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hills have rocky ridges and the majority of the slope gradients are less than 25%. The land features are a result of the physical character of the geologic units, uplift of the Sierra Nevada Mountain Block and subsequent stream erosion.

2. Geologic Conditions

The area geology and soils are directly related to the geologic history of the foothill region. During the Cretaceous period interbedded siltstones, sandstones, volcanics, and minor amounts of conglomerates were faulted. This material is tilted to a near vertical position (northwest strike), and intruded by a granitic pluton associated with the Sierra batholith. Subsequent volcanic activity in the Tertiary period deposited agglomerates and tuffs in the foothill belt. Since the Tertiary period, minor Sierran uplifts and erosion have created the present landscape.

a. Geologic Units

The geology consists of two main categories: ultrabasic intrusives and interbedded Mariposa formation rocks. The ultrabasic rocks are found throughout the area except in the southern part. The ultrabasic rocks are composed of a complex of rock types consisting of alkali granite, pyroenite, peridotite, gabbrodiorite, and small amounts of serpentine. Mariposa formation rocks consist of interbedded
metasediments (siltstone, conglomerate) and metavolcanics. The rock is not significantly faulted, but is intruded by the ultrabasic complex and produces talc, asbestos and serpentine minerals from hydrothermal alteration with the contact zone.

3. Seismic Hazards

Seismic hazards are considered low for the area in particular and for the region in general. No significant or active faulting is noted in geologic literature. The nearest major faults are to the north of Lake Tahoe, at the north end of Owens Valley, and in the San Francisco Bay area.

4. Soils

Residual soils weathered from the underlying rock attain a thickness of approximately 10-36 inches, and are composed of sandy silt and rock fragments. Transported soils found in drainages are deeper (up to 5 feet) and are composed of very fine to medium silty sand (loam). Typically the residual soil profile consists of three horizons. The surficial layer is composed of gravelly sandy silt and silty very fine to medium sand (loam). The medium horizon forms at a depth of 10-18 inches and is composed of well to slightly weathered and fractured bedrock which grades to the third, and final unit, of fresh bedrock at depths of 25-48 inches.

A comparison of the geology and soils information reveals a correlation of the Rescue soil series with
the basic intrusive and related ultrabasic rocks, 
and a similar correlation of the Auburn series with 
the Mariposa rocks. 
The erosion hazard potential determined by the U. S. 
Soil Conservation Service, depending on the steepness 
of the slope, is "slight to high" for the Rescue and 
Auburn soils series (soils information generalized 
from data obtained from U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation 
Service, Placerville, California). 
5. Biotic Conditions 
a. Vegetation 
The Rescue area lies in the foothill vegetation 
belt at a point near the western limit of the 
yellow pine belt. The foothill belt is composed 
of pine-oak woodland and brushlands, or chaparral, 
and although they are not similar, they are often 
intermingled. 
The majority of the area has been farmed or ranched. 
In referring to this area, the 1927 Soil Survey 
of the Placerville Area, California states, "... 
... nearly all the land has at some time or other been 
under cultivation." This, along with severe brush 
fires in the last 100 years, has caused extensive 
modification to the plant communities. The general 
plant communities within the area are: oak woodland, 
 oak savanna, oak-shrub, chaparral, annual grassland, 
and riparian. Along with these six somewhat natural 
communities exist two managed communities: perennial 
grasslands, and standing waters.
6. Rare or Endangered Species

a. Plants
The western portion of the Rescue General Plan contains five plants which have been mapped by the California Native Plant Society and are listed in their "Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California". These are:
Pine Hill Ceanothus (Ceanothus Roderickii)
Pine Hill Flannelbush (Fremontodendrum Decumbens)
El Dorado Galium (Galium Californicum Sierae)
Amador Rush Rose (Helianthemum Suffrutescens)
El Dorado Mule Ears (Wyethia Reticulata)
All of these plants are found in the chaparral community and are semi-protected on the state property on Pine Hill. Only El Dorado Mule Ears has been mapped in other portions of the General Plan area, near the Rescue town center and along Deer Valley Road. Amador Rush Rose and El Dorado Galium are the only plants at all endangered.

b. Animals and Birds
Two birds which are on the California list of rare and endangered species list may be overhead visitors to the area. These are the Southern Bald Eagle and the American Peregrine Falcon. No rare or endangered species of animals are known to be residents of the area.
C. Purpose of the Plan

The Rescue Area Land Use Plan is a general statement of the interests of the local community and the El Dorado County Planning Commission relative to the need to provide for orderly development of the area. This Plan attempts to analyze the local situations and problems and should be considered a refinement and updating of the Land Use Element of the El Dorado County General Plan adopted in 1969. Several factors have contributed to the need for an Area Land Use Plan:

1. A rapid population growth in the County - 30% in last five years;
2. Great numbers of land divisions (parcel maps) in the general area over the last few years;
3. The growth of a very large single family residential subdivision complex to the west of the plan area.
4. The establishment of a medium sized single family residential subdivision near the center of the plan area.

