oak woodland is common and several vernal pools occur in the study area.	C	C	C
Deer Herd Habitat	Most of the study area is Winter Range.	C	C	C
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is partially located in areas of high and very high fire severity.	D	D	D
Flooding	The study area is not located in a 100-year or a 500-year FEMA flood zone.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located in erosion hazard areas. Only about 5 acres of land that would be developed under Alternative 1 is located in an erosion hazard area. Approximately 5 acres of land that would be developed under Alternative 3 has very high potential for expansive soils.	C	C	D
Cultural Resources	There are 43 previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area, six of which are eligible for listing in the NRHP. Alternative 1 includes grazing and rural residential land uses and would not result in any new residential units. Alternative 2 does not provide for Resource Conservation land use designations that could be used to protect significant cultural resources. Alternative 3 includes mixed residential development but also includes designated Resource Conservation land use areas.	A	C	C

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 11 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA II (PARADISE URBAN RESERVE)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	All development likely to be viable over General Plan time horizon, for all alternatives.	A	A	A
Fiscal Impacts	Good revenue and service efficiency potential mean this study area could be fiscally neutral or positive, as long as rural service standards are acceptable.	B	B	B
Jobs/Housing Balance	Only residential development in all alternatives. Paradise needs jobs.	C	C	C
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Portions of the development under Alternatives 1 and 3 would not have adequate service levels. All of the development under Alternative 2 would not have adequate service levels.	C	D	C
Sheriff	Study area has slow response times. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would generate the need for less than six new officers.	C	C	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Paradise and Durham Unified School Districts. Alternative 1 could be accommodated by the existing capacities. Alternatives 2 and 3 would exceed the capacity of the DUSD, but not enough students for a new school.	A	D	D
Water				
Water Supply	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow development near the Paradise Irrigation District.	B	B	B
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternatives 1 and 3 allow minor development, and Alternative 2 allows significant development.	C	D	C
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternative 1 can effectively be served by septic. Development under Alternative 2 could be served by sewer with difficulty. Development under Alternative 3 cannot effectively be served by septic or sewer.	B	C	D
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area.	B	B	B
Transit	On or adjacent to an existing transit line.	A	A	A

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE II ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA II (PARADISE URBAN RESERVE) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Portions of the study area are located within the Paradise Skypark's Airport Compatibility Zones.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1 and 3 would convert significant portions of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	D	B	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	There are known occurrences and potential habitat in this study area.	B	D	D
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There is critical habitat for Central Valley steelhead in Little Dry Creek, but it would not be affected by any of the alternatives. No other critical habitat or other protected lands exist in the study area.	B	B	B
Sensitive Habitats	Blue oak woodlands and Little Dry Creek and Hamlin Canyon support riparian habitat. All alternatives have the potential to avoid these habitat areas.	C	C	C
Deer Herd Habitat	Winter Range deer herd habitat exists throughout the study area.	C	C	C
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	Significant portions of land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 are located within areas of high and very high fire severity.	D	D	D
Flooding	The study area is not located in a 100-year or a 500-year FEMA flood zone.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	Land that would be developed under Alternative 1 is constrained by severe in erosion hazard areas.	D	B	D
Cultural Resources	There are 13 previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area, one of which is eligible for listing in the NRHP. Alternative 1 is assigned a B despite the absence of resource conservation land use areas because the development is very sparse. Alternatives 2 and 3 may impact significant cultural resources as a result of residential development, but both include resource conservation land use areas that could be used to protect significant cultural resources.	B	C	C

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 12. ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 12 (SOUTHEAST PARADISE SPECIFIC PLAN)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Market demand should be adequate over course of General Plan time horizon.	A	A	A
Fiscal Impacts	The fiscal concern is adequacy of existing fire services in the study area. If service levels must be upgraded, then rank could turn negative.	B	B	B
Jobs/Housing Balance	Lack of jobs to offset new housing.	C	C	C
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow more than minimal development, the majority of which would not have adequate service levels.	D	D	D
Sheriff	Study area has slow response times. Development under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would not generate the need for new officers.	C	C	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Paradise Unified School District, which has significant capacity beyond current enrollment. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 could be accommodated by the existing capacity.	A	A	A
Water				
Water Supply	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow development adjacent to the Paradise Irrigation District and Del Oro Water Company.	B	B	B
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow minor development.	C	C	C
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 cannot effectively be served by septic or sewer.	D	D	D
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	Within 1 mile of a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area.	C	C	C
Transit	On or adjacent to an existing transit line.	A	A	A

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 12 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 12 (SOUTHEAST PARADISE SPECIFIC PLAN) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Portions of the study area are located within the Paradise SkyPark's Airport Compatibility Zones.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would convert approximately 200 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	D	D	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	No occurrences of special-status species are known in this study area but potential habitat is present. All alternatives are the same and would allow 300 new dwellings dispersed over 1,500 acres of Rural Residential. It is presumed that sensitive areas could be avoided.	C	C	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There are no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	Sensitive habitats, if any, are not common in this study area. New development could be configured to avoid sensitive habitats.	B	B	B
Deer Herd Habitat	The entire study area is in Winter Range for deer herd.	C	C	C
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	All development under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within areas of high and very high fire severity.	D	D	D
Flooding	The study area is not located in a 100-year or a 500-year FEMA flood zone.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	760 acres of land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within a severe erosion hazard area.	D	D	D
Cultural Resources	There are 11 previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area. All three alternatives are identical and may impact significant cultural resources through residential and recreational development. Although there is no designated resource conservation land use in the study area, the very low density of residential development would provide the opportunity to avoid significant cultural resources.	C	C	C

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 13 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 13 (SOUTHEAST PARADISE/PENTZ ROAD)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Alternative 1 includes no new development. Likely adequate market support for all development under Alternatives 2 and 3 during General Plan time horizon.	0	A	A
Fiscal Impacts	Since Alternative 1 includes no new development, fiscal impacts would be neutral. Low revenue potential, service inefficiencies are concerns under Alternatives 2 and 3.	C	C	C
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternative 1 includes no new development. Lack of jobs to offset housing under Alternatives 2 and 3.	C	C	C
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 2 and 3 allow more than minimal development, all of which would not have adequate service levels.	0	D	D
Sheriff	Study area has slow response times. Alternatives 2 and 3 would generate the need for less than six new officers.	0	C	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Paradise Unified School District, which has significant capacity beyond current enrollment. Alternatives 2 and 3 could be accommodated by the existing capacity.	0	A	A
Water				
Water Supply	Alternatives 2 and 3 allow development within the Del Oro Water Company service area.	0	A	A
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. There would be no new development under Alternative 1, and Alternatives 2 and 3 allow minor development.	A	C	C
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternatives 2 and 3 cannot effectively be served by septic or sewer.	0	D	D
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	Within ½ mile of a State highway or major roadway.	0	B	B
Bicycle Circulation	Within 1 mile of a planned bike facility within 1 mile of an urban area.	0	C	C
Transit	Within 1 mile of an existing transit line.	0	C	C

