

---

# EL DORADO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN



**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF  
GENERAL PLAN POLICY MODIFICATIONS  
AS PART OF THE  
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

State Clearinghouse No. 2001082030

**JULY 2004**

---

# EL DORADO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN



**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF  
GENERAL PLAN POLICY MODIFICATIONS  
AS PART OF THE**

**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2001082030

PREPARED FOR:  
EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
2850 FAIRLANE COURT  
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667  
(530) 621-5355  
CONTACT: PETER MAURER, PRINCIPAL PLANNER

PROJECT MANAGEMENT:  
HEIDI TSCHUDIN, CONTRACT PLANNER  
EL DORADO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OFFICE  
330 FAIR LANE  
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667  
(530) 621-5712  
(916) 447-1809

PREPARED BY:  
EDAW  
2022 J STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
CONTACT: GARY JAKOBS, AICP  
(916) 414-5800

JULY 2004

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter/Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	1
Policy Modification Assessment.....	2
Changes to the General Plan Introduction .....	2
Changes to the Land Use (LU) Element .....	3
Changes to the Transportation and Circulation (TC) Element.....	11
Changes to the Housing (H) Element .....	15
Changes to the Public Services and Utilities (PS) Element .....	19
Changes to the Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element .....	23
Changes to the Conservation and Open Space (CO) Element .....	25
Changes to Agriculture and Forestry (AF) Element .....	28
Changes to the Parks and Recreation Element.....	32
Changes to Economic Development Element.....	34

## INTRODUCTION

The El Dorado County General Plan proposed for adoption by the Board of Supervisors on June 17, 2004 is based primarily on the 1996 General Plan Alternative and the mitigation measures proposed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for that alternative. The proposed General Plan also includes policies and land use designations from the Environmentally Constrained Alternative designed to reduce traffic congestion and protect agriculture, and policy language that was proposed as a result of testimony during the hearings on the General Plan.

This assessment evaluates the potential effects of the land use designation and policy changes included in the proposed General Plan that were not included in the 1996 General Plan alternative or adopted in response to mitigation recommendations in the EIR. The assessment identifies the potential environmental effects associated with each change and evaluates the extent to which those effects were analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

For each change, the assessment first describes the likely environmental resources that could be affected by the change, if any. The assessment asks whether the change would result in any potential differences in the amount, location, or intensity of development, or the manner in which the development may occur and, if so, the environmental issues that would be affected. Based on this discussion, the assessment then reviews the analysis in the EIR to determine whether the physical effect of the change was considered in the EIR and, if it was, whether the change would result in a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact identified in the EIR. If the change was not considered in the EIR, the assessment considers whether the physical effects of the change would result in an adverse significant environmental impact. References to impact analyses relate to the EIR's analysis of impacts of the 1996 General Plan Alternative, unless otherwise specified.

The assessment evaluates the policy changes in the order in which they appear in each element of the proposed General Plan. Where several related changes have been made, they are discussed collectively. Page references are to the Proposed General Plan dated July 12, 2004. That document includes the final policy language including all revisions described in this assessment. Text that was added to a policy is shown in this assessment as underlined and text that was deleted is shown in ~~strikeout (example)~~. New policies are not shown in underline.

# POLICY MODIFICATION ASSESSMENT

## CHANGES TO THE GENERAL PLAN INTRODUCTION

**Page 1** – The section entitled “Background” including three paragraphs of text within that section is deleted. This text was inserted for reader convenience to explain the relationship between the 1996 General Plan alternative and the No Project Alternative during the public review period for the plan alternatives. It is not relevant for an adopted plan. Because the text had no effect on the plan policies its deletion will have no effect on the environment and no further discussion is necessary.

**Page 5** – Modify the first two complete sentences at the top of page as shown below.

In light of these considerations, the Plan has been designed to match any increases in the size of roadways to those necessary to meet the Level of Service and concurrency policies included in the Transportation and Circulation Element. ~~allows for traffic congestion during limited time periods. Such congestion is a reasonable price to pay for the economic benefits of development and the maintenance of the County’s rural atmosphere.~~

This text change reflects policy changes in the Transportation and Circulation Element. These policy changes are discussed in the assessment of changes in that element.

**Page 7** – Delete the following General Plan objective:

~~13. — To accommodate to the extent feasible the activities and events of the Sesquicentennial, January 1998 to September 2000.~~

Because the Sesquicentennial has passed this objective is no longer relevant. Because the objective did not establish any specific plan policies its deletion will have no effect on the environment and no further discussion is necessary.

**Page 7** – In order to clarify the status of the Implementation Measures of the General Plan, the following text is added before the section entitled “Using The Plan”:

### IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

This General Plan relies upon measures identified in each Element that implement the policies. These implementation measures identified throughout this Plan carry the same weight as policies in terms of guidance for County decision-making. Modification of the text of these measures would require amendment of the General Plan. “Responsibility” assignments and “time frames” for each implementation measure are advisory only. Modifications to responsibility assignments and/or timeframes do not require amendment of the General Plan.

This change clarifies the effect of implementation measures included in the General Plan. The EIR assumed that all implementation measures included in the General Plan would be implemented as directed by this text. Therefore the text change will not result in any physical effect on the environment not considered in the EIR and no further discussion is necessary.

## CHANGES TO THE LAND USE (LU) ELEMENT

**Policy 2.1.1.1 (Page 12)** -- Remove Georgetown and Tahoe Community Regions from list of Community Regions in Policy 2.1.1.1.

This change was accompanied by several other conforming and related changes, as listed below:

**Policy 2.1.2.1 (Page 13)** -- Add Georgetown to the list of Rural Centers in Policy 2.1.2.1.

**(Pages 43-44, 49)** -- Revise policies applicable to the Tahoe Basin.

**Figure LU-1 (after Page 50)** -- Modify Land Use Diagram to redesignate Georgetown from Community Region to Rural Center.

The effect of the change regarding Georgetown is discussed below. The effect of the change regarding the Tahoe Basin is discussed in connection with policy changes on page 49 of the Land Use Element.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Development in Rural Centers has the potential to result in a broad array of environmental impacts, as addressed in all sections of the Draft EIR and Final EIR.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Table 3-8 of the Draft EIR lists Community Regions and Rural Centers. Community Regions are recognized as locations where population growth and economic expansion would occur. Rural Centers are recognized as locations with a focus to provide goods and services to surrounding rural areas. The change of Georgetown from a Community Region to a Rural Center recognizes that infrastructure to support the higher development densities of a Community Region are not available or planned for Georgetown.

The change does not alter the underlying land uses allowable in Georgetown, or anywhere else in the County, as expressed in the land use map in Appendix D.2 of Volume 4.E of the Final EIR. Further, there are no other physical changes that are associated with the Rural Center designation. For these reasons, there would be no physical effect on the environment.

Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 2.1.1.5 (Page 12)** -- Delete Policy 2.1.1.5 in its entirety.

