
4.7 LAND USE, PLANNING, AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

4.7 LAND USE, PLANNING, AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Introduction

This section describes the existing and planned land uses in and around the Proposed Project site, including the current land uses, land use designations, and zoning. As stated previously, CEQA does not recognize socioeconomic issues as physical impacts to the environment. The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15131) state that economic or social information may be included in an EIR; however, the economic and social effects of a project are only considered significant to the extent that the economic effects result in a reasonably foreseeable physical change to the environment. Section 15125 of the CEQA Guidelines states that the EIR shall discuss “any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans...” Potential conflicts between the Proposed Project and the City of Dixon General Plan and Northeast Quadrant Specific Plan (NQSP) policies are discussed in this section.

As discussed in the Initial Study (see Appendix A), the Proposed Project would not physically divide an established community or conflict with a habitat conservation plan or a natural communities conservation plan; therefore, these issues are not discussed in this section. Issues specifically evaluated in this section with regards to agricultural resources include the conversion of farmland to urban uses, potential conflicts with nearby agricultural uses, and potential conflicts with City of Dixon General Plan policies adopted to protect agricultural resources.

Comments raised in letters received in response to the NOP (see Appendix B) include conversion of agricultural land, impact on adjacent agricultural uses, land use conflicts, agricultural mitigation measures, and the economic impact on the loss of agricultural land. The Initial Study (IS) determined that the project site is not restricted by any Williamson Act contracts; therefore, this issue was addressed in the IS and will not be discussed further in this EIR, (see Appendix A for a copy of the NOP/IS). Also, the economic impacts resulting from the loss of farmland does not result in an environmental impact under CEQA and will not be discussed in this section. The remaining issues are addressed in this section.

Information in this section was obtained from the *City of Dixon Northwest Quadrant Specific Plan Draft EIR (1994)* the Dixon 1993 General Plan, and the Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection FMMP Dixon Area Important Farmland 2002 map.

Environmental Setting

Regional Setting

The City of Dixon is located in the Central Valley region of northern California along the I-80 corridor, with the cities of Davis and Sacramento located approximately six miles and 25 miles to the northeast, respectively, and the cities of Vacaville and Fairfield located approximately 15 miles and 22 miles to the

west, respectively as shown in Figure 3-1, in Chapter 3, Project Description. The project site is part of the City of Dixon's 643-acre NQSP area. Dixon is a community that historically was focused on the surrounding agricultural economy and in recent years has seen development of residential subdivisions as the primary urban land use. The City's downtown is located south of the project site.

Site Characteristics and Existing Land Uses and Designations

The topography of the project site is flat. In the past, lands within the project site consisted primarily of field and row crops, including corn, tomatoes, and alfalfa, with a small area in the northwest portion undeveloped and uncultivated. This undeveloped portion contains a large concrete pad and various piles of debris. According to the NQSP, 128 acres of the 260-acre site was owned by the Mistler family and 101 acres was owned by Vaughn. It is assumed the concrete pad is a remnant of the Mistler family ranch. Interstate 80 abuts the site at the northwest corner.

According to the NQSP the project site is zoned Light Industrial (ML), Highway Commercial (CH), and Professional/Administrative Offices (PAO) with a General Plan designation of Employment Center (E) (see Figure 4.7-1).

Adjacent Land Uses

The Proposed Project site is surrounded by agricultural and developed uses. The Campbell's Company food processing and canning facility and a truck repair and parts company are adjacent to the site to the east. Row, field crops, and orchards are among the agricultural uses that surround the site to the east, south, and north across I-80 to the north. Rural residential uses are also located to the south. Developing portions of the NQSP are to the west. Lands to the east and north of I-80 of the Proposed Project site are outside of the City of Dixon city limits and are therefore in the County's jurisdiction. I-80 abuts the site at the northwest corner. A proposed development project, Flying J, is located to the north, adjacent to the Proposed Project site within the NQSP area. The Milk Farm project is located on the opposite side of I-80 and has a development proposal into the City of Dixon for highway commercial office and research facilities. Originally a stopping point for travelers, providing food and lodging since 1919, the Milk Farm closed in 1984.