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 13 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 13 (SOUTHEAST PARADISE/PENTZ ROAD) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternative 3 would convert 35 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	B	B	C
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	Potential habitat for special-status animals and plants.	C	C	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There are no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	Potential oak woodlands (require field verification), could be avoided for all alternatives.	B	B	B
Deer Herd Habitat	Winter Range deer herd habitat throughout Study area.	C	C	C
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within high and very high fire severity areas. Alternative 1 assumes there are approximately 4 acres located within a high fire severity area.	A	D	D
Flooding	The study area is not located in a 100-year or a 500-year FEMA flood zone.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	Areas of high erosion and landslide hazards could be avoided in Alternatives 1 and 2. Approximately 46 acres of land that would be developed under Alternative 3 is located in an area of high landslide potential.	A	B	C
Cultural Resources	There are no previously recorded cultural resource sites in the study area, but the study area is of moderate sensitivity based on landforms and the presence of waterways. Under Alternative 1 the entire study area is designated Resource Conservation/Constrained. Alternative 2 provides for some low density residential development, and Alternative 3 provides for more very low and low density residential development. Alternatives 2 and 3 both include some designated Resource Conservation/Constrained land use.	A	B	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 14 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 14 (NANCE CANYON/SR-99)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Market viability not an issue under Alternative 1. Absorption of retail and industrial Alternatives 2 and 3 during General Plan time horizon is doubtful.	0	D	D
Fiscal Impacts	Alternative 1 has neutral fiscal impacts. Alternatives 2 and 3 have potential fiscal benefits due to revenue potential and service efficiencies, even if all commercial development is not absorbed during General Plan time horizon, but fiscal benefits from Alternative 3 are less certain.	C	B	C
Jobs/Housing Balance	No impact in Alternative 1; large employment component in Alternatives 2 and 3 creates jobs surplus; however, full job potential not likely within General Plan time horizon.	0	B	B
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 2 and 3 could support a new fire station.	0	B	B
Sheriff	Study area has quick response times. Alternatives 2 and 3 would generate the need for more than five new officers.	0	C	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Chico Unified School District. Alternative 2 could be accommodated by the planned capacity.	0	B	0
Water				
Water Supply	There is no identified water supply for the study area. Alternatives 2 and 3 allow significant development.	0	D	D
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. There would be no new development under Alternative 1, and Alternatives 2 and 3 allow significant development.	A	D	D
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternatives 2 and 3 could support a new sewer system.	0	B	B
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	0	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and more than 1 mile from and urban area.	0	C	C
Transit	On or adjacent to an existing transit line,	0	A	A

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 14 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 14 (NANCE CANYON/SR-99) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 2 and 3 would convert significant portions of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	A	D	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	Under Alternative 2 and 3, development would be located within vernal pools and swales that provide potential habitat for a number of special-status species. Alternative 1 would designate these areas in Grazing and Open Land but range improvements could damage vernal swale complex that provides potential habitat for special-status species.	C	D	D
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	Under Alternative 2 and 3, development would be located within Vernal Pool Core Recovery Area.	C	D	D
Sensitive Habitats	Under Alternatives 2 and 3, development would be located within sensitive habitats – vernal pool and swale areas and oak woodlands. Alternative 1 would designate these areas in Grazing and Open Land but range improvements could damage sensitive vernal swale complex.	C	D	D
Deer Herd Habitat	There is Winter Range habitat in the east. Alternative 1 would designate Agriculture for whole study area, while the other alternatives would allow development within winter Range.	A	C	C
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	Land that would be developed is located outside of fire hazard areas.	A	B	B
Flooding	Land that would be developed is located outside of the FEMA floodplain.	A	B	B
Geologic Hazards	Alternative 1 does not include any development. Development in Alternatives 2 and 3 could be located to avoid known erosion, subsidence and expansive soil hazard areas.	A	B	B
Cultural Resources	There are ten previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area. Alternative 1 results in the entire study area being used for grazing, which results in little impacts to cultural resources. Alternatives 2 and 3 may impact significant cultural resources as a result of the significant residential and industrial development, respectively. However, both alternatives also provide for large area of designated Resource Conservation that can be used to protect significant cultural resources.	A	B	C

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 15 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 15 (HAMLIN CANYON/SR-99)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	For Alternative 1, absorption potential is not an issue. Alternatives 2 and 3, large portions of planned development will likely go unabsorbed during the General Plan time horizon.	0	D	D
Fiscal Impacts	Alternative 1 includes no development so would have neutral fiscal impacts. For Alternatives 2 and 3, solid revenue potential and service efficiencies create potential for fiscal benefits.	C	B	B
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternative 1 has no impact on jobs/housing balance. Large job-generating components under Alternatives 2 and 3 lead to job surpluses and improvement of countywide job deficit.	0	B	B
Public Services	Public Services are limited for the majority of this study area.	∅	∅∅	∅∅
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 2 and 3 could support a new fire station.	0	B	B
Sheriff	Study area has quick response times. Alternatives 2 and 3 would generate the need for more than five new officers.	0	C	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Durham Unified School District. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would not generate any new students.	0	0	0
Water				
Water Supply	There is no identified water supply for the study area. Alternatives 2 and 3 allow significant development.	0	D	D
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. There would be no new development under Alternative 1, and Alternatives 2 and 3 allow significant development.	A	D	D
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternatives 2 and 3 could support a new sewer system.	0	B	B
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	0	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and more than 1 mile from an urban area.	0	C	C
Transit Service	On or adjacent to an existing transit line.	0	A	A

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 15 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 15 (HAMLIN CANYON/SR-99) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternatives 2 and 3 would convert 1,690 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	A	D	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	Known occurrences and potential habitat.	C	D	D
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There is critical habitat for steelhead in Little Dry Creek which will not be affected and Vernal Pool Core Recovery Habitat at lower elevations which could be affected.	C	D	D
Sensitive Habitats	Vernal swale complexes, oak and riparian woodlands.	C	D	D
Deer Herd Habitat	Winter range deer herd habitat at higher elevations.	A	C	C
Safety & Hazards	Development under Alternatives 2 and 3 could avoid fire and flooding hazards, but likely would not be able to avoid areas of expansive soils.			
Fire	The hilly north and east portions of the study area are in a high fire severity zone, but development likely could be located to avoid these areas.	A	B	B
Flooding	A portion of the site is in the FEMA 100-year flood zone along Hamlin Slough.	A	B	B
Geologic Hazards	The flatter eastern part of the study area is subject to expansive soils, and development under Alternatives 2 and 3 likely would not be able to avoid areas of expansive soils.	A	D	D
Cultural Resources	There are nine previously recorded cultural resources sites in Study Area 15. Alternatives 2 and 3 may impact significant cultural resources.	A	B	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 16 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 16 (OROVILLE CHICO HIGHWAY/SR-99)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Absorption potential is not a concern under Alternatives 1 and 2. Absorption potential under Alternative 3 is neutral due to concern for potential to fully absorb, but compared to Study Areas 14 and 15, the plan is much less aggressive.	0	0	C
Fiscal Impacts	No significant fiscal impacts under Alternatives 1 and 2. Alternative 3 is not likely to generate substantial positive or negative fiscal impacts.	C	C	C
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternatives 1 and 2 would not affect jobs/housing balance. Alternative 3 would generate jobs and no housing.	0	0	C
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternative 3 allows more than minimal development, all of which would not have adequate service levels.	0	0	D
Sheriff	Study area has quick response times. Alternative 3 would generate the need for one to five new officers.	0	0	B
Schools	Study area is served by the Durham Unified School District, which is near capacity. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would not generate any new students.	0	0	0
Water				
Water Supply	Alternative 3 allows development near the Durham Mutual Water Company.	0	0	B
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. There would be no new development under Alternatives 1 and 2. Alternative 3 allows significant development.	A	A	D
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternative 3 could support a new sewer system.	0	0	B
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	0	0	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and more than 1 mile from an urban area.	0	0	C
Transit	On or adjacent to an existing transit line.	0	0	A