~~Pursuant to Objective 3.5.1 and Policies 3.5.1.1 and 3.5.1.6, roadways within or serving the Community Regions may experience temporary congestion during peak periods. Such congestion is considered acceptable in light of the economic benefits of development and the costs of sizing roads to deal solely with peak periods.~~

This change was accompanied by several other conforming and related changes deleting policies 2.1.2.7 and 2.1.3.2 which contained comparable language.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

New development can lead to increases in traffic volumes. Depending on the capacity of roadways, increased traffic volumes can lead to traffic congestion. These policies would have authorized congestion during peak traffic periods.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

The Transportation and Circulation Element contains detailed policies specifying Level of Service standards and procedures for evaluating compliance with those standards. (See Policies TC-Xa through TC-Xi.) The policies indicate permissible levels of congestion at peak periods under various circumstances. Because the Transportation and Circulation Element policies are more detailed than Land Use Element policies 2.1.1.5, 2.1.2.7, and 2.1.3.2, the Land Use Element policies do not provide meaningful direction and could create ambiguity in the General Plan. The Transportation and Circulation Element congestion policies were evaluated in the EIR (see section 5.4, Volume 4A pages 2-10 through 2-34, and Master Responses 14 and 15) and changes to those policies are discussed in the assessment of changes to the Transportation and Circulation Element below.

Because deletion of these policies will not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 2.1.1.7 (Page 12) --** Add new Policy 2.1.1.7 describing the general requirements for development in the County:

Development within Community Regions, as with development elsewhere in the County, may proceed only in accordance with all applicable General Policies, including those regarding infrastructure availability as set forth in the Transportation and Circulation and the Public Services and Utilities Elements. Accordingly, development in Community Regions and elsewhere will be limited in some cases until such time as adequate roadways, utilities, and other public service infrastructure become available and wildfire hazards are mitigated as required by an approved Fire Safe Plan.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

This policy notes that development may proceed only in accordance with applicable general plan policies. The policy explains that these include policies regarding infrastructure availability and that this factor will limit the ability to develop affected lands until such time as adequate infrastructure is in place.

Development, including infrastructure to support that development, has the potential to result in a broad array of environmental impacts, as addressed in all sections of the EIR.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

The Public Facilities and Utilities Element of the 1996 General Plan Alternative includes policies addressing the infrastructure requirements for proposed new development. Specifically, Policy 5.1.2.1 states that “prior to the approval of any discretionary development, the approving authority shall make a determination of the adequacy of the public services and utilities to be impacted by that development, and where demand is determined to exceed capacity, the approval of the development shall be conditioned to require expansion of the impacted facility or service to be available concurrent with the demand, mitigated, or a finding made that a CIP project is funded and authorized which will increase service.”

Similar to the Public Services and Utilities Element, the Transportation and Circulation Element includes policies TC-Xa through TC-Xi which require that new roadway infrastructure be developed concurrently

with development projects that have the potential to reduce traffic levels of service below standards set forth in the General Plan.

Implementation of this policy (as well as Policies 5.1.2.1 and TC-Xa through TC-Xi) would result in the physical development of infrastructure where needed for General Plan compliance; the effects were analyzed primarily as part of the Traffic (Section 5.4), Utilities (Section 5.6) and Public Services (Section 5.7) analyses in the EIR, as modified by pages 2-10 through 2-51 of Volume 4.A of the EIR.

Although this policy would potentially result in a physical effect on the environment based on infrastructure needs, these effects were already analyzed. This policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development (including infrastructure) and the manner in which development would occur as analyzed in the EIR. Accordingly, there would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Table 2-1 (Page 14)** -- In Table 2-1 add a new land use designation "Agricultural Lands," marked as consistent within Rural Regions only.

This change is the first of several changes reflecting the adoption of that portion of the Environmentally Constrained alternative that established an "Agricultural Lands" land use designation. Related changes are:

- ▶ **(Page 16)** -- Add new land use designation "Agricultural Lands" as follows:

Agricultural Lands (AL): This designation is appropriate for lands described in Policy 8.1.1.8. A maximum of two residential dwellings used to support the agricultural use are allowed. The AL designation may be applied in Rural Regions only.

- ▶ **(Page 19)** – Add new land use designation "Agricultural Lands" to Table 2-2 with Units Per Acre of "0.05", Persons Per Housing Unit of "2.8", and Persons Per Acre of "0.14".
- ▶ **(Page 20)** – Add new land use designation "Agricultural Lands" to Table 2-3 with a Floor Area Ratio of 0.1.
- ▶ **(Page 21)** -- Several zoning districts already located within Rural Regions (e.g., rural agriculture, 20 acre minimum, rural agriculture, 40 acre minimum, timber production zone, mineral resources, open space) are identified as being consistent with the AL land use designation (no underlying zoning was changed).
- ▶ **(Page 22)** -- Add new land use designation "AL -- Agricultural Lands" to Table listing Land Use Designations and Zoning Districts.
- ▶ **(Figure LU-1) (after Page 50)** – Modify Land Use Diagram to place the Agricultural Lands Designation on all land designated Agricultural Land in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative with the following exceptions: (1) lands within Community Regions and Rural Centers retain their original designations; (2) Commercial and Industrially-designated parcels retain the Commercial and Industrial designations; (3) federally owned lands having the Open Space designation retain that designation.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

This change would re-designate to Agricultural Lands (maximum density of 1 unit per 20 acres) land that had been designated for Low-Density Residential (maximum density of 1 unit per 5 acres), Rural

Residential (maximum density of 1 unit per 10 acres), Natural Resources (maximum density of 1 unit per 40 acres), and Tourist Recreation (no residential development allowed). These changes have the potential to address inconsistent levels of protection for agricultural operations in identified agricultural areas, and have the potential to change the extent to which residential development could occur (which could affect a variety of impacts).

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, a large amount of land was evaluated under Agriculture District Overlay (49,460 acres) and Williamson Act restrictions (41,853 acres), both of which require 20 acre minimum parcel sizes (see discussions on Page 5.2-18, 5.2-28 and 5.2-32 of the draft EIR and Policy 2.2.2.2 of the Annotated Draft 1996 General Plan Alternative). A large amount of land within these two designations overlapped. Of the area that would now be covered by the AL designation, an estimated 1,554 acres was not covered by either the Agricultural District overlay or Williamson Act contracts.

Exhibit 1 shows the location (by Traffic Analysis Zone, see Exhibit 4-1 of the EIR) and net land use effects of this change in designation. This change is expected to result in 105 fewer units at buildout than would the 1996 General Plan alternative. As described on page 4-16 of the draft EIR, the 1996 General Plan alternative is forecasted to result in development of 32,491 dwelling units in 2025 and has a capacity of 78,692 units at buildout. The reduction in total capacity is not expected to have a substantial effect on capacity at 2025 or the expected location of development at 2025. The total General Plan capacity (at buildout) is still more than double the capacity necessary to accommodate forecasted 2025 demand in all affected TAZs except six. For the TAZs with sufficient capacity, there will be no effect on number of units expected to be developed in 2025. For the six without sufficient capacity, the reduced capacity would be expected to push a total of only 9 units of demand into adjoining TAZs. Because other TAZs have excess capacity they can be expected to readily absorb those units. Therefore this change is not expected to change the expected pattern of development at 2025. It will have a small beneficial effect at buildout by reducing the total amount of development that could theoretically be allowed.