The above factors were recognized by the area residents and their concerns over orderly and prudent development patterns for their area prompted a series of discussions with the Planning Staff and the generation of this Land Use Plan.

In cooperation with a group of concerned citizens, the Planning Department Staff held a series of public meetings within the Plan area at which residents, property owners and interested citizens were encouraged to take an active part in generating development goals, policies, density and land use recommendations.
This citizen input combined with resource data, growth patterns, existing land use patterns, environmental considerations, and good planning practices, have provided the basis for this Community Land Use Plan. The Plan is designed and intended to reflect community developed guidelines only for the next five to ten year period and should be periodically reviewed for any needed revisions and updating.

D. Plan Assumptions

It is very difficult to predict with any assurance even five to ten years in the future; therefore, a few assumptions must be generally accepted as a basis for physical development guidelines:

1. The Rescue area will continue to be an attractive rural residential/agriculturally oriented area;
2. There will be a limited need for commercial/industrial expansion;
3. Individual septic tanks will continue to be the primary source of sewerage disposal in the plan area;
4. Population growth is expected to at least maintain and probably increase over the planning period;
5. The existing road system is adequate for the current population, buildout rates and projected short term increases, but any introduction of a major traffic generator would require reconsideration of the above statement.
E. Land Use Development Goals and Policies

The citizens of the Rescue area participated in a series of public meetings, advertised and held at the Community Center on Green Valley Road from the Fall of 1974 to the Spring of 1975. This series of meetings generated the following goals and policies to guide land development and the land use classifications and locations of uses shown on the map accompanying this text:

1. Goals

   a. Retention of the present rural/agricultural atmosphere and low density of population.
      (5 to 10 acre parcels preferred)

   b. Limit or discourage high density mobilehome developments as being out of character with the existing and proposed rural development pattern.

   c. Maintain stringent controls on water and air quality and nuisance noise within the bounds of socio-economic reality.

   d. Encourage establishment and preservation of park areas and a recreational trails system for the use of community residents.

It is the desire of Rescue's inhabitants to encourage and develop these qualities through a logical and comprehensive set of planning policies and objectives. The General Plan, then, will be used to guide the growth of Rescue and its surrounding area toward an orderly, attractive, and efficient balance of land uses, population densities, and traffic circulation.
2. Policies

a. Retention of a rural atmosphere and low density of population, to precluded major traffic increases and problems, police protection and major tax increases to support resulting additional schools.

b. Existing land parcels of large sizes should be zoned to the lowest parcel size as shown on the adopted plan unless there are overriding considerations, so that the rural/ agricultural atmosphere and the valued lifestyle of the residents in the area will be maintained, and the open space values will not be destroyed.

c. Expansion areas for high density, single family residential subdivisions are provided for on the General Plan Map and shown as HDR, High Density Residential. No additional areas should be considered without a complete re-study of the Plan Area. (March 31, 1981, Resolution # 85-81.)

d. High density, mobilehome developments will be strongly discouraged within the Plan Area, as incompatible with a rural/agricultural atmosphere.

e. Recommend that consideration be given to the Rescue Area in future plans for bicycle and equestrian trails, and two roadside parks should be place on Deer Valley and Green Valley Roads.
f. The existing public land on Pine Hill in Section 16, T10N, R9E, MDB & M should be retained as public land or utilized for recreation purposes due to the large numbers of rare and endangered plants found in that location.

g. The 100+ acre parcel of Bureau of Land Management land fronting on Deer Valley Road north of Rescue Post Office should be acquired and utilized for a fire station site and multi-use recreation area.

h. Notwithstanding any of the foregoing statements of desirable development patterns, individual minimum parcel sizes should be based on compliance with the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act and other County requirements regarding parcel sizes and building sites.

i. The existing and future commercial and residential developments in the Community Center area should be strongly encouraged to retain and reflect a Gold Rush/Victorian architectural style in keeping with the historical character of the community. Additionally, the existing sign ordinances in the County should be revised to more closely control and guide on-site and off-site advertisements so as to retain the rural and open-character of the Rescue Community area and the County generally.