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 16 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 16 (OROVILLE CHICO HIGHWAY/SR-99) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternative 3 would convert approximately 150 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	A	A	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	Most of the study area provides habitat for special-status species. Under Alternatives 1 and 2 the study area would remain in Grazing and open Land and land use would not change, but range improvements could damage vernal swale complex that provides potential habitat for special-status species. Alternative 3 would develop 150 acres.	C	C	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	The study area is within vernal pool critical habitat. Under Alternatives 1 and 2 the study area would remain in Grazing and open Land and land use would not change, but grazing range improvements could damage sensitive vernal swale complex. Alternative 3 would develop 150 acres.	C	C	D
Sensitive Habitats	Most of the study area is sensitive habitat. Under Alternatives 1 and 2 the study area would remain in Grazing and open Land and land use would not change, but grazing range improvements could damage sensitive vernal swale complex. Alternative 3 would develop 150 acres.	C	C	D
Deer Herd Habitat	There is no deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	The study area is located outside of a fire hazard area.	A	A	A
Flooding	Land that would be developed is located outside of the FEMA floodplain.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	Alternative 1 does not include any development. Development in Alternatives 2 and 3 could be located to avoid 6 acres of expansive soils, the only geologic constraint in this study area.	A	B	B
Cultural Resources	Under Alternatives 1 and 2, the entire study area would remain in agricultural use dedicated to grazing, which poses a minimal risk of destruction of cultural resources. Alternative 3 would result in industrial development, but almost half of the study area is designated Resource Conservation land that may be used to protect significant cultural resources.	A	A	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 17 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 17 (DURHAM)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Although all alternatives would likely absorb a substantial amount of planned development during the General Plan time horizon, full absorption of retail uses is unlikely.	C	C	C
Fiscal Impacts	Good revenue potential and service efficiency result in B's for all three alternatives.	B	B	B
Jobs/Housing Balance	Each alternative would generate a surplus of jobs relative to new employed residents. Full jobs/surplus unlikely to be realized during General Plan time horizon.	A	A	B
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow more than minimal development, portions of which would not have adequate service levels.	C	C	C
Sheriff	Study area has quick response times. Alternative 1 would not generate the need for new officers. Alternatives 2 and 3 would generate the need for one to two officers.	A	B	B
Schools	Study area is served by the Durham Unified School District, which is near capacity. Alternative 1 could be accommodated by existing capacity. Alternatives 2 and 3 would exceed the existing capacity and would not generate enough students to support a new school.	A	D	D
Water				
Water Supply	Portions of the study area are served by the Durham Irrigation District and the Durham Mutual Water Company.	B	B	B
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternatives 1 and 2 allow minor development, and Alternative 3 allows significant development.	C	C	D
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternatives 1 and 2 cannot effectively be served by septic or sewer. Development under Alternative 3 could be served by sewer with difficulty.	D	D	C
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to an existing bike facility and a planned bike facility and more than 1 mile from an urban area.	B	B	B
Transit	Within 1 mile of an existing transit line.	C	C	C

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 17 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 17 (DURHAM) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternatives 1 and 2 would convert 700 acres of Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses. Alternative 3 would convert 900 acres of Prime Farmland to residential use.	D	D	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	One known occurrence and potential habitat for 10 special-status species, mostly in the Butte Creek corridor.	C	C	D
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There is critical habitat for both Central Valley steelhead and Central Valley fall-run and spring-run Chinook in Butte Creek.	C	C	D
Sensitive Habitats	Butte Creek runs through the study area and supports extensive areas of willow scrub and emergent wetlands.	C	C	D
Deer Herd Habitat	There is no deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	The study area is located outside of a fire hazard area.	A	A	A
Flooding	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within a 100-year FEMA floodplain.	D	D	D
Geologic Hazards	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within a subsidence hazard area.	D	D	D
Cultural Resources	There are two previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area, one of which is eligible for listing in the NRHP. Alternatives 1 and 2 include more than 1,000 acres of agriculture devoted to rice and orchards, which can result in impacts to cultural resources. Alternative 3 does not include any land designated for agriculture. None of the alternatives provide for Resource Conservation land use designations that could be used to protect significant cultural resources.	D	D	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 18 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 18 (DURHAM-DAYTON/SR-99)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	With no planned development, absorption potential is not a concern under Alternatives 1 and 2. Alternative 3 receives a D due to questionable market potential for both its retail and industrial components.	0	0	D
Fiscal Impacts	With no planned development, neither Alternatives 1 or 2 would have significant fiscal impacts. Industrial and retail development under Alternative 3 would likely trigger the need for a new fire station, resulting in fiscal deficits.	C	C	D
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternatives 1 and 2 would not affect jobs/housing balance. With no housing and significant employment potential, Alternative 3 could lead to an excess of jobs in the Durham area.	0	0	B
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternative 3 allows more than minimal development, all of which would not have adequate service levels.	0	0	D
Sheriff	Study area has quick response times. Alternative 3 would generate the need for one to five new officers.	0	0	B
Schools	Study area is served by the Durham Unified School District. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would not generate any new students.	0	0	0
Water				
Water Supply	There is no identified water supply for the study area. Alternative 3 allows significant development.	0	0	D
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. There would be no new development under Alternatives 1 and 2. Alternative 3 allows significant development.	A	A	D
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternative 3 could support a new sewer system.	0	0	B
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	0	0	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and more than 1 mile from an urban area.	0	0	C
Transit	Within ¼ mile of existing transit line.	0	0	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 18 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 18 (DURHAM-DAYTON/SR-99) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternative 3 would convert 110 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	A	A	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	Most of the study area provides habitat for special-status species. Under Alternatives 1 and 2 the study area would remain in Grazing and Open Land and land use would not change, but range improvements could damage vernal swale complex that provides potential habitat for special-status species. Alternative 3 would develop the study area.	C	C	D
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	The study area is within vernal pool critical habitat. Under Alternatives 1 and 2 the study area would remain in Grazing and open Land and land use would not change, but grazing range improvements could damage sensitive vernal swale complex. Alternative 3 would develop the study area.	C	C	D
Sensitive Habitats	Most of the study area is sensitive habitat. Under Alternatives 1 and 2 the study area would remain in Grazing and open Land and land use would not change, but grazing range improvements could damage sensitive vernal swale complex. Alternative 3 would develop the study area.	C	C	D
Deer Herd Habitat	There is no deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	The study area is located outside of a fire hazard area.	A	A	A
Flooding	The study area is located outside of a FEMA floodplain.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	Alternatives 1 and 2 do not include any development. Approximately 80 acres under Alternative 3 is located in an area with significant erosion and subsidence hazards.	A	A	C
Cultural Resources	There are no previously recorded cultural resource sites in the study area, resulting in low archaeological sensitivity. Under Alternatives 1 and 2, the study area is completely designated agriculture and would likely be used for grazing. Alternative 3 includes designated land uses for retail and industrial.	A	A	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 19 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 19 (DURHAM-PENTZ/SR-99)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Market viability is not an issue for Alternatives 1 and 2. Alternative 3 receives a D due to questionable viability of both its residential and retail components.	0	0	D
Fiscal Impacts	Fiscal impacts of Alternatives 1 and 2 would be neutral due to no new development. The potential fiscal benefits of the retail components of Alternative 3 are unlikely to be realized in General Plan time horizon.	C	C	C
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternatives 1 and 2 would not affect jobs/housing balance. Alternative 3 would be likely to have positive jobs/housing balance during the General Plan time horizon, depending upon absorption of retail component.	0	0	B
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternative 3 allows more than minimal development, all of which would not have adequate service levels.	0	0	D
Sheriff	Study area has quick response times. Alternative 3 would generate the need for one to five new officers.	0	0	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Durham Unified School District, which is near capacity. Alternative 3 would exceed the existing capacity, and would not generate enough students to support a new school.	0	0	D
Water				
Water Supply	There is no identified water supply for the study area. Alternative 3 allows significant development.	0	0	D
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. There would be no new development under Alternatives 1 and 2. Alternative 3 allows significant development.	A	A	D
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternative 3 could support a new sewer system.	0	0	B
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	0	0	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and more than 1 mile from an urban area.	0	0	C
Transit	On or adjacent to an existing transit line.	0	0	A