Because the AL designation was evaluated in the EIR's Environmentally Constrained Alternative, agricultural impacts associated with this modification would be similar to the impacts of that alternative as described on pages 5.2-42 through 5.2-50 of the draft EIR. Impacts would be somewhat more severe than projected for that alternative because the AL designation in the proposed General Plan would not apply to lands within Community Regions and Rural Centers, Commercial and Industrially-designated parcels, or federally owned lands having the Open Space designation. The reduction in total potential buildout is not sufficiently large to change any of the analysis or conclusions of the 1996 General Plan alternative that are based on overall development potential. However, by extending agricultural policies to more than 1,500 acres of agricultural land that was not subject to those policies under the 1996 General Plan alternative, the proposed General Plan would reduce the severity of impacts to agriculture compared to the 1996 General Plan alternative, but not to a degree that would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the EIR.

Because there would be no substantial change in the amount, location, and intensity of development through 2025, none of the impact conclusions of the EIR would be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

### **Policy 2.2.1.2 (Page 18) -- Modify definition of Industrial as follows:**

Industrial (I): The purpose of this land use category is to provide for a full range of light and heavy industrial uses. Types of uses that would be permitted include manufacturing, processing, distribution, and storage. Incompatible, non-industrial uses, excluding support services, shall be

prohibited. Industrial uses shall be restricted to Industrial lands within, or in close proximity to, Community Regions, and Rural Centers. Industrial lands in Rural Regions shall be constrained to uses which support on-site agriculture, timber resource production, mineral extraction, or other resource utilization. In the Rural Regions, no additional land shall be designated for industrial uses. This designation is considered appropriate within Community Regions, Rural Centers and, subject to the limitation described above, Rural Regions.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Industrial uses have the potential to create a wide range of environmental impacts depending on the nature of the use and the natural characteristics of the location of the use. This change would not change the uses permitted on lands designated as Industrial but would preclude amending the General Plan land use diagram to designate as Industrial any lands in the Rural Regions that are not designated as Industrial on the land use diagram in the proposed General Plan. This could have the effect of avoiding impacts that might arise as a result of redesignations in the future. Because no such redesignations are proposed at this time, however, it would require undue speculation to identify any specific environmental benefits.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Table 2-3 (Page 20) --** Modify first footnote as follows:

~~\* Ratio of allowable floor area (square footage) to site area (square footage). An increased FAR is allowed as part of a Planned Development where a site specific traffic impact study demonstrates that measures can be imposed to keep traffic at levels associated with the applicable FAR threshold. The FAR can be calculated over an entire integrated development rather than on a project by project basis, as long as the aggregate average FAR within applicable land use designations does not exceed the allowed maximum. The FAR can be calculated over an entire integrated development rather than on a project-by-project basis under the following circumstances: 1) the aggregate average FAR within applicable land use designations does not exceed the General Plan maximum; or 2) satisfactory evidence is provided that demonstrates on a site-specific basis that measures will be imposed to keep traffic at levels associated with the applicable FAR threshold.~~

This change was accompanied by the following conforming change for floor area ratios: Page 20 – Add double asterisk next to “.25” entry for R&D FAR and add the following new footnote:

\*\*Shall not exceed 0.30 for the El Dorado County Business Park based on limitations established on employees in Policy TC-1y. In order to document overall compliance with the purposes of both the FAR limitation herein and the employee cap in Policy TC-1y, all projects within the Business Park that would individually exceed 0.25 FAR must undergo review and approval by the County.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The floor-to-area ratio (FAR) defines the amount of development that can occur on a site. An FAR of 0.25 means that for every one acre (43,560 s.f.), 1/4 acre of development (10,890 s.f.) can be allowed. Site coverage depends on number of floor plates, so the same 0.25 FAR can cover 1/4 of a site (single floor), 1/8 of a site (two floors), etc. The FAR determines the ultimate amount of development allowable

on a site, so it can affect traffic, noise, air quality, infrastructure, etc. This change would allow for greater flexibility in the development of integrated projects by allowing the FAR to be allocated over the entire project rather than specific development sites within a given project.

Thus, FAR policies have the potential to generate sufficient traffic to cause inconsistencies with traffic level of service (LOS) policies and to increase daily and peak hour traffic, to increase exposure to ground transportation noise sources, and to generate long-term operational air quality effects from emissions of reactive organic gasses (ROG), oxides of nitrogen (NOx) and small particulate matter (PM10).

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

The EIR evaluated the effects of development at a 0.25 FAR, including at the Business Park. The effect of the change would be to allow greater flexibility over individual elements of a development, so long as the integrated development does not exceed the 0.25 FAR or generate more traffic than would be associated with a 0.25 FAR. The change in policy will affect only distribution of specific uses within a single integrated development or within the Business Park. Overall, those sites are required to comply with the same performance standard as the policy set forth in the 1996 General Plan alternative. The amount, location, and intensity of development would be the same as evaluated in the EIR. Thus, the level and distribution of traffic would be the same as evaluated in Impacts 5.4-1 and 5.4-2, as would noise effects evaluated in Impact 5.10-2 and air quality effects evaluated in Impact 5.11-2. Please see the analysis of impacts in Sections 5.4 (as modified in pages 2-11 through 2-32, Volume 4.A of the Final EIR), 5.10, and 5.11 (as modified by pages 2-61 through 2-62 in Volume 4.A of the Final EIR).

The change in the FAR at the El Dorado County Business Park was accompanied by a cap on employment generation (Policy TC-1y) adopted pursuant to Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b). The analysis in the EIR demonstrated that if Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b) were implemented by restricting full-time employment growth to 10,045 through 2025, then roads projected to operate at LOS F would operate at LOS E or better. (See pages 5.4-50 and 5.4-51 of the Draft EIR and pages 2-31 and 2-32 of the Volume 4.A of the Final EIR). The reduction in traffic would lead to commensurate reductions in noise and air quality impacts.

Because there would be no change in the location and intensity of development, and because additional restrictions avoid the potential for increased amounts of development at the Business Park to result in any increase in traffic or other related impacts, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts

**Policies 2.2.2.5 and 2.2.7.2 (Pages 24 and 35) --** Delete the first paragraph of Policy 2.2.2.5 to remove the “Non-Jurisdictional Lands (NJ)” designation from the General Plan and the land use diagram and reorganize the General Plan by moving paragraphs A through D of Policy 2.2.2.5 to new Objective 2.2.7 and new Policies 2.2.7.1 through 2.2.7.4 on Pages 35 to 36. In addition, new policy 2.2.7.2 was modified as follows:

The County will actively participate and coordinate with the appropriate Federal and State agencies in land use planning that affects the County’s customs, culture, fire safety and economic stability. The County shall....