The above stated goals and policies were adopted by the Rescue Plan Area citizens at a series of public meetings ending in March of 1975.
F. Existing and Proposed Land Use Status

The existing County wide General Plan covering the Rescue Area would allow an estimated saturation population of 49,680 as shown on the following chart #1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Number Acres</th>
<th>Minimum Parcel</th>
<th>Dwelling Unit Saturation</th>
<th>Total Population **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>49.82</td>
<td>1-40 D.U.</td>
<td>20 D.U./Ac.* = 996.40</td>
<td>3,238.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>3,382.83</td>
<td>1-5 D.U.</td>
<td>3.5 D.U./Ac.* = 11,839.91</td>
<td>38,479.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>5,831.80</td>
<td>1 D.U.</td>
<td>1 D.U./3.5 Ac. = 1,666.23</td>
<td>5,415.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive</td>
<td>2,669.14</td>
<td>1 D.U./20 Ac.</td>
<td>133.46</td>
<td>433.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>1,227.43</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Estate/Ag.</td>
<td>8,128.10</td>
<td>1 D.U./12.5 Ac.</td>
<td>1 D.U./12.5 Ac. = 650.25</td>
<td>2,113.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>21,299.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POPULATION 49,680.30

* Mean Density Taken for These Designations

** Total Population estimate is derived from dwelling units times 3.25 population/average family

The existing zoning, at full development, would allow for much less density and represents a level of development and population that is much closer to the aims and desires of the residents and land owners as shown on the following chart #2: EXISTING ZONING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Number Acres</th>
<th>Minimum Parcel</th>
<th>Dwelling Unit Saturation</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>88.15</td>
<td>10,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>383.98</td>
<td>1,247.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Acre</td>
<td>104.76</td>
<td>1 Acre</td>
<td>104.76</td>
<td>340.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Acres</td>
<td>Minimum Parcel</td>
<td>Dwelling Unit Saturation</td>
<td>Total Population **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ACRE RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>131.58</td>
<td>2 Ac.</td>
<td>65.79</td>
<td>213.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL ESTATE</td>
<td>2,948.48</td>
<td>5 Ac.</td>
<td>589.70</td>
<td>1,916.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>12,617.55</td>
<td>10 Ac.</td>
<td>1,261.75</td>
<td>4,100.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCLUSIVE AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>3,823.58</td>
<td>20 Ac.</td>
<td>191.18</td>
<td>622.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC FACILITIES</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.L.M. LAND</td>
<td>844.84</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCLASSIFIED</td>
<td>712.29</td>
<td>1 Ac.</td>
<td>712.29</td>
<td>2,314.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ACREAGE 21,299.34</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL POPULATION 10,757.23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plan as proposed and translated into zonings would modify the theoretical population allowable under it drastically downward from the existing County General Plan to an estimated allowable population of 10,651. This is a 79% reduction as shown below in Chart #3:

**PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN RESCUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Acres</th>
<th>Minimum Parcel</th>
<th>Dwelling Unit Saturation</th>
<th>Total Population **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>40.11</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE FAMILY</td>
<td>201.51</td>
<td>10,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>438.89</td>
<td>1,426.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ACRE RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>528.89</td>
<td>1 Ac.</td>
<td>528.89</td>
<td>1,718.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ACRE RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL ESTATE</td>
<td>4,599.0</td>
<td>5 Ac.</td>
<td>919.80</td>
<td>2,989.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>13,468.57</td>
<td>10 Ac.</td>
<td>1,346.85</td>
<td>4,377.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCLUSIVE AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>858.48</td>
<td>20 Ac.</td>
<td>42.92</td>
<td>139.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC FACILITIES</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Total Population estimate is derived from dwelling units times 3.25 population/average family
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Acres</th>
<th>MinimumParcel</th>
<th>Dwelling Unit Saturation</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARKS</td>
<td>213.34</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.L.M. LAND</td>
<td>1,374.11</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOURIST RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL ACREAGE 21,299.34 TOTAL POPULATION 10,651.38

These reductions in allowable minimum parcel sizes and reductions in theoretical population limits are directly in keeping with the goals and policies adopted by the residents of the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS</th>
<th>ZONING ORDINANCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>Commercial, General Commercial, Planned Commercial, Professional Office Commercial*, Tourist Residential and other zones that could logically develop in time to commercial status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC FACILITIES</td>
<td>Planned Commercial, Professional Office Commercial*, Single and Multi-Residential with Special Use Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKS</td>
<td>Open Space and Conservation with Special Use Permit: Recreation zone*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>R-1, R-20,000, R1A, R2A, R3A, or larger if the market, economics, circulation, timing, etc., are not compatible with a smaller lot zoning proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO ACRE RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>Residential Two Acre and all larger Residential and Agricultural zonings up to and including Residential-Agricultural 160 acre (R2A, R3A, RE, RE-10, Planned Agriculture, RA-20, -40, -60, -80, and -160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL AGRICULTURE (5 acre)</td>
<td>Estate Residential and all larger Residential and Agricultural zonings up to and including Residential-Agriculture 160 Acre (RE, RE-10, Planned Agriculture, RA-20, -40, -60, -80, and -160), and Exclusive Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL AGRICULTURE (10 acre)</td>
<td>Estate Residential-10 Acre and all larger Residential and Agricultural zonings up to and including Residential-Agriculture 160 Acre (Planned Agriculture, RA-20, -40, -60, -80, and -160) and Exclusive Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCLUSIVE AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>Exclusive Agriculture - Planned Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New Zoning Ordinances (planned to be adopted)