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 19 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 19 (DURHAM-PENTZ/SR-99) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternative 3 would convert 220 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	A	A	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	Three known occurrences and potential habitat for 19 special-status species.	C	C	D
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There is critical habitat for Central Valley steelhead in Little Dry Creek which flows through the middle of the study area and vernal pool core recovery area throughout the study area.	C	C	D
Sensitive Habitats	Grassland with vernal swale complex occupies the northwestern half of the study area and riparian habitat along Little Dry Creek.	C	C	D
Deer Herd Habitat	There is no deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	The study area is located outside of fire hazard areas.	A	A	A
Flooding	Land that would be developed under Alternative 3 is located in a 100-year FEMA floodplain.	A	A	D
Geologic Hazards	Alternatives 1 and 2 do not include any development. Land that would be developed under Alternative 3 is located in an area with subsidence and expansive soil hazards.	A	A	D
Cultural Resources	There are two previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area. Alternatives 1 and 2 would result in the entire study area remaining devoted to grazing, which has little impact on cultural resources. Alternative 3 would result in the residential and retail development of the study area and would not provide for Resource Conservation land use designations that could be used to protect significant cultural resources.	A	A	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 20 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 20 (SR-191 (CLARK ROAD)/DURHAM PENTZ)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Large portions of the retail components of all alternatives would not be likely to absorb in this location.	D	C	D
Fiscal Impacts	The retail development in all three alternatives has strong revenue potential, and this study area is in a TRA where the County receives an above-average percentage of property taxes.	A	A	A
Jobs/Housing Balance	Each alternative would help improve jobs/housing balance in the Paradise area; however, this exacerbates an existing job surplus that already exists in the immediate area due to presence of Butte College.	D	C	B
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternative 1 allows minimal development, all of which would not have adequate service levels. Alternatives 2 and 3 allow more than minimal development, portions of which would not have adequate service levels.	C	C	C
Sheriff	Study area has slow response times. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would generate the need for less than six new officers.	C	C	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Durham Unified School District, which is near capacity. Alternative 2 could be accommodated by the existing capacity. Alternative 3 would exceed the existing capacity, and would not generate enough students to support a new school.	0	A	D
Water				
Water Supply	There is no identified water supply for the study area. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow minor development.	C	C	C
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow minor development.	C	C	C
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternative 1 can effectively be served by septic. Development under Alternatives 2 and 3 cannot effectively be served by septic or sewer.	B	D	D
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and more than 1 mile from an urban area.	C	C	C
Transit	On or adjacent to an existing transit line.	A	A	A

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 20 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 20 (SR-191 (CLARK ROAD)/DURHAM PENTZ) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternatives 1 and 2 would convert less than 100 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses. Alternative 3 would convert 315 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	C	C	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	No special-status species are known to occur in this study area, but vernal pools and grassland provide potential habitat for several special-status species. Under Alternative 1 the study area would remain in Grazing and Open Land, but Alternatives 2 and 3 would allow development in potential habitat for special-status species.	C	C	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	The study area is within vernal pool critical habitat. Under Alternative 1 the study area would remain in Grazing and Open Land, but Alternatives 2 and 3 would allow development in the critical habitat.	C	D	D
Sensitive Habitats	Most of the study area is sensitive habitat. Under Alternative 1 the study area would remain in Grazing and Open Land, but Alternatives 2 and 3 would allow development in sensitive vernal pool habitat	C	D	D
Deer Herd Habitat	Most of the study area is outside deer herd habitat, there is a small area of Intermediate Range deer herd habitat.	C	C	C
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	Land that would be developed is outside of fire hazard areas.	B	B	B
Flooding	Land that would be developed is outside of the 100-year FEMA floodplain. Alternative 1 assumes there are 4 acres in a 500-year flood zone.	A	B	B
Geologic Hazards	Alternatives 1 and 2 have 20 acres of development, and Alternative 3 has 560 acres, in areas with very high expansive soil potential.	C	D	D
Cultural Resources	The study area possesses low sensitivity for cultural resources. Alternative 1 is assigned an A despite the retail development because of the area's low sensitivity and the small amount of development. Alternative 2 results in the majority of the study area remaining in agricultural use, devoted to grazing. Alternative 3 designates more than half of the study area to residential and retail development.	A	A	C

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 21 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 21 (THERMALITO)

Issue	Alternatives		
	1	2	3
Economics			
Market Viability	Alternatives 1 and 2 receive D's because of questionable absorption potential for both their residential and retail components. Alternative 3 receives a C because it includes a less aggressive quantity of residential development.	D	D C
Fiscal Impacts	All three alternatives receive a B. The large amounts of retail have high revenue potential but are unlikely to be fully built out.	B	B B B
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternatives 1 and 2 have a surplus of housing relative to jobs. Alternative 3 has potential for a surplus of jobs relative to housing, but this is unlikely to be achieved during the General Plan time horizon.	D	D D B
Public Services			
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1 and 2 could support a new fire station. Alternative 3 allows more than minimal development, portions of which would not have adequate service levels.	B	B C
Sheriff	Study area has quick response times. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would generate the need for more than five new officers.	C	C C C
Schools	Study area is served by the Thermalito Union and Oroville Union High School Districts. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would exceed existing capacities. Alternative 3 would generate enough students to support a new school.	D	D D C
Water			
Water Supply	Study area would be served by TID.	A	A A A
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow significant development.	D	D D D
Wastewater	Development under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would be served by TID and SC-OR. SC-OR may not have sufficient capacity to served additional development.	C	C C C
Circulation			
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	A A A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area.	B	B B B
Transit	On or adjacent to an existing transit line.	A	A A A

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 21 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 21 (THERMALITO) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Portions of the study area are located within Oroville Municipal Airport's Land Use Compatibility Zones.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would convert 30 acres of Farmland of Statewide Significance and 355 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	D	D	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	Potential habitat for 17 special-status species.	C	C	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There is no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	Grassland with vernal swale complex is present in the northwest corner of the study area. Small areas of valley oak riparian woodland have been mapped scattered throughout the study area, and valley oak riparian and emergent wetlands are associated with the Feather River in the east of the study area.	C	C	C
Deer Herd Habitat	There is no deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	The study area is located outside of fire hazard areas.	A	A	A
Flooding	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is partially located within a 100-year and a 500-year FEMA floodplain. Alternatives 2 and 3 assume there are 4 acres of land that would be developed, located in a 500-year flood zone.	D	D	D
Geologic Hazards	The study area is located outside of areas known for erosion, subsidence, landslide, expansive soil, fault and liquefaction hazards.	A	A	A
Cultural Resources	There are no previously recorded cultural resource sites in the study area. None of the alternatives provide for Resource Conservation land use designations that could be used to protect significant cultural resources. Alternatives 1 and 2 provide for much higher density residential development that does Alternative 3, which is almost entirely Rural Residential and Very Low Density Residential.	D	D	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 23 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 23 (EASTERN OROVILLE/OROVILLE HILLS)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Each of the alternatives receives a negative rank due to questionable market viability of their retail and residential components. Alternatives 2 and 3 have a marginally better rank than Alternative 1 because their housing components are less aggressive.	D	C	C
Fiscal Impacts	Although each has potential for fiscal surpluses if all retail is built out, this is unlikely during General Plan time horizon.	C	C	C
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternative 1 would have a shortfall of jobs relative to new housing. Alternatives 2 and 3 would help improve jobs/housing balance even if not fully built out.	C	B	B
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 could support a new fire station.	B	B	B
Sheriff	Study area has quick response times. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would generate the need for more than five new officers.	C	C	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Oroville City Elementary and Oroville Union High School Districts. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would exceed existing capacities. Alternatives 1 and 2 would generate enough students to support new schools.	C	C	D
Water				
Water Supply	Study area would be served by the South Feather Water and Power Agency.	A	A	A
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow significant development.	D	D	D
Wastewater	A portion of the development under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would be served by LOAPUD and SC-OR; the remaining development could support expansion of the sewer system. SC-OR's connection fees do not adequately cover the costs of providing service to new development.	C	C	C
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area.	B	B	B
Transit	On or adjacent to an existing transit line.	A	A	A