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

This change removes the NJ Overlay. The overlay served to identify lands over which the County lacks land use jurisdiction. Because the scope of the County’s jurisdiction is determined by state and federal laws, removal of the overlay will have no effect on the scope of the County’s jurisdiction. The

paragraphs of Policy 2.2.2.5 which address how the County will work with other jurisdictions with respect to planning for such lands will remain in the General Plan as separate policies. These changes have no potential to create physical environmental effects. The effect of adding fire safety to the list of issues to be considered in joint planning efforts with state and federal agencies is discussed in connection with related changes in the Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element, discussed below.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 2.3.2.1 (Page 37)** -- Modify Policy 2.3.2.1 as follows:

Disturbance of slopes ~~forty (40)~~ thirty (30) percent or greater shall be discouraged to minimize the visual impacts of grading and vegetation removal.

This change was accompanied by a related change to an implementation measure related to this policy:

**(Page 47)** – Revise the time frame for Measure LU-E as shown below. This makes the time frame consistent with the time frames in the TCE.

~~Review~~ Review manual within two ~~one~~ years of General Plan adoption. ~~Complete needed revisions within three years of General Plan adoption.~~

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Disturbance of slopes can have adverse visual effects.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

This change would discourage grading on slopes of 30% or more rather than only 40% or more. The policy would therefore apply to reduce visual impacts on more land than would be affected under the 1996 General Plan alternative. The effects of the 40% threshold were analyzed in the EIR (see Section 5.3 and Volume 4.A pages 2-9 through 2-10). Although impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable, this change would operate to reduce the severity of the impact. The change to implementation measure LU-E would result in the implementing procedures being completed within three years instead of two years. This will not have an adverse effect on the environment.

Because this policy could have the effect of reducing somewhat the amount, location, and intensity of development, the impacts could be less severe but the conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 2.9.1.6 (Page 43)** -- Add new Policy 2.9.1.6:

The policies and implementation measures of this plan shall be implemented in a manner that does not take private property for public use without just compensation as required by applicable law.

This change was accompanied by one other conforming and related change, as listed below:

- ▶ **(Page 49)** -- Add new Measure LU-N as follows:

Develop procedures to be used by applicants to substantiate requests pursuant to Policy 2.9.1.6. Responsibility: County Counsel's Office and Planning Department. Time Frame: Within one year of General Plan adoption.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Many of the General Plan policies limit the ability to develop property depending on various circumstances (slope, presence of sensitive habitat, etc.). This policy requires that those policies be implemented in a manner that does not take private property for public use without just compensation as required by applicable law. None of the policies in the General Plan are expected to have this effect. However, if the overall effect of the policies on a specific parcel of land were to have the effect of taking property for public use then this policy would require the County to provide just compensation for that use. This would not have a physical effect on the environment.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

These new policies state that implementation of the General Plan would not result in the taking of private property without just compensation. This is consistent with legal requirements that require compensation for the taking of private property for public uses.

Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Goal 2.10 and Policies 2.10.1.1 through 2.10.1.5 (Page 43)** -- Add new sub-section entitled Lake Tahoe Basin from the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, including: 1) Goal LU-5 as new Goal 2.10; and 2) Policies LU-5a through LU-5e as new Policies 2.10.1.1 through 2.10.1.5.

This change was accompanied by other conforming and related changes, as listed below:

- ▶ **Figure 2-1 (after Page 50)** -- Modify Land Use Diagram to place the Adopted Plan designation on the Tahoe Basin.
- ▶ **(Page 18)** -- Modify "Adopted Plan" text to reference the Regional Plan for the Tahoe Basin and the Plan Area Statements, both adopted by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), and the Meyers Community Plan adopted by El Dorado County and TRPA.
- ▶ **(Page 49)** -- Add as Implementation Measure LU-O, Implementation Measure LU-E from the Environmentally Constrained Alternative as modified by Mitigation Measure 5.14-1.
- ▶ **(Page 12)** -- Delete Tahoe Community Regions from Policy 2.1.1.1.
- ▶ Delete Tahoe Basin Element.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

These changes adopt the approach to the Tahoe Basin taken in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, replacing the various 1996 General Plan Alternative land use designations for the Tahoe Basin with the "Adopted Plan" designation, and replacing the separate Tahoe Basin Element with Tahoe-related policies in the Land Use Element. The policies include the Tahoe-related goal and policies from the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, as well as an additional policy proposed by Mitigation Measure 5.14-1 (Policy 2.10.1.4) and a new policy recognizing the County's authority to adopt more stringent regulations than TRPA where not prohibited by TRPA from doing so (Policy 2.10.1.5). These

changes simplify the County's land use designations and policies in the Basin by directly incorporating the standards of the Regional Plan for the Tahoe Basin and implementing regulations adopted by TRPA. As discussed in the DEIR (page 5.14-3), these changes will not result in any material difference in the allowable types or intensities of land use in the Basin as compared with the 1996 Alternative, and therefore will not have physical effects on the environment.

#### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

The impacts of development under the proposed land use designation and policies were analyzed in Chapter 5.14 of the DEIR. Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Implementation Measure LU-1 (Page 48)** -- Modify the Timeframe for Measure LU-I regarding the Scenic Corridor ordinance as follows:

~~Begin inventory within one year of~~ immediately following General Plan adoption. ~~Prepare draft standards and ordinance text within two years.~~ Adopt ordinance within ~~five years.~~ 18 months.

#### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The proposed General Plan could result in impacts to visual resources.

#### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Impact 5.3-1 in the EIR addresses the potential degradation of the quality of scenic vistas and scenic resources in the County.

This change addresses the timeframe for Measure LU-I, which calls for the inventory of potential scenic corridors and the preparation of a Scenic Corridor Ordinance, which address potential visual resource impacts. Specifically, it dictates that the inventory and ordinance process be conducted on an accelerated timeframe, which would result in planning-related and environmental benefits. This modification would not result in a physical effect on the environment because it is strictly a timing issue.

Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

## **CHANGES TO THE TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION (TC) ELEMENT**

The Board replaced the Transportation and Circulation Element from the 1996 General Plan Alternative and replaced it with the Transportation and Circulation Element from the Environmentally Constrained Alternative as that element had been recommended for modification by the Planning Commission. The key policy differences between the 1996 General Plan alternative's Transportation and Circulation Element and the Environmentally Constrained alternative's Transportation and Circulation Element are:

- ▶ The level of service (LOS) standards in the adopted General Plan are LOS E in Community Regions and LOS D in rural areas, whereas the 1996 General Plan Alternative had additionally required that certain roadways maintain an LOS of C or better.

- ▶ The adopted General Plan includes a new Circulation diagram reflecting the modified Land Use Diagram and the modified LOS standards with the effect of reducing the number of roadway segments planned for widening by 15.

The effect of these changes is discussed below. The remaining differences between the two alternatives are in the manner in which policies are presented. There is no difference in the effect of the policies. The EIR identified no policies from the 1996 General Plan alternative that would be appropriate for inclusion in the Environmentally Constrained alternative in order to avoid or mitigate significant environmental effects.