Existing Agriculture in Solano County

Solano County had a gross agricultural income of over 214 million dollars in 2003.¹ Agriculture in Solano County is characterized by a broad diversity of commodities. The five leading commodities within the County are nursery stock, cattle and calves, tomatoes (processing), alfalfa, and feeder lambs.²

The most recent California Farmland Conversion Report (2002) inventoried 582,372 acres in Solano County. The County contains 143,211 acres of Prime Farmland, 7,584 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 13,735 acres of Unique Farmland totaling 164,530 acres of Important Farmland. Solano County has not designated any Farmland of Local Importance. The survey also inventoried 201,338 acres of Grazing Land, 55,433 acres of Urban and Built-up Land, and 111,374 acres of Other Land.³

1 Solano County Department of Agriculture, *Solano County Crop & Livestock Report 2003*, page 1.

2 Solano County Department of Agriculture, *Solano County Crop & Livestock Report 2003*, pages 5.

3 California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping, and Monitoring Program, *California Farmland Conversion Report 2000-2002, Table A-36 Solano County*,
http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/pubs/2000_2002/conversion_tables/solcon02.xls

California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Classifications

The California Department of Conservation (CDC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) combines technical soil ratings and current land use information to create an inventory of Important Farmland. Information on soils is primarily taken from the U.S. Department of Agriculture soil surveys. The CDC divides Important Farmland into four categories: Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance. According to the FMMP, and as shown in Table 4.7-1, the entire 260-acre project site is classified as Prime Farmland.

Soils

There are several methods of classifying soil quality for agricultural uses. One method involves a soil capability rating provided by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). Capability ratings indicate, in a general way, the suitability of soils for most kinds of field crops. The classes are developed according to the limitation of the soils when used for field crops, the risk of damage when they are used, and the way they respond to treatment. The broadest capability groups are designated by Roman numerals I through VIII. Prime Farmland usually consists of Class I and Class II soils. As shown in Table 4.7-2, increasing numerals indicate progressively greater limitation and narrower choices for practical agricultural use. The majority of soil within the project area is Class I and II.

Another method of evaluating soil quality for agricultural uses is the Storie Index. This index numerically expresses the relative degree of suitability of a soil for general intensive agriculture, as it exists at the time of evaluation. The rating is based on soil characteristics only and is obtained by evaluating such factors as soil depth, surface texture, subsoil characteristics, drainage, presence of salts and alkali, and topography. The majority of the Storie Index ratings on the project site range from 69 to 90.

Nearly all of the farmland surrounding the City of Dixon consists of four soil types; Brentwood clay loam (BrA), Capay silty clay loam (Ca), Yolo loam (Yo), and Yolo silty clay loam (Ys). The Proposed Project site consists of BrA, Ca, and Ys. Table 4.7-3 summarizes these soils types, as well as the capability rating and Storie Indexes.

Regulatory Framework

Federal and State Regulations

There are no specific federal or State regulations pertaining to land use or agriculture that would be applicable to the Proposed Project.

Local Regulations

City of Dixon General Plan

The following policies from the City of Dixon General Plan relate to land use and agricultural resources and are applicable to the Proposed Project:

Table 4.7-1

FMMP Farmland Classifications

Land Classification	Definition
Prime Farmland	Land with the best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain long-term production of agricultural crops. The land has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields. The land must have been used for the production of irrigated crops at some time during the two update cycles prior to the mapping date to be classified as prime. Prime Farmland generally consists of Class I and II soils. They have the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields of crops when treated and managed, including water management, according to current farming methods.
Farmland of Statewide Importance	Similar to Prime Farmland but with some minor differences, such as greater slopes or less ability to store soil moisture. The land must have been used for irrigated agricultural production some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.
Unique Farmland	Farmland that is not classified as prime or of statewide importance, which produces one of California’s 40 leading economic crops, such as grapes, artichokes, avocados, and dates. Soil characteristics and irrigation are not considered.
Farmland of Local Importance	Land other than Unique Farmland, which may be important to the local economy due to its productivity or value. Determined by each county’s board of supervisors and a local advisory committee.
Grazing Land	Land on which the existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock. The minimum mapping unit for Grazing Land is 40 acres.
Urban and Built-up Land	Land occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel. Common examples include residential, industrial, commercial, institutional facilities, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, and water control structures.
Other Land	Land not included in any other mapping category. Examples of land classified as Other Land include low density rural developments; timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than forty acres. Vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres is also mapped as Other Land.