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 23 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 23 (EASTERN OROVILLE/OROVILLE HILLS) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	The study area is located outside Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance and Grazing Land.	A	A	A
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	Three known occurrences and potential habitat for ten special-status species.	D	D	D
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There are no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	Mixed oak and blue oak woodlands. Extensive patches of riparian habitat along valley floors and creeks associated with Wyman Ravine and its tributaries, particularly in the study area west and northwest of Wyman. Emergent wetlands, patches of willow scrub, and small ponds are scattered throughout the study area.	D	D	D
Deer Herd Habitat	There is no deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within a high fire severity zone.	D	D	D
Flooding	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within a 100-year FEMA floodplain.	B	B	D
Geologic Hazards	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within areas of erosion, landslide, expansive soil and fault hazards.	D	D	D
Cultural Resources	This study area is highly sensitive for cultural resources. All three Alternatives allow for a small amount of Resource Conservation land use and extensive residential development. However, the Rural Residential and Very Low Density Residential development would likely be able to avoid cultural resources.	D	C	C

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 24 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 24 (STRINGTOWN MOUNTAIN)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	While the residential component of all alternatives is likely to be absorbed, the 15-acre retail component is questionable.	C	C	C
Fiscal Impacts	Each of the three alternatives is positive due to good revenue potential, provided that rural service standards are not enhanced. If service levels are increased, fiscal impacts could be negative.	B	B	B
Jobs/Housing Balance	Each of the alternatives receives a D because they would contribute to Oroville’s existing imbalance of jobs and housing.	D	D	D
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow more than minimal development, the majority of which would not have adequate service levels.	D	D	D
Sheriff	Study area has quick response times. Alternatives 1 and 2 would generate the need for about three new officers. Alternative 3 would generate the need for more than five new officers.	B	B	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Oroville City Elementary and Oroville Union High School Districts. Alternatives 1 and 2 would be accommodated by existing capacities. Alternative 3 would exceed the existing OCESD capacity, and w2ould not generate enough students to support a new K-8 school.	A	A	D
Water				
Water Supply	A portion of the study area would be served by the South Feather Water and Power Agency.	B	B	B
Recharge Potential	Study area is unlikely to serve as a potential recharge area. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow significant development.	B	B	B
Wastewater	Study area is adjacent to LOAPUD and SC-OR. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 could support expansion of the sewer system. SC-OR’s connection fees do not adequately cover the costs of providing service to new development.	C	C	C
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	Within 1 mile of a planned bike facility and more than 1 mile from an urban area.	D	D	D
Transit	More than 1 mile from an existing transit line.	D	D	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 24 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 24 (STRINGTOWN MOUNTAIN) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located outside of agricultural areas. Alternatives 1 and 2 assume there is 1 acre of grazing land in this study area.	A	A	A
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	There are no known occurrences, but there is potential habitat for special-status species throughout in this study area. All alternatives could impact potential habitat.	C	C	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There is no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	All alternative could allow development with oak woodlands	C	C	C
Deer Herd Habitat	The study area is within Critical Winter Range habitat. Although all alternatives would designate most of the study area as Resource Conservation, all would allow residential development in Critical Winter Range habitat.	D	D	D
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	Significant portions of land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 are located within fire hazard areas.	D	D	D
Flooding	Land that would be developed under Alternative 3 is located with a 100-year FEMA floodplain.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within areas of erosion hazard. Approximately 1 acre of land that would be developed under Alternative 3 has high potential for expansive soils.	D	D	D
Cultural Resources	There are 54 previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 may impact significant cultural resources because of residential development. Alternatives 1 and 2 provide for more than 80 percent of designated Resource Conservation land use areas that could be used to protect significant cultural resources.	C	C	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 25 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 25 (THERMALITO AFTERBAY AREA)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Alternative 1 receives an A because it is likely that all or a substantial amount of their development could absorb during the General Plan time horizon. Alternative 2 includes no new development. Alternative 3 receives a B because its residential development requires more aggressive absorption assumptions.	A	0	B
Fiscal Impacts	Alternative 1 has sound revenue-generating potential but only a modest number of new homes. Alternative 3 receives a D because of a risk of fiscal deficits associated with the residential development if increased development triggers a need for enhanced service levels. Fiscal impacts would be neutral under Alternative 2.	B	0	D
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternatives 1 and 3 receive negative scores because they would contribute to a deteriorated jobs/housing balance in the Oroville area. Alternative 2 is neutral because it does not add housing or jobs.	C	0	D
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1 and 3 allow more than minimal development. All development under Alternative 1 would have adequate service levels. All development under Alternative 3 would not have adequate service levels.	B	0	D
Sheriff	Study area has quick response times. Alternative 1 would not generate the need for new officers. Alternative 3 would generate the need for more than five new officers.	A	0	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Thermalito Union, Oroville Union High and Biggs Unified School Districts. Alternative 1 could be accommodated by the existing capacities. Alternative 3 would exceed the existing capacities and would not generate enough students to support new schools.	A	0	D
Water				
Water Supply	Alternatives 1 and 3 allow development near TID.	B	0	B
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternative 1 allows minor development and Alternative 3 allows significant development. There would be no new development under Alternative 2.	C	A	D
Wastewater	Study area is adjacent to TID and SC-OR. Development under Alternative 1 can effectively be served by septic. Development under Alternative 3 could support the expansion of the sewer system, but SC-OR may not have sufficient capacity to served additional development.	B	0	C
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	0	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and more than 1 mile from an urban area.	C	0	C
Transit	Within 1 mile of an existing transit line.	C	0	C
A = highest possible score	D = lowest possible score	0 = not relevant		

TABLE 25 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 25 (THERMALITO AFTERBAY AREA) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Portions of study area are located within Oroville Municipal Airport's Land Use Compatibility Zones.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternatives 1 and 3 would convert 410 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	D	A	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	No known occurrences in this study area and potential habitat for 15 special-status species.	C	C	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There are no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	Grassland with vernal swale complex occupies approximately two-thirds in the southern portion of the study area.	D	C	D
Deer Herd Habitat	There is no deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	The study area is located outside hazardous fire areas.	A	A	A
Flooding	The study area is located outside of a FEMA floodplain.	D	D	D
Geologic Hazards	The study area is located outside of known geologic hazard areas.	A	A	A
Cultural Resources	There are no previously recorded cultural resource sites in the study area. None of the alternatives provide for Resource Conservation land use designations that could be used to protect significant cultural resources. However, Alternative 2 would result in the entire study area being used for grazing, Alternative 1 would result in low density residential development, and Alternative 3 would result in higher density residential and retail development.	B	A	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 26 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 26 (LAS PLUMAS/SOUTHSIDE/OPHIR)