The first policy difference identified above is with respect to applicable level of service standards. The level of service (LOS) standards in the adopted General Plan are LOS E in Community Regions and LOS D in rural areas, whereas the 1996 General Plan Alternative had additionally required that certain roadways maintain an LOS of C or better. This type of change to the 1996 General Plan alternative's LOS standard was also recommended as Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c). As discussed in the EIR at page 5.4-46 and 5.4-53 and shown on Table 5.4-7, this change would allow roadways to become more congested. It would also avoid the need for some roadway widening projects, however, which would have the effect of reducing impacts associated with roadway construction. Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs from that which was analyzed in the EIR for the Environmentally Constrained alternative, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

The second change noted above is with regard to the Circulation Diagram. The Circulation Diagram in the Environmentally Constrained alternative was correlated to the land use diagram for that alternative. The proposed General Plan includes a new Circulation Diagram based on the land use diagram for the proposed General Plan and the LOS standards described above. The effects of the new Circulation Diagram are analyzed in the Modified 1996 General Plan Alternative Modeling Technical Memorandum by Fehr & Peers (July 7, 2004) attached as Exhibit 2 to this Assessment.

The Technical Memorandum concludes that the revised Circulation Diagram will result in fewer impacts than projected for the Environmentally Constrained alternative. It projects that under the proposed General Plan there could be 74 roadway segments where the existing LOS would deteriorate from A, B, or C to LOS D, E, or F or where any measurable traffic increase (10 or more peak hour trips) would occur on roadway segments with an existing LOS D, E, or F under 2025 conditions. This is more than projected for the 1996 General Plan alternative (67 segments) and fewer than projected for the Environmentally Constrained alternative (85 segments). Thus the change would not lead to any new significant impact and no increase in the severity of significant impacts already analyzed in the EIR.

The remainder of this section evaluates changes made to the text of the Environmentally Constrained alternative's Transportation and Circulation Element to evaluate the extent to which those changes could lead to new impacts or an increase in the severity of impacts analyzed in the EIR.

**Relationship to other Elements (Page 51) – Modify this paragraph as shown below.**

#### **RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ELEMENTS**

The Transportation and Circulation Element has been correlated with the Land Use Element as required by Government Code Section 65302(b). Related policies can also be found in the Parks and Recreation Element (~~bikeways and trails~~); Conservation and Open Space Element (~~scenic~~

highways); Health, Safety, and Noise Element (~~noise and air quality~~); and Public Services and Utilities Element (~~concurrency~~).

This revision simply clarifies text and has no policy effect. Therefore it is not discussed further in this assessment.

**Policy TC-Xh (Page 71)** – Add a new policy as follows:

All subdivisions shall be conditioned to pay the traffic impact fees in effect at the time a building permit is issued for any parcel created by the subdivision. Until such time as updated traffic impact fees are adopted pursuant to this General Plan, any subdivisions will be required to either (1) execute an agreement agreeing to pay the higher fees, even after building permits have been issued or (2) have a notice of restriction placed on the final map prohibiting the issuance of building permits until the updated traffic impact fees are adopted.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Subdivisions have the potential to increase traffic on the County roadway system. This new policy would clarify the timing for payment of fees to mitigate those impacts. In addition, the policy would ensure that any subdivisions approved prior to adoption of a new fee program are required to pay the fees set by the new program.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

The EIR evaluates potential effects of new subdivisions on the County Roadway System in section 5.4 and pages 2-10 through 2-34 of Volume 4A of the EIR together with Master Responses 13-15. The EIR concludes that growth will have significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to traffic and recommends mitigation measures (including the policies adopted as TC-Xa through TC-Xg) to develop fee programs and other financing mechanisms to offset those impacts. This policy would bolster those programs but would not reduce any impacts to a level that is less than significant. Because this policy change would not change the amount, location and intensity of development, or substantially change the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no increase in the severity of impacts and no new significant impacts.

**Policy TC-Xi (Page 72)** -- Add a new policy as follows:

The planning for the widening of U.S. Highway 50, consistent with the policies of this General Plan, shall be a priority of the County. The County shall coordinate with other affected agencies, such as the City of Folsom, the County of Sacramento, and Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) to ensure that U.S. Highway 50 capacity enhancing projects are coordinated with these agencies with the goal of delivering these projects on a schedule to meet the requirements of the policies of this General Plan.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Expansion of Highway 50 could have effects on the environment.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

The expansion of Highway 50 was proposed on the Circulation Diagram proposed as part of the 1996 General Plan alternative and carried through to the Circulation Diagram in the proposed General Plan. The impacts of expansion are evaluated throughout the EIR. This policy change directs the County to work with other jurisdictions in pursuing expansion consistent with the Circulation Diagram. Because

this policy change would not change the amount, location and intensity of development, or substantially change the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no increase in the severity of impacts and no new significant impacts.

**Policy TC-2f (Page 73) -- Add new Policy TC-2f as follows:**

The County shall work with the El Dorado Transit Authority and support the provision of paratransit services and facilities for elderly and disabled residents, and those of limited means, which shall include bus shelters, bus stops, and ramps at stops.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Transit services can reduce traffic levels by providing alternative modes of transportation. This policy would support extending transit service to the elderly and disabled together with those of limited means.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

This policy was included in the 1996 General Plan alternative as Policy 3.8.1.1. The EIR identified no significant impacts associated with that policy. Because this policy change would not change the amount, location and intensity of development, or substantially change the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no increase in the severity of impacts and no new significant impacts.

**Policy TC-5a (Page 75) -- Modify this policy as follows:**

Sidewalks and curbs shall be required throughout residential subdivisions, including land divisions created through the parcel map process, where any residential lot or parcel size is ~~one-half acre~~ 10,000 square feet or less.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Vehicle trips and other sources will increase regional emissions of ROG, NOx and PM10. Sidewalks provide an opportunity for alternative transportation that does not contribute to these emissions.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Page 5.11-35 of the Draft EIR describes the effect of vehicle trips on regional air quality. The EIR determined that potential impacts were significant (see Impact 5.11-2) and identified in the Roadway Constrained and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(g) to encourage development of pedestrian and bike paths. This would reduce air quality impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level (see page 5.11-38 of the Draft EIR and page 2-62 of the Volume 4.A of the Final EIR).

This policy does not affect the analysis regarding the significance of the impact.

The modified policy would implement the intent of the mitigation, and would do so in a manner that reflects more reasonable standards. Lots that are 10,000 square feet or less are typically in subdivisions, where sidewalks are compatible and development is more compact, lending itself to more feasible pedestrian transportation than in large lot areas that are typically more rural and distant from services.

Because this policy change would not change the amount, location and intensity of development, or substantially change the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no increase in the severity of impacts.

**Policy TC-5b (Page 75)** Modify Policy TC-5b as follows:

In commercial, ~~industrial~~, and research and development subdivisions, curbs and sidewalks shall be required on all roads. Sidewalks in industrial subdivisions may be required as appropriate.

**Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Vehicle trips and other sources will increase regional emissions of ROG, NOx and PM10. Bikeways and trails provide an opportunity for alternative transportation that does not contribute to these emissions.

**Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Page 5.11-35 of the Draft EIR describes the effect of vehicle trips on regional air quality. The EIR determined that potential impacts were significant (see Impact 5.11-2) and identified in the Roadway Constrained and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(g) to encourage development of pedestrian and bike paths. This would reduce air quality impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level (see page 5.11-38 of the Draft EIR and page 2-62 of the Volume 4.A of the Final EIR).

This policy does not affect the analysis regarding the significance of the impact.