Source: California Department of Conservation, *California Farmland Conversion Report 1998-2000*, page 5.

Table 4.7-2
Soil Classification Ratings

Class	Description
Class I	Soils have few limitations that restrict their use
Class II	Soils have moderate limitation that reduce the choice of plants or that require moderate conservation practices
Class III	Soils have severe limitation that reduce the choice of plants, require special conservation practices or both
Class IV	Soils have very severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants, require very careful management, or both
Class V	Soils are not likely to erode but have other limitations, impractical to remove, that limit their use largely to pasture, range, woodland, or wildlife
Class VI	Soils have severe limitations that make them generally unsuited to cultivation and that restrict their use largely to pasture or range, woodland, or wildlife
Class VII	Soils have very severe limitations that make them unsuited to cultivation and that restrict their use largely to pasture or range, woodland, or wildlife
Class VIII	Soils and landforms have limitations that preclude their use for commercial plants and restrict their use to recreation, wildlife, or water supply, or to aesthetic purposes

Source: United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of Merced County, California, Issued June 1972.

Table 4.7-3
Soil Ratings Within the Project Area

Soil	Soil Name	Slope (%)	Capability Rating	Storie Index
BrA	Brentwood clay loam	0-2	IIs-3	81
Ca	Capay silty clay loam		IIs-3	69
Yo	Yolo loam		I-1	100
Ys	Yolo silty clay loam		I-1	90

Source: United States Department of Agricultural Soil Conservation Service, *Soil Survey Solano County California*. May 1977.

URBAN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

2. The City shall actively pursue a balanced community comprising industrial, commercial and residential development.
3. The City shall ensure that urban development occurs only within the incorporated portion of the Planning Area, and that land proposed for such development will be annexed by the City before final development approval is given. In the unincorporated sections of the Planning Area, beyond the edge of proposed future urbanization, the existing rural character and agricultural uses shall be maintained and preserved at least until the year 2010. The County of Solano should prohibit urban development within the Dixon Planning Area outside of the Dixon city limits, unless it is specifically endorsed by the City of Dixon and fully consistent with the provisions of Solano County Proposition "A" and the Solano County General Plan.

9. The City shall identify agriculture as an acceptable interim use on land in the unincorporated portions of the Planning Area which have been designated for ultimate development in residential, commercial, industrial, or institutional use.
10. The City shall encourage the maintenance of agricultural uses in all undeveloped areas designated for future urban use, especially in the areas designated for future industrial uses.
12. The City shall encourage agriculture and the preservation of open space between Dixon and Vacaville, and between Dixon and Davis, to maintain community integrity and urban form.

The Natural Environment section of the Dixon General Plan contains goals and policies related to the natural environment including agriculture and soils, which seek to project and preserve agricultural land. The following goal and policies apply to the Proposed Project:

GOAL

To protect agricultural land from premature development.

Policies

1. The City shall preserve agricultural lands and prevent their premature conversion to urban uses.
2. The City shall protect existing agriculturally related operations from potential land use conflicts.

City of Dixon Zoning Ordinance

The City of Dixon Zoning Ordinance provides for the creation of a site-specific, mixed-use, planned development zoning district where the allowed land uses and the physical form those uses take are governed by a Planned Development Plan (PD Plan) that sets forth development and design guidelines that are exclusively applicable to the site, as required by application of the overlying planned development zoning district. The Proposed Project has designated the project site for a land use designation that includes entertainment, commercial, and office mixed-use, the development of which will be subject to and governed by the NQSP and the Dixon Downs Development and Design Guidelines (Design Guidelines) that have been prepared for the project. The Design Guidelines provide additional detail on permitted uses, development standards, design guidelines and design review for development of the Dixon Downs project. The Design Guidelines, in combination with the NQSP, constitute the PD Plan for the project.

Solano County

The Solano County Agricultural Lands and Operations Ordinance provides a notice to purchasers of real property that is meant to minimize conflicts that arise between residential or urban land uses and existing agricultural activities. The notice is included with any grant deed, quitclaim deed, or land sale.