Issue	Alternatives		
	1	2	3
Economics			
Market Viability	D	D	B
<p>Alternatives 1 and 2 receive a D because both the retail and industrial components are questionable. Alternative 3 receives a B because most, but potentially not all, of its residential development should be absorbed.</p>			
Fiscal Impacts	C	C	D
<p>Alternatives 1 and 2 receive C's because their potential fiscal benefits are unlikely to be realized within the General Plan time horizon. Alternative 3 receives a D due to low revenue-generating potential and potential liability for costs associated with substantial residential development.</p>			
Jobs/Housing Balance	D	0	D
<p>Considering absorption potential, Alternative 1 would likely result in more new housing and few new jobs, exacerbating Oroville's existing imbalance. Alternative 3 includes no jobs to balance its residential component.</p>			
Public Services			
Fire/Emergency	B	B	B
<p>Alternatives 1 and 2 could support a new fire station. Alternative 3 allows more than minimal development, all of which would have adequate service levels.</p>			
Sheriff	C	C	C
<p>Study area has quick response times. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would generate the need for more than five new officers.</p>			
Schools	D	B	D
<p>Study area is served by the Oroville City Elementary, Palermo Union and Oroville Union High School Districts. Alternatives 1 and 3 would exceed existing and planned capacities, and would not generate enough students for new schools. Alternative 2 could be accommodated by the planned capacity.</p>			
Water			
Water Supply	A	A	A
<p>Study area would be served by the South Feather Water and Power Agency.</p>			
Recharge Potential	D	D	D
<p>Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow significant development.</p>			
Wastewater	C	C	C
<p>More than half of the development under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would be served by LOAPUD and SC-OR; the remaining development could support expansion of the sewer system. SC-OR's connection fees do not adequately cover the costs of providing service to new development.</p>			
Circulation			
Roadway Proximity	A	A	A
<p>On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.</p>			
Bicycle Circulation	B	B	B
<p>On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area.</p>			
Transit	A	A	A
<p>On or adjacent to an existing transit line.</p>			
A = highest possible score	D = lowest possible score	0 = not relevant	

TABLE 26 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 26 (LAS PLUMAS/SOUTHSIDE/OPHIR) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternatives 1 and 3 would convert 55 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance and 800 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses. Alternative 2 would convert 70 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	D	C	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	There are no known occurrences of special-status species but there is potential habitat for vernal pool and grassland species in this study area. All alternatives would allow development in areas of potential habitat.	C	C	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There are no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	There are areas of sensitive vernal pool and oak woodland habitat in the south of the study area. These areas would be impacted by development under all alternatives.	D	D	D
Deer Herd Habitat	There is no deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards		Ø	Ø	Ø
Fire	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1 and 3 is located within fire hazard areas.	D	B	D
Flooding	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1 and 3 is located within a 100-year FEMA floodplain.	D	D	D
Geologic Hazards	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within a fault hazard area. Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1 and 3 is also located within erosion hazard areas.	D	D	D
Cultural Resources	There are two previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area. Alternatives 1 and 3 do not provide for Resource Conservation land use designations that could be used to protect significant cultural resources. Alternative 2 does provide for designated Resource Conservation land use areas, but also provides for moderate density residential and industrial development that could have impacts on cultural resources.	D	C	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 27 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 27 (PACIFIC HEIGHTS ROAD/SR-70)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Alternative 1 receives a C because its retail component is questionable. Viability is not an issue under Alternative 2. Alternative 3 receives an A because there is reasonable potential for absorption of a substantial portion of the planned residential and retail development over the General Plan time horizon.	C	0	A
Fiscal Impacts	Alternative 1 receives a C because potential fiscal benefits from the large retail component are unlikely to be realized in General Plan time horizon. Alternative 2 has neutral fiscal impacts. Alternative 3 receives a D due to low revenue-generating potential of residential.	C	C	D
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternative 2 has no effect on jobs/housing balance. Alternative 3 generates more employed residents than jobs.	C	0	D
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1 and 3 allow more than minimal development. Portions of the development under Alternative 1 and the majority of the development under Alternative 3 would not have adequate service levels.	C	0	D
Sheriff	Study area has quick response times. Alternative 1 would not generate the need for new officers. Alternative 3 would generate the need for more than five new officers.	A	0	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Palermo Union and Oroville Union High School Districts. Alternative 1 could be accommodated by existing capacities. Alternative 3 would exceed the existing PUSD capacity, but would generate enough students to support a new K-8 school.	A	0	C
Water				
Water Supply	Study area is adjacent to the South Feather Water and Power Agency.	B	0	B
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternative 1 allows minor development and Alternative 3 allows significant development. There would be no new development under Alternative 2.	C	A	D
Wastewater	Study area is adjacent to the City of Oroville and SC-OR. Development under Alternative 1 can effectively be served by septic. Development under Alternative 3 could support the expansion of the sewer system, but SC-OR's connection fees do not adequately cover the costs of providing service to new development.	B	0	C
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	0	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and within 1 mile of an urban area.	B	0	B
Transit	Within 1 mile of an existing transit line.	C	0	C

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 27 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 27 (PACIFIC HEIGHTS ROAD/SR-70) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	A portion of study area is located within the Oroville Municipal Airport's Land Use Compatibility Zones.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternatives 1 and 3 would convert significant areas of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	D	A	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	No known occurrences and potential habitat for 16 special-status species in this study area.	C	C	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There is a vernal pool core recovery area in this study area.	D	C	D
Sensitive Habitats	Grassland with vernal swale complex is present within the grasslands in the study area. Blue oak woodland and savanna are also present.	C	C	C
Deer Herd Habitat	No deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	The study area is located outside of fire hazard areas.	A	A	A
Flooding	Land that would be developed under Alternative 1 is located within a 100-year FEMA floodplain.	C	A	B
Geologic Hazards	Land that would be developed under Alternative 1 is located within a severe erosion hazard area. Alternative 2 does not include any development. Development under Alternative 3 would be located to avoid erosion and subsidence hazards.	D	A	B
Cultural Resources	There are six previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area. Alternatives 1 and 2 do not provide for Resource Conservation land use designations that could be used to protect significant cultural resources, but Alternative 2 would result in the entire study area in use for grazing, which would have relatively low impacts to cultural resources. Alternative 3 provides for the most residential development, but also provides for designated Resource Conservation land use areas.	C	A	C

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 28 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 28 (SOUTHERN OROVILLE)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Alternative 1 receives a C because absorption of its industrial component is questionable. Alternative 2 receives an A because it is likely that all its planned development would absorb during the General Plan time horizon. Alternative 3 had questionable potential to absorb a significant portion of its planned residential development during the General Plan time horizon.	C	A	C
Fiscal Impacts	Alternative 1 receives a B because impacts would not be significantly positive or negative. Alternative 2 would likely have neutral fiscal impacts due to service efficiencies offsetting low revenue potential. Alternative 3's large residential component may trigger service upgrade needs, resulting in a fiscal deficit.	C	C	D
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternative 1 unlikely to realize full potential jobs/housing benefits during General Plan time horizon, but could provide some additional jobs. Alternatives 2 and 3 do not include any jobs to balance new residential development, but Alternative 2 only includes 100 new homes.	B	C	D
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow more than minimal development. Portions of the development under Alternative 1 and all of the development under Alternative 3 would not have adequate service levels. All development under Alternative 2 would have adequate service levels.	C	B	D
Sheriff	Study area has quick response times. Alternative 1 would generate the need for three to five new officers. Alternative 2 would not generate the need for any new officers. Alternative 3 would generate the need for more than five new officers.	B	A	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Palermo Union and Oroville Union High School Districts. Alternative 1 could be accommodated by the planned capacities. Alternative 2 could be accommodated by existing capacities. Alternative 3 would exceed the existing PUSD capacity, but would generate enough students to support a new K-8 school.	B	A	C
Water				
Water Supply	A portion of the study area would be served by the South Feather Water and Power Agency.	B	B	B
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternatives 1 and 3 allow significant development and Alternative 2 allows minor development.	D	C	D
Wastewater	Study area is adjacent to the City of Oroville and SC-OR. Development under Alternatives 1 and 3 could support the expansion of the sewer system, but SC-OR's connection fees do not adequately cover the costs of providing service to new development.. Development under Alternative 2 can effectively be served by septic.	C	B	C