The modified policy would implement the intent of the mitigation, and would do so in a manner that reflects more reasonable standards. Sidewalks in industrial areas may or may not be appropriate, depending on the location and use. For instance, a sidewalk may not be appropriate at an isolated industrial site or at a site where hazards may be proximate.

Because this policy change would not change the amount, location and intensity of development, or substantially change the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no increase in the severity of impacts.

**Implementation Measure TC-S (Page 81)** -- Modify Measure TC-S to change the Time Frame for an enforcement program for traffic concurrency requirements from the first full fiscal year following general plan adoption to one year from General Plan adoption.

This modification would clarify the original intent that an enforcement program be developed within one year of General Plan adoption. No further analysis is required.

**CHANGES TO THE HOUSING (H) ELEMENT**

**Policy HO-1b (Page 163)** -- Modify Policy HO-1b as follows:

To ensure that projected housing needs can be accommodated, the County shall maintain an adequate supply of suitable sites that are properly located based on environmental constraints, community facilities, and adequate public services.

**Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

This policy change reflects an editorial clarification that reflects the need for “adequate” public services to meet housing needs. This modification would not result in a physical effect on the environment; instead, it strictly represents a social issue related to the provision of housing in the County.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

#### **Policy HO-1f (Page 163) -- Modify Policy HO-1f as follows:**

The County ~~shall require~~ will encourage new or substantially rehabilitated discretionary residential developments to provide for housing that is affordable to low and moderate income households.

This change was accompanied by related and conforming changes including:

#### **Policy HO-1g (Page 163) -- Modify Policy HO-1g as follows:**

The County shall ~~strive to~~ give highest priority for permit processing to development projects that provide housing affordable to very low or lower income households.

#### **Policy HO-2e (Page 165) -- Add new Policy HO-2e:**

The County shall encourage manufactured home subdivisions.

#### **Policy HO-3g (Page 166) -- Planning Commission. Modify Policy HO-3g as follows:**

New multifamily affordable housing developments shall not be converted to condominiums for at least ~~five~~ twenty years after issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.

#### **Implementation Measure HO-C (Page 170) -- Modify Measure HO-C as follows:**

The County shall ~~adopt a mandatory~~ establish a task force to explore options that will encourage and assist in the development of affordable housing. One option to be considered is an inclusionary housing ordinance that requires encourages that a percentage of units in market-rate developments be affordable to very low, lower, and moderate income households. This ordinance ~~will utilize~~ may examine the following methods to ... Timeframe: Within 180 days of General Plan adoption. Within one year of General Plan adoption. Within three months of General Plan adoption an interim ordinance shall be put into place. Expected Outcome: Adoption of an inclusionary housing ordinance. Identification of new or additional means to encourage and assist in the development of affordable housing.

#### **Implementation Measure HO-I (Page 173) -- Change the time frame for Measure HO-I (adoption of a fee waiver ordinance for certain affordable housing developments) from two years to “three months”.**

#### **Implementation Measure HO-M (Page 175) -- Modify Measure HO-M as follows:**

Apply for state and federal monies for direct support of affordable housing construction and rehabilitation. The Planning Department and the Department of Community Services will continue to assess potential funding sources, such as the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Home Investment Partnerships Program, and AB 2034 programs, and explore additional ways such funds may be used countywide (e.g., if they can be used to pay for necessary infrastructure improvements). The County shall make it a priority to identify sufficient matching funds from the County for the CDBG programs. The County will promote the benefits of these

programs to the community by posting information on their website and creating handouts to be distributed with land development applications. [Policy HO-1j]

**Policy HO-DD (Page 182)** – Modify the last bullet of Measure HO-DD regarding feature to be included in universal design standards as follows:

- ▶ ~~Kitchens with~~ Varying counter heights.

**Implementation Measure HO-LL (Page 184)** -- Modify Measure HO-LL as follows:

Continue to refer people who suspect discrimination in housing to the appropriate agency or organization for help. The County Human Services Department will also endeavor to distribute fair housing information as a part of its housing programs. These are ~~This is~~ ongoing efforts by the County. [Policies HO-6b and HO-6c]

**Implementation Measure HO-PP (Page 185)** -- Add new Measure HO-PP as follows:

Work with owners of subsidized housing units and organizations interested in preserving such units to develop a strategy to ensure the preservation of housing units at risk of conversion to market rate housing. The strategy should include identification of funding sources that may be used to preserve at-risk units.

<u>Responsibility:</u>	<u>Department of Human Services</u>
<u>Time Frame:</u>	<u>Develop strategy within two years of General Plan adoption.</u>
<u>Funding:</u>	<u>General Fund</u>
<u>Expected Outcome:</u>	<u>Strategy to preserve units at risk of conversion.</u>

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The proposed General Plan could potentially result in the need for replacement housing, particularly affordable housing. These policy changes would affect the manner in which the General Plan operates to promote development of such housing. The changes would encourage, instead of require, affordable housing in discretionary residential developments; require the County to give highest priority to applications for affordable housing developments; encourage use of manufactured homes to promote affordability; limit conversions of affordable rental housing to condominiums; accelerate development of a fee waiver ordinance for affordable housing projects; consider the feasibility of using state and federal grant funds to support infrastructure necessary for affordable housing development in the County; clarify the scope of universal design standards for countertops; require distribution of fair housing information; and require development of strategies to preserve the affordability of affordable housing units at risk of converting to market rate housing.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Impact 5.1-4 of the EIR evaluated the need for replacement housing, and concluded that there would not be a significant environmental impact and no mitigation measures were necessary. The policy change primarily represents implementation changes (i.e., approach, timing, and outcome) in addressing the social issue of development of affordable housing in the County.

Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy HO-1u (Page 165)** -- Change the word “farmworkers” to “agricultural employees” in Policy HO-1u. (Global change throughout this element.)

#### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

This policy change reflects a text edit in order to use a more appropriate group reference, changing the term “farmworkers” to “agricultural employees.” This modification would not result in a physical effect on the environment.

#### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Implementation Measure HO-G (Page 173)** -- Delete bullet 7 from Measure HO-G.

~~Reduction in the open space/recreational area requirements of high density residential developments when the project is located adjacent to public open space areas that may include schools, parks, passive recreation areas, etc;~~

#### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Housing development has the potential to occupy lands that provide open space resources. Various General Plan policies require residential development projects to include an open space component. This change would delete a requirement that the County consider reducing these requirements for high density residential developments. The change would enhance protection of open space resources.

#### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

The EIR evaluated the effects of development, including high density residential development. The effect of development on open space resources was considered in several chapters including chapters 5.3 (Visual Resources) and 5.12 (Biological Resources). (Please also see pages 2-9 through 2-10 and 2-63 through 2-69 of Volume 4.A of the EIR.) This change has the potential to reduce the severity of impacts to those areas. Because the impacts are affected by a wide range of development, however, this change would not reduce the existing significant impacts identified in the EIR to a level that is less than significant. Although this policy could affect the amount, location, and intensity of development and the manner in which development occurs by limiting the intensity of development, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Implementation Measure HO-V (Page 179)** -- Change Measure HO-V as follows:

Consider ministerial approval of multifamily and/or affordable housing. [Policies HO-1f and HO-1p]

#### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

This policy change would require the County to consider ministerial approval only of affordable housing. Multifamily housing that is not affordable would be subject to discretionary review. All development in

the County, whether ministerial or discretionary, would be required to conform to all General Plan policies pursuant to Policy 2.2.5.20. By ensuring discretionary review of multifamily housing this change would provide greater opportunities for public input.

#### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

The potential amount, location, and intensity of development and the manner in which development would occur as analyzed in the EIR would not change based on this policy change. Because there would be no physical effect on the environment from this General Plan change, the severity of identified significant impacts in the EIR would not change.

#### **Implementation Measure HO-OO (Page 185) -- Add new Measure HO-OO:**

Policy HO-OO describes a process to inventory vacant land to match housing development to available infrastructure, in order to reduce development costs (see full text in proposed General Plan).

#### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

This policy change facilitates the development of affordable housing projects based on minimization of potential cost factors (i.e., infrastructure development). By minimizing infrastructure development, it also would reduce the amount of ground-disturbing activities that could potentially result in adverse environmental impacts. This policy change could result in a (beneficial) physical effect on the environment based on the potential to reduce ground-disturbing activities

#### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Although this policy change could result in a physical impact on the environment, the potential amount, location, and intensity of development and the manner in which development would occur as analyzed in the EIR would not substantially change (a minor reduction could occur). Further, it primarily represents an economic issue related to meeting affordable housing objectives in the General Plan. As a result, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

## **CHANGES TO THE PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES (PS) ELEMENT**

**Table 5-1 (Page 235) --** Consistent with modifications to the Transportation and Circulation Element, modify Table 5-1 entry for “County and State road circulation system” under “Rural Center and Rural Region” from “E” to “D”. The effect of this change is discussed in the assessment of changes to the Transportation and Circulation Element.

**Policy 5.2.1.15 (Page 239) --** Add new Policy 5.2.1.15 based on Policy PS-2a from the Environmentally Constrained Alternative as follows:

The County shall support the efforts of the County Water Agency and public water providers to retain existing and acquire new surface water supplies for planned growth and existing and planned agricultural uses within El Dorado County. New surface water supplies may include wastewater that has been reclaimed consistent with state and federal law.

#### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The General Plan would increase demand for water, which would result in the likelihood of surface water supply shortages.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Table 5.5-1 of the EIR shows the total demand for water on the west slope of the county and surface water supplies. The demand includes projected demands to serve residential, commercial and industrial development and to serve existing and new agriculture. Impact 5.5-1 of the EIR (pages 5.5-44 through 5.5-46) describes the impact to surface water supplies and concludes that the impact is significant. Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) on pages 5.5-46 and 5.5-47 of the EIR, as modified on pages 2-36 and 2-37 of Volume 4.A of the EIR, would reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 5.5-1 of the EIR evaluated water supply effects of the proposed General Plan and concluded that a significant impact would occur. The water supply analysis considered both urban and agricultural water demand. This policy change addresses the need for adequate agricultural water supplies in the County. Because the EIR considered impacts associated with developing such supplies this proposed modification does not change the analysis in the EIR.

Because this policy change would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 5.2.3.4 (Page 239)** – Correct Policy 5.2.3.4 as follows:

All applications for divisions of land and other discretionary or ministerial land uses which rely on groundwater for domestic uses, or other type of use, shall demonstrate that groundwater is adequate as part of the review and approval process. The County shall not approve any discretionary or ministerial projects unless the County finds, based on evidence provided by the applicant, or other evidence that may be provided, that groundwater demand supply for the project in question is adequate to meet the highest demand ~~of the proposed development associated with the approval on the lands in question.~~

The modifications to Policy 5.2.3.4 correct an error in the original text and make non-substantive clarifications to the text, but do not affect the intended substance of the measure or its efficacy.

**Policy 5.2.3.6 (Page 240)** – Modify Policy 5.2.3.6 to revise the first sentence as follows:

~~During the five years after adoption of the General Plan,~~ The County shall assess and analyze the well data gained since the permit process started in 1990.

As a conforming change, the Time Frame for Implementation Measure PS-I would also be revised from five years to two years.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Development under the proposed General Plan will affect demand for groundwater resources. This change would require the County to begin analyzing groundwater well data gathered since 1990 upon adoption of the General Plan and complete that analysis within two years rather than over a five year period.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Demand for groundwater was analyzed in section 5.5 of the EIR (also see pages 2-34 through 2-47 of Volume 4.A of the EIR). This change would affect only the timing of the analysis. Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 5.3.1.1 (Page 240)** – Consistent with the change to Land Use Element Policy 2.1.1.1, modify Policy 5.3.1.1 to delete the reference to Georgetown as a Community Region. The effect of this change is discussed in the assessment of changes to the Land Use Element.

Modify the second sentence of Policy 5.3.1.1 as follows:

In the community Regions of Georgetown and Camino/Pollock Pines, the long term development of public sewer service shall be encouraged ~~to be developed~~; however, development projects will not be required to connect to wastewater collection facilities where such connection is infeasible, based on the scale of the project.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Development under the proposed General Plan will affect the need for public sewer service. This is an editorial change with no effect on the manner in which this policy will be applied.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Because this text revision would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 5.3.1.5 (Page 241)** -- Modify Policy 5.3.1.5 as follows:

*~~Standards for On-site septic systems for second dwellings and temporary units occupied for more than six months shall should be upgraded requiring these units to meet the same sizing capacity and replacement area requirements as the primary dwelling. Additionally when a temporary mobile home is occupied for more than six months and connected to an on-site system, the on-site system must be upgraded to meet current standards and be expanded to accommodate the increased capacity as may be required by Environmental Management.~~*

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Development under the proposed General Plan will affect the use of on-site wastewater treatment systems. This revision would clarify the upgrade requirements applicable to second dwelling units and would expand the policy as proposed to apply also to temporary dwelling units occupied for more than six months.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Impacts associated with use of on-site wastewater treatment systems were analyzed in section 5.5 of the EIR (also see pages 2-34 through 2-47 of Volume 4.A of the EIR). Policy 5.3.1.5 was considered in that analysis. Because this change would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There

would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 5.3.1.7 (Page 249) --** Add new Policy 5.3.1.7 based on Policy PS-4a from the Environmentally Constrained Alternative as follows:

In Community Regions, all new development shall connect to public wastewater treatment facilities. In Community Regions where public wastewater collection facilities do not exist project applicants must demonstrate that the proposed wastewater disposal system can accommodate the highest possible demand of the project.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Development under the General Plan will result in increase wastewater flows and related infrastructure impacts.