Notice to Purchaser of Real Property

Solano County is an agricultural county with many areas zoned for agricultural operations. The presence of farms and ranches yields significant aesthetic and economic benefits to the residents of the county. Thus, the county's agriculture must be protected, including in areas where it is near residential development. To

do this, Solano County has enacted Chapter 2A of its county code, which provides that properly conducted agricultural operations will not be deemed a nuisance.

The ordinance further requires the county to give notice of the ordinance and its provisions to buyers of real property located in Solano County. Accordingly, you are hereby notified that if the property you are purchasing is located close to agricultural lands or operations, you may be subject to inconvenience or discomfort from the following agricultural operations: cultivation and tillage of the soil; burning of agricultural waste products; lawful and proper use of agricultural chemicals including, but not limited to, the application of pesticides and fertilizers; and production, irrigation, pruning, growing, harvesting, and processing of any agricultural commodity, including horticulture, timber, apiculture, the raising of livestock, fish, poultry, and commercial practices performed as incident to or in conjunction with such agricultural operation, including preparation for market, delivery to storage or market, or to carriers or transportation to market. These operations may generate dust, smoke, noise and odor.

If you live near an agricultural area, you should be prepared to accept such inconveniences or discomfort as a normal and necessary aspect of living in a county with a strong rural character and a healthy agricultural sector.

To assist in resolving problems between residential and agricultural land use, an Agricultural Grievance Committee has been created in Solano County to arbitrate and mediate disputes concerning agricultural operations. For information concerning where agricultural operations are located in relation to your property, you may contact the Solano Department of Environmental Management, 601 Texas Street, Fairfield. For questions concerning the specific kinds of agricultural operations in your area, including their use of fertilizers and pesticides, and information on the Agricultural Grievance Committee, you should contact the Solano County Agricultural Commissioner, 2000 West Texas Street, Fairfield.

This notice is given for informational purposes only and nothing in the Ordinance or this Notice should be deemed to prevent you from complaining to any appropriate agency or taking any other available remedy concerning any unlawful or improper agricultural practice. (Ord. No. 1270, §1.)

Northeast Quadrant Specific Plan (NQSP)

“The Dixon Northeast Quadrant Specific Plan policies add detail to the City of Dixon General Plan policies or establish policies applicable only to the plan area.”⁴ The following are the NQSP Land Use goals:

1. Provide the City of Dixon with a major employment center.
2. Provide shopping services for City residents, employees in the plan area and travelers on I-80.

The NQSP does not contain any goals or policies that address agricultural resources.

Standards of Significance

For the purposes of this EIR, impacts related to land use or agricultural resources would be considered significant if the Proposed Project would:

- Conflict with City of Dixon General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, NQSP, and other applicable plan policies or ordinances that are intended to protect the environment;
- Convert Prime Farmland, as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Department of Conservation, to non-agricultural use;⁵ or

⁴ City of Dixon, *Northeast Quadrant Specific Plan*, April 3, 1995, page 1-4.

- Develop uses that would be generally incompatible with existing and planned surrounding uses and/or such that the productivity of adjacent agricultural activities is substantially reduced due to nuisances associated with project development or operation.

Methods of Analysis

The Proposed Project is evaluated for consistency with the City of Dixon General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, NQSP, and other applicable plans or regulations. Ultimately, the Dixon City Council, as the decision makers for the Proposed Project, would make the final determination of consistency with the General Plan. Potential impacts were assessed by reviewing the City of Dixon General Plan goals and policies, consulting the California Department of Conservation’s FMMP, reviewing the tentative map and design guidelines, and taking inventory of existing agricultural uses on, and surrounding, the project area through a site visit. The tentative map and Dixon Downs Development and Design Guidelines specify both visual aspects of the development as well as the intensity.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact 4.7-1	Implementation of the Proposed Project could conflict with the City of Dixon General Plan, NQSP, Zoning Ordinance, and other applicable policies that are intended to protect the environment.	
Applicable Policies and Regulations	General Plan Urban Growth and Development policies, Natural Environment Section GP policies 1 and 2, NQSP Land Use goals 1 and 2.	
Significance before Mitigation	Phase 1:	No Impact
	Phases 1 and 2:	No Impact
Applicable NQSP Mitigation Measures	None	
Mitigation Measures	Phase 1:	None required
	Phases 1 and 2:	None required
Significance after Mitigation	Phase 1:	No Impact
	Phases 1 and 2:	No Impact