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 28 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 28 (SOUTHERN OROVILLE) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area.	B	B	B
Transit	On or adjacent to an existing transit line.	A	A	A
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would convert significant amounts of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses. Alternative 2 assumes there are 4 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance in this study area.	D	D	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	One vernal-pool associated special-status plant is known to occur and there is extensive potential habitat for vernal-pool associated special-status species. All alternatives would allow development in this habitat.	D	D	D
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There are no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	Much of the study area supports sensitive vernal swale habitat. All alternatives would allow development in this habitat.	D	D	D
Deer Herd Habitat	There is no deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	The study area is located outside of fire hazard areas.	A	A	A
Flooding	Land that would be developed under Alternative 1 is located within a 100-year FEMA floodplain. Alternative 2 and 3 assume there are 3 acres of land that would be developed, located in a 100-year flood zone.	C	B	B
Geologic Hazards	520 acres of development under Alternative 1 is located within severe erosion and subsidence hazard areas. Development in Alternatives 2 and 3 could be located to avoid most subsidence hazard areas, but in Alternative 3 40 acres is still affected.	D	A	B
Cultural Resources	There is one previously recorded cultural resource site in the study area. Alternative 1 includes less than 30 percent industrial development, with the remainder in Very Low Density Residential. Alternative 2 allows for rural residential use and provides resource conservation. Alternative 3 provides Low Density Residential and resource conservation, but will allow for more dwelling units, creating the potential for greater impacts than Alternative 2.	B	B	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 29 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 29 (PALERMO)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Alternative 1 has questionable potential to fully absorb residential and commercial components. Alternatives 2 and 3 are positive because all planned development could potentially be absorbed during General Plan time horizon.	D	A	A
Fiscal Impacts	There is low revenue potential associated with the residential component of Alternative 1 and a likely need to enhance service standards. Alternatives 2 and 3 receive a C because it is unlikely they would realize full potential benefits associated with retail during General Plan time horizon.	D	C	C
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternative 1 does not provide adequate jobs to offset residential growth. Alternatives 2 and 3 both would potentially improve jobs/housing balance.	D	B	B
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternative 1 could support a new fire station. Alternatives 2 and 3 allow more than minimal development, all of which would have adequate service levels.	B	B	B
Sheriff	Study area has quick response times. Alternative 1 would generate the need for more than five new officers. Alternatives 2 and 3 would not generate the need for any new officers.	C	A	A
Schools	Study area is served by the Palermo Union and Oroville Union High School Districts. Alternative 1 would exceed the existing capacities, and would not generate enough students to support a new high school. Alternatives 2 and 3 could be accommodated by the existing capacities.	D	A	A
Water				
Water Supply	Study area is served by the South Feather Water and Power Agency.	A	A	A
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternative 1 allows significant development and Alternatives 2 and 3 allow minor development.	D	C	C
Wastewater	Study area is near LOAPUD and SC-OR. Development under Alternative 1 could support the expansion of the sewer system, but SC-OR's connection fees do not adequately cover the costs of providing service to new development. Development under Alternatives 2 and 3 cannot effectively be served by septic or sewer.	C	D	D
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area.	B	B	B
Transit	On or adjacent to an existing transit line.	A	A	A
A = highest possible score	D = lowest possible score	0 = not relevant		

TABLE 29 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 29 (PALERMO) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would convert Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Significance and Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	D	D	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	One known occurrence and potential habitat for 18 special-status species.	D	D	D
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There are no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	Many sensitive habitats are found throughout this study area. Blue oak woodland occupies the northeast corner of the study area. Grassland with vernal swale complex occurs in the south and northwest of the study area. Willow scrub and emergent wetland are found along Wyandotte Creek in the southeast of the study area and additional areas of willow scrub occur along several other drainages south of Palermo. There is an extensive area of valley oak riparian woodland along Wyman Ravine.	D	D	D
Deer Herd Habitat	No deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within a fire hazard area. Alternatives 2 and 3 assume there is 1 acre of high fire severity in this study acre.	D	C	C
Flooding	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within a 100-year FEMA floodplain. Alternative 1 assumes there are 3 acres in a 100-year flood zone.	D	D	D
Geologic Hazards	Parts of Alternative 1 are severely constrained by potential erosion, subsidence and expansive soils. Alternatives 2 and 3 avoid geologic constraints.	D	A	A
Cultural Resources	There are five previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area. Alternative 1 calls for unspecified agriculture, medium to medium high density residential, and allows no resource conservation that could be used to protect significant cultural resources. Alternatives 2 and 3 do not provide for Resource Conservation land use but do allow for very low density housing and grazing, and therefore should have less impact on potentially significant cultural resources than Alternative 1.	D	B	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 30 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 30 (BANGOR)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	All alternatives receive a D because full absorption of the residential development is questionable and full absorption of the retail development is highly unlikely.	D	D	D
Fiscal Impacts	Alternatives 1 and 3 receive a C because potential fiscal benefits associated with retail are unlikely to be realized in General Plan time horizon. Alternative 2 receives a B because with only retail, if only a portion builds out during General Plan time horizon, impacts are likely positive.	C	B	C
Jobs/Housing Balance	It is unlikely that Alternatives 1 and 3 would absorb enough retail in General Plan time horizon to help improve jobs/housing balance. Alternative 2 would improve jobs/housing balance even if retail component does not fully absorb, since there is no residential component.	D	B	D
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow more than minimal development, the majority of which would not have adequate service levels.	D	D	D
Sheriff	Study area has slow response times. Alternative 1 would generate the need for more than five new officers. Alternatives 2 and 3 would generate the need for less than six new officers.	D	C	C
Schools	Study area is served by the Bangor Union Elementary and Oroville Union High School Districts. Alternatives 1 and 3 would exceed the existing capacity of the BUESD. Alternative 1 could generate enough students to support a new K-8 school.	C	0	D
Water				
Water Supply	Study area is served by the South Feather Water and Power Agency.	A	A	A
Recharge Potential	Study area is unlikely to serve as a potential recharge area. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow significant development.	B	B	B
Wastewater	Study area is not served by sewer. Development under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 could be served by sewer with difficulty.	C	C	C
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and more than 1 mile from an urban area.	C	C	C
Transit	Beyond 1 mile of an existing transit line.	D	D	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 30 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 30 (BANGOR) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternatives 1 and 3 would convert 615 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses. Alternative 2 would convert 95 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses.	D	C	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	No occurrences of special-status species but there is potential habitat for several special-status species in this study area. Alternatives 1 and 3 would allow development in these habitats. Alternative 2 could avoid impacts on potential habitat.	C	B	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There are no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	Alternative 1 would allow 1,600 new units, much of which would be located within sensitive oak woodlands. Under Alternative 2 fewer units are proposed. Alternative 2 could avoid impacts on sensitive habitat.	D	B	C
Deer Herd Habitat	The study area is within Winter Range habitat for deer herd. Alternatives 1 and 3 would allow residential development in this habitat. Alternative 2 could avoid deer herd habitat.	C	B	C
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	Land that would be developed under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 is located within a fire hazard area.	D	D	D
Flooding	The study area is located outside a FEMA floodplain.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	190 acres in Alternatives 1 and 3, and 30 acres in Alternative 2, have potential for severe soil expansion. Alternatives 1 and 3 assume there are 2 acres of land constrained by severe erosion.	D	C	D
Cultural Resources	There are three previously recorded cultural resources sites in the study area. None of the alternatives provide for Resource Conservation land use designations that could be used to protect significant cultural resources. Alternative 1 allows the most residential units as well as retail land uses and has the potential to have the most impacts on potentially significant cultural resources. Alternative 2 allows unspecified agricultural use and retail land use. Alternative 3 would allow retail but also would have very low density residential resulting in a lower chance to encounter potential cultural resources.	D	C	C