Phases 1 and 2

The Proposed Project includes land use designations that differ from land use designations included in the City’s General Plan and the NQSP. The Proposed Project would result in the development of a horse racetrack and commercial uses on land that is currently being used for agricultural activities and zoned Light Industrial, Highway Commercial, and Professional/Administrative Offices. As a part of the project, the City would amend the NQSP and create a new land use designation as part of the PD Plan, Entertainment/Commercial/Office-Mixed Use (ECO-MU) to allow the proposed facilities. Also, some of the proposed structures would exceed the height limitations as provided by the various zoning designations; however, the PD Plan provides for the creation of a site-specific, mixed-use, planned development zoning district. The Planned Development overlay zone requires specific development and design standards to guide future development. The Dixon Downs Development and Design Guidelines include specific provisions for building heights that are applicable to the project.

5 Prime Farmland is the only category included in the Standard of Significance because it is the only type of Important Farmland present in the project area.

General Plan policies that are relevant to the Proposed Project are listed above in the Regulatory Framework and focus on maintaining balanced development within the incorporated portion of the City and the maintenance and preservation of agriculture uses in specified areas. The Urban Growth and Development policies focus on limiting development to within the Dixon Planning Area both to manage growth and to ensure an orderly and efficient use of local services. The project site is within the City limits and therefore within the urban service boundary. Development on the site would comply with Policy 3 which requires that urban development occur only within the incorporated portion of the Dixon Planning Area. The agriculture policies in the General Plan focus on preventing the premature conversion of agricultural land and protecting existing agricultural operations from land use conflicts (see Impact 4.7-3 for the compatibility discussion). The Proposed Project would not be considered a premature conversion of agricultural land because the area is within the NQSP area, which has been designated and zoned by the City for future development. The project site is also not designated in the General Plan or the NQSP for agricultural uses, nor is the site zoned for Agriculture. The project site is currently zoned for industrial, commercial and offices uses. The site is currently used for agricultural uses, which is consistent with policies 9 and 10. After development of the Proposed Project there would still be open space between the City of Dixon and the cities of Davis and Vacaville, which would comply with Policy 12.

The NQSP land use goals that apply to the Proposed Project focus on the types of uses that should be provided within the Specific Plan area specifically “major employment center” and shopping and services for residents and employees in the plan area and travelers along I-80. Phase 1 of the Proposed Project would provide a horse race track facility, which would also provide the services of a commercial horse stable facility during non-race time. Phase 2 would provide commercial shopping opportunities. With the completion of both phases the Proposed Project would provide employment opportunities at both the horse track and the commercial shopping area and would provide shopping opportunities for residents, employees, and travelers.

As discussed above, the project appears to be essentially consistent with the overall intent of the applicable goals and policies in the NQSP and the City’s General Plan, as well as the zoning ordinance. However, it is within the City’s purview to interpret its own General Plan and other planning documents to ultimately decide if the project is consistent or inconsistent with any adopted City goals or policies. It is anticipated the project would not conflict with any applicable plans or policies resulting in *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Impact 4.7-2	Development of the Proposed Project would result in the conversion of Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses.	
Applicable Policies and Regulations	Dixon Natural Environment Section GP policies 1 and 2	
Significance before Mitigation	Phase 1:	Significant
	Phases 1 and 2:	Significant
Applicable NQSP Mitigation Measures	None	
Mitigation Measures	Phase 1:	4.7-2
	Phases 1 and 2:	4.7-2
Significance after Mitigation	Phase 1:	Significant and Unavoidable
	Phases 1 and 2:	Significant and Unavoidable

Prime farmland is classified by the CDC as “land with the best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain long-term production of agricultural crops.” The loss of Prime Farmland through its conversion to non-agricultural uses is considered a significant impact. The 260-acre project area consists exclusively of land classified as Prime Farmland on the FMMP. It should be noted that small portions of the site including the former Mistler homestead and drainage ditches are not considered Prime Farmland.

Phase 1

Phase 1 includes the development of a horse racing facility including all of the supporting buildings/services for employees, guests, and horses. This phase would develop the majority of the site and would eliminate all agricultural activity that currently exists on the entire site. Approval of the Proposed Project and implementation of Phase 1 would convert Prime Farmland on-site to non-agricultural uses. The conversion of 260 acres of Prime Farmland is considered a *significant impact*.

Phases 1 and 2

The Phase 2 development would occur after completion of the Phase 1 development; therefore, the baseline to evaluate the loss of farmland resulting from Phase 2 would be the project site after development of Phase 1 was complete. Phase 2 includes the development of a commercial center on the western portion of the project site. Phase 1 includes, as described above, the development of a horse racing facility including all of the supporting buildings/services for employees, guests, and horses. The Phase 2 project area would be paved and used as a parking lot as a part of the Phase 1 development. Therefore, the loss of Prime Farmland would be *significant*.

Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measure listed below would reduce the impact to the maximum extent feasible, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 would preserve Prime Farmland; however, it is important to note that this mitigation does not “replace” Prime Farmland and that implementation of the Proposed Project would nonetheless result in a loss of Prime Farmland. Therefore, the impact would be *significant and unavoidable*.

4.7-2 (Phases 1 and 2)

The project applicant shall preserve an equal amount of Prime Farmland of equal quality or an equivalent amount subject to City approval, and shall protect the land for agricultural use through long-term land use restrictions, such as agricultural conservation easements. An organization such as the Solano Land Trust shall be used to facilitate the establishment of the conservation easement. This measure shall be implemented prior to grading. If possible, this land shall also be used to provide suitable foraging habitat to comply with Mitigation Measure 4.3-1.

There are organizations, such as the Solano Land Trust, that offer facilitation services for the establishment of conservative easements. The Solano Land Trust typically has land they are working to purchase and any mitigation fees can be applied to the purchase of land.

Impact 4.7-3	Development of the Proposed Project could create incompatible uses such that the productivity of adjacent agricultural land is substantially reduced due to nuisances associated with project development or operation.	
Applicable Policies and Regulations	Dixon Natural Environment Section GP policy 2	
Significance before Mitigation	Phase 1:	Less than Significant
	Phases 1 and 2:	Less than Significant
Applicable NQSP Mitigation Measures	LU-A	
Mitigation Measures	Phase 1:	None required
	Phases 1 and 2:	None required
Significance after Mitigation	Phase 1:	Less than Significant
	Phases 1 and 2:	Less than Significant

Phases 1 and 2

It is anticipated that existing agricultural operations would continue on the project site until Phase 1 begins development. The project site is currently surrounded by both agricultural and light industrial development. Within the City limits, the land to the north is zoned for highway commercial development (Flying J truck stop is proposed), land to the west is zoned for professional/administrative offices, and land to the south is zoned for light industrial uses. Land to the east, across Pedrick Road, is in the unincorporated County and is used for agricultural processing and other agricultural activities. A horse racing facility would not be expected to conflict with agriculture, the dominate use currently surrounding the site, like some other urban uses (i.e., residential subdivisions). However, some potential land use conflicts could arise as discussed below.

Active agricultural activities can generate dust, odors, pesticide spray drift, and elevated noise levels. Crops grown within the project site include field and row crops. Because the type of row crops grown varies from year to year and season to season, agricultural practices, such as the type and timing of pesticide application, crop planting, harvesting, and tilling, could also vary. In addition, depending on the type of crop, certain harvest techniques often generate loud machine noise and require lighting for night work. For example, row crops often use large machines to harvest and work through the night. These activities can be a nuisance to adjacent urban uses, having a varying effect depending on the urban use

and the agricultural activity. A horse racing facility would also be expected to create a certain level of noise, night lighting, dust, etc.