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 31 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 31 (BIGGS AREA)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Alternative 1 receives an A because there is reasonable potential to absorb most if not all of the planned development during the General Plan time horizon. Alternative 2 receives a C because absorption of all industrial is questionable. Alternative 3 receives a D because absorption of industrial and retail is questionable and residential assumptions are more aggressive than Alternative 1.	A	C	D
Fiscal Impacts	Alternatives 1 and 3 receive a C due to their likelihood of achieving fiscal neutrality. Alternative 2 receives a B, assuming that service enhancements are not necessary due to industrial development.	C	B	C
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternative 1 does not generate enough jobs to offset new residential. Alternative 2 generates only jobs. Potential jobs/housing benefits from Alternative 3 may not occur in General Plan time frame.	C	B	C
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow more than minimal development. Portions of the development under Alternative 1 and all of the development under Alternatives 2 and 3 would not have adequate service levels.	C	D	D
Sheriff	Study area has slow response times. Alternatives 1 and 3 would generate the need for more than five new officers. Alternative 2 would generate the need for less than five new officers.	D	C	D
Schools	Study area is served by the Biggs Unified School District. Alternatives 1 and 3 could generate a significant number of new students, but not enough to support a new high school.	D	0	D
Water				
Water Supply	Portions of the development under Alternatives 1 and 3 would be served by the Butte Water District and Biggs-West Gridley Water District. Development under Alternative 2 would be served by the Biggs-West Gridley Water District.	B	A	B
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow significant development.	D	D	D
Wastewater	Study area is adjacent to the City of Biggs' municipal sewer service. Development under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 could support the expansion of the sewer system.	B	B	B
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area.	B	B	B
Transit	Within ¼ mile of an existing transit line.	B	B	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 31 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 31 (BIGGS AREA) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would convert Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses.	D	D	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	No known occurrences and potential habitat for eight special-status species in this study area.	C	C	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There are no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	No sensitive habitats in this study area.	A	A	A
Deer Herd Habitat	No deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	The study area is not located within a fire hazard area.	A	A	A
Flooding	The study area is not located in a FEMA floodplain.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	All three alternatives would be subject to significant subsidence and expansive soil constraints.	D	D	D
Cultural Resources	All alternatives include some combination of development plus intensive agricultural cultivation. Since row crops and orchards can be destructive to cultural resources, all alternatives receive a D despite the low sensitivity of the area.	D	D	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 33 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 33 (SOUTH OF BIGGS)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Alternative 1 has strong potential to fully absorb during General Plan time horizon. Alternative 2 receives a D due to questionable ability for its retail and industrial components to fully absorb during the General Plan time horizon. Alternative 3 is slightly weaker than Alternative 1 because it requires more aggressive absorption for larger residential component.	A	D	B
Fiscal Impacts	Alternatives 1 and 2 would likely be fiscally neutral. Alternative 2 has potential to generate some fiscal benefits from retail and industrial development.	C	B	C
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternatives 1 and 3 lack jobs to balance residential. Alternative 2 would improve jobs/housing balance in the Gridley/Biggs area, even if only a portion of its retail and industrial development absorbs during the General Plan time horizon.	C	B	C
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow more than minimal development, all of which would not have adequate service levels.	D	D	D
Sheriff	Study area has slow response times. Alternatives 1 and 2 would generate the need for less than six new officers. Study Area 3 would generate the need for more than five new officers.	C	C	D
Schools	Study area is served by the Biggs Unified School District. Alternatives 1 and 3 could generate a significant number of new students, but not enough to support new schools.	D	0	D
Water				
Water Supply	Study area is served by the Butte Water District.	A	A	A
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow significant development.	D	D	D
Wastewater	Study area is adjacent to the City of Biggs' municipal sewer service. Development under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 could support the expansion of the sewer system.	B	B	B
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	Within ¼ mile of a State highway or major roadway.	B	B	B
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area.	B	B	B
Transit	On or adjacent to an existing transit line.	A	A	A

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 33 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 33 (SOUTH OF BIGGS)(CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would convert over 100 acres of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses.	D	D	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	There are no known occurrences and potential habitat for eight species in this study area.	C	C	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There is no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	No sensitive habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Deer Herd Habitat	No deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	This study area is not located within a fire hazard area.	A	A	A
Flooding	This study area is not located within a FEMA floodplain.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	Significant subsidence and expansive soil constraints.	D	D	D
Cultural Resources	All alternatives include some combination of development plus intensive agricultural cultivation. Since row crops and orchards can be destructive to cultural resources, all alternatives receive a D despite the low sensitivity of the area.	D	D	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

TABLE 34 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 34 (NORTH OF GRIDLEY)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Economics				
Market Viability	Alternative 1 receives an A due to high likelihood of absorbing during General Plan time horizon. Alternative 2 has a low probability of absorbing retail component during General Plan time horizon. Alternative 3's retail and residential components are questionable.	A	C	D
Fiscal Impacts	Alternatives 1 and 2 receive a C due to potential for fiscal balance or only slight deficits. Alternative 3 would risk fiscal deficits due to costs of serving 5,600 new homes.	C	C	D
Jobs/Housing Balance	Alternative 1 is residential only. Alternative 2 would improve jobs/housing balance but these benefits are unlikely to be realized during the General Plan time horizon. Alternative 3's potential jobs/housing benefits may not be realized during the General Plan time horizon.	C	B	C
Public Services				
Fire/Emergency	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 allow more than minimal development. Portions of the development under Alternative 1 and all of the development under Alternative 2 would not have adequate service levels. Alternative 3 could support a new fire station.	C	D	B
Sheriff	Study area has slow response times. Alternative 1 would generate the need for about one new officer. Alternatives 2 and 3 would generate the need for more than six new officers.	C	D	D
Schools	Study area is served by the Gridley Unified School District, which has some capacity beyond current enrollment. Alternative 1 could be accommodated by the existing capacity. Alternatives 2 and 3 would exceed the existing capacity. Alternative 3 could generate enough students to support new schools.	A	D	C
Water				
Water Supply	Development under Alternatives 1 and 2 would be served by the Butte Water District and Biggs-West Gridley Water District. Portions of the development under Alternative 3 would be served by the Butte Water District and Biggs-West Gridley Water District.	A	A	B
Recharge Potential	Study area may have moderate to high recharge potential. Alternative 1 allows minor development. Alternatives 2 and 3 allow significant development.	C	D	D
Wastewater	Study area is adjacent to the City of Gridley's municipal sewer service. Development under Alternative 1 cannot effectively be served by septic or sewer. Development under Alternatives 2 and 3 could support the expansion of the sewer system.	D	B	B

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

TABLE 34 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION SUMMARY – STUDY AREA 34 (NORTH OF GRIDLEY) (CONTINUED)

Issue	Explanation	Alternatives		
		1	2	3
Circulation				
Roadway Proximity	On or adjacent to a State highway or major roadway.	A	A	A
Bicycle Circulation	On or adjacent to a planned bike facility and adjacent to an urban area.	B	B	B
Transit	On or adjacent to an existing transit line.	A	A	A
Airport Compatibility	Study area is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone.	A	A	A
Agriculture	Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would convert significant areas of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses.	D	D	D
Biological Resources				
Special-Status Animal and Plant Species	No occurrences of special-status species are known, but there is potential habitat for several species, including giant garter snake in this study area. Alternative 1 could avoid the potential habitat.	B	C	C
Critical Habitat and Other Protected Lands	There are no critical habitat or other protected lands in this study area.	A	A	A
Sensitive Habitats	Most of the study area is in agriculture or residential land cover and no sensitive habitats have been mapped.	A	A	A
Deer Herd Habitat	No deer herd habitat in this study area.	A	A	A
Safety & Hazards				
Fire	The study area is located outside of a fire hazard area.	A	A	A
Flooding	The study area is located outside of a FEMA floodplain.	A	A	A
Geologic Hazards	Significant subsidence constraints.	D	D	D
Cultural Resources	All alternatives include some combination of development plus intensive agricultural cultivation. Since row crops and orchards can be destructive to cultural resources, all alternatives receive a D despite the low sensitivity of the area.	D	D	D

A = highest possible score D = lowest possible score 0 = not relevant

**BUTTE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2030
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**