Urban uses could also create a nuisance for farmers through road congestion, vandalism, etc. The development of urban uses generally increases the intensity of use of the land and therefore, increasing the number people and vehicles in the area. This increased use of these narrower and previously sparsely traveled roads can make it inconvenient and potentially dangerous for the slower moving farm equipment. The project site is located in close proximity to I-80 minimizing the distance between the entry to the facility and I-80. Also, as stated above, light industrial uses along Pedrick Road are opposite the project site and a truck stop (Flying J) is proposed between the project site and I-80. The most direct route between the facility and I-80 would pass by very little farmland. However, with a greater number of people in any given area there is also an increased possibility of vandalism. Vandalism on agricultural properties can directly affect productivity if crops are damaged and therefore the livelihood of the farmer and eventually with continued vandalism the viability of farming in that area. With full implementation of the NQSP the project site would be surrounded to the north, west, and south by urban uses decreasing the likelihood of vandalism resulting from the Proposed Project on nearby agriculture. The approved mitigation from the NQSP EIR includes Mitigation Measure LU-A, which requires that all future development within the NQSP strictly enforce the landscape medians and agricultural buffer zones established by the specific plan.

Commercial stables and riding academies are allowed under agricultural zoning, which is what the Proposed Project would function as during non-race days, among other uses. The Solano County Agricultural Lands and Operations Ordinance provides a notice to purchasers of real property that aims to minimize conflicts and complaints by those moving into established agricultural areas. While the project site is in the City of Dixon it is bordered by unincorporated portions of Solano County. Therefore, it is anticipated the incompatibilities with surrounding uses would be minimal and the impact ***less than significant***. Conflicts due to traffic, noise, etc. will be discussed in the appropriate sections of this EIR.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The Land Use analysis in an EIR does not typically include a discussion of cumulative impacts. Because the project-specific analysis considers both existing and future planned land uses, impacts resulting from the additive effect of other proposed or speculative land use plans would not differ from those identified in the above impact discussions. Similarly, because the analysis of applicable land use goals and policies considers both existing and planned land uses, cumulative land use compatibility impacts are not considered independently. The cumulative loss of agricultural land is discussed below.

Impact 4.7-4	The Proposed Project, in combination with other development, would result in the loss of Prime Farmland.	
Applicable Policies and Regulations	Natural Environment Section GP policies 1 and 2.	
Significance before Mitigation	Phase 1:	Significant
	Phases 1 and 2:	Significant
Applicable NQSP Mitigation Measures	LU-A	
Mitigation Measures	Phase 1:	4.7-4
	Phases 1 and 2:	4.7-4
Significance after Mitigation	Phase 1:	Significant and Unavoidable
	Phases 1 and 2:	Significant and Unavoidable

The most recent California Farmland Conversion Report (2002) inventoried 582,372 acres in Solano County. The County contains 143,211 acres of Prime Farmland, 7,584 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 13,735 acres of Unique Farmland totaling 164,530 acres of Important Farmland. Solano County has not designated any Farmland of Local Importance. The survey also inventoried 201,338 acres of Grazing Land, 55,433 acres of Urban and Built-up Land, and 111,374 acres of Other Land.⁶ A net loss of 1,456 acres of Prime Farmland, 3,188 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 760 acres of Unique Farmland with a total of 5,404 acres of Important Farmland occurred from 2000-2002.

Phase 1

The project site contributes approximately 260 acres to the County’s total amount of Prime Farmland. Development of the Proposed Project would result in the conversion of Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses. This would contribute to the cumulative countywide loss of Prime Farmland.

Although Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 would set aside Prime Farmland elsewhere, it would not prevent the direct, net loss of Prime Farmland in Solano County. Development of the Proposed Project and additional development within the County would result in the conversion of Prime Farmland. This would be cumulatively considerable, resulting in a *significant cumulative impact*.

Phases 1 and 2

As discussed above, Phase 2 development would occur after completion of Phase 1 development; therefore, the baseline to evaluate the loss of farmland resulting from Phase 2 would be the project site after development of Phase 1 was complete. Because essentially the entire project site would be disturbed under Phase 1 and no active agricultural activities would continue on the site, the loss of Prime Farmland under Phases 1 and 2 would be cumulatively considerable the same as under Phase 1, resulting in a *significant cumulatively impact*.

6 California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping, and Monitoring Program, *California Farmland Conversion Report 2000-2002, Table A-36 Solano County*, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/pubs/2000_2002/conversion_tables/solcon02.xls

Mitigation Measure

Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 would require the preservation of other Prime Farmland; however, this mitigation does not “replace” Prime Farmland. Therefore, even on a cumulative level, the impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*.

(Phases 1 and 2)

4.7-4 *Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2.*