### **Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impacts**

Impact 5.5-4 in the Draft EIR (pages 5.5-79 through 5.5-87), as modified on page 2-44 of Volume 4.A of the Final EIR, discusses potential increases in wastewater flows and impacts from treating the flows and constructing new facilities. The impact was identified as significant. In addition, Impact 5.5-7 (pages 5.5-121 through 5.5-126) analyzed water quality effects related to wastewater, and was also determined to represent a significant impact. This policy is more restrictive than the policies analyzed in the EIR based on the provision that all development in Community Regions must connect to a public wastewater disposal system (where available), and if not available, the proposed wastewater system must demonstrate that it can meet maximum demand. This would reduce potential wastewater impacts associated with urban development in Community Regions. As such, this policy change would result in environmental benefits by ensuring adequate wastewater treatment for new development. However, because there would be no change in the location and intensity of development, and because any potential reduction in infrastructure and water quality impacts would be partially offset by the exception based on infeasibility set forth by Policy 5.3.1.1, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. Furthermore, this new policy is based on an identical policy from the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, which resulted in impacts of the same magnitude as the Project. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 5.3.1.3 (Pages 240-241) –** Revise Policy 5.3.1.3 as follows:

~~Private community wastewater collection and on-site disposal systems and/or package wastewater treatment plants may be considered an acceptable alternative to traditional wastewater treatment for mobile home parks, commercial and industrial centers, and multifamily residential in Rural Centers.~~ In Rural Centers, the County may allow community wastewater systems and other alternative solutions as an acceptable option to traditional wastewater treatment for mobile home parks, commercial and industrial centers, and multifamily residential. The applicant must prove and the County must find that the proposed system will be adequately and safely operated and can accommodate the highest possible demand of the project.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Onsite wastewater systems (septic systems) have the potential to pollute groundwater.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Impact 5.5-8 of the Draft EIR describes to potential for improperly functioning/ failing septic systems to pollute groundwater. Page 5.5-134 of the EIR describes this impact as significant. The use of community wastewater systems is considered appropriate if it can accommodate the demand of the service area, which is a stipulation of this policy change. In addition, all community wastewater would need to comply with the water quality standards in the Basin Plan as required by the Clean Water Act. This policy change would clarify and slightly expand upon similar guidelines for community wastewater systems (see original Policy 5.3.1.3), which were considered in the EIR analysis under Impact 5.5-4 and Impact 5.5-7.

Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Schools Discussion (Page 245)** -- Add the following new paragraph after the heading “Schools” to explain the methodology used for the school analysis:

As a part of the General Plan update, the County examined a countywide average student yield. It is recognized that there is a range in student yield that varies by region. For example the Tahoe and Pollock Pines districts are currently in decline, whereas the Buckeye, Rescue, and Latrobe districts are experiencing growth. It is the County’s intent to work cooperatively with the various school districts to understand and recognize differences between districts, and to plan for future school facility needs by district, including appropriate locations for new schools.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

New Schools could create potential land use incompatibilities.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Pages 5.7-47 through 5.7-48 and pages 5.7-52 through 5.7-53 of the draft EIR evaluate the impacts of constructing new schools (Impact 5.7-3). The new text clarifies the methodology used to evaluate impacts related to the provision of educational services. This information is presented for clarification purposes only, and there would be no physical effects on the environment from this change.

Because this change would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

## **CHANGES TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND NOISE ELEMENT**

**Policy 6.5.1.14 (Page 267)** – Modify Policy 6.5.1.14 to change “i.e.” in line four to “e.g.”

**Policy 6.2.3.4 (Page 258)** – Add new Policy 6.2.3.4 as shown below.

All new development and public works projects shall be consistent with applicable State Wildland Fire Standards and other relevant State and federal fire requirements.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

New development has the potential to increase the likelihood of and public exposure to wildfires. This policy would clarify that new development (including County public works projects) must be designed to conform to applicable state and federal standards.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Impacts associated with wildland fire were analyzed in section 5.8 of the EIR. Specifically, the applicable federal, state and county regulations and planning requirements are described on pages 5.8-155 through 5.8-121 of the EIR (also see page 2-54 of Volume 4.A of the EIR). The State Wildland Fire Standards referenced in the new text are one of the multiple regulations that were analyzed in the EIR. Because this change would ensure that development is consistent with state and federal fire requirements, it would either not change or serve to increase or decrease the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, and, therefore, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Asbestos Discussion (Page 258-59)** – Insert the following text under Asbestos from beneath the heading Geologic and Seismic Hazards.

Asbestos is of special concern in El Dorado County because it occurs naturally in surface deposits of several types of ultramafic materials (materials that contain magnesium and iron and a very small amount of silica). Asbestos emissions can result from the sale or use of asbestos-containing materials, road surfacing with such materials, grading activities, and surface mining.

The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) is responsible for implementing and enforcing asbestos-related regulations and programs. This includes implementation of Title 17, Sections 93105 and 93106 of the California Code of Regulations (Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure-Asbestos-Containing Serpentine) and the County's Naturally Occurring Asbestos and Dust Protection Ordinance. Regulated activities include construction or digging on a site containing naturally occurring asbestos in rock or soils and the sale and use of serpentine material or rock containing asbestos materials for surfacing.

Asbestos-related measures presented in this General Plan are focused on supporting the actions of the AQMD.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The General Plan could result in increases in public exposure to naturally occurring asbestos.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Impacts related to naturally occurring asbestos were discussed on pages 5.8-95 through 5.8-99 and 5.8-103 through 5.8-104 of the Draft EIR (Impact 5.8-9). The impact of the General Plan was identified as significant.

The new text provides background information related to naturally-occurring asbestos. Because the additional text would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

## CHANGES TO THE CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE (CO) ELEMENT

**Policy 7.2.1.1 (Page 285)** – Add the following reference to the end of Policy 7.2.1.1:

6. Busch, Lawrence L. 2001. Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California. Open File Report 2000-03. Prepared for the California Department of Conservation.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Development pursuant to the General Plan has the potential to affect the development of mineral resources of statewide importance.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Impacts associated with mineral resource availability were analyzed in section 5.9 of the EIR (also see pages 2-55 and 2-56 of Volume 4.A of the EIR). Impact 5.9-5 of the EIR (pages 5.9-63 through 5.9-70) describes the impact of the General Plan to the accessibility of mineral resources and concludes that the impact is significant. Impact 5.9-6 of the EIR (pages 5.9-74 through 5.9-79) describes the impact of the General Plan to land use compatibility with mineral operations and concludes that the impact is significant.

This change would reference the most recent state report on the location and extent of mineral resources in El Dorado County. This report was considered in the EIR. Because addition of this reference would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 7.4.1.2 (Page 292)** – Clarify Policy 7.4.1.2 as follows:

Private land for preserve sites will ~~only~~ be purchased only from willing sellers.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

General Plan policies regarding preservation have the potential to affect the effectiveness of preservation efforts.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

This text change would clarify that private land may be acquired by gifts and that the County is not required to only purchase such lands. This change would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs. Therefore the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 7.4.1.7 (Page 293)** – Add new Policy 7.4.1.7 from PC Alternative CO-6e as follows:

The County shall continue to support the Noxious Weed Management Group in its efforts to reduce and eliminate noxious weed infestations to protect native habitats and to reduce fire hazards.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The intent of the new policy is to demonstrate the need to reduce and eliminate noxious weeds, which could affect wildlife habitat. The proposed new policy represents a minor change and would not result in physical effects on the environment.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Impacts to wildlife habitat are discussed in Section 5.12, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR. As discussed on page 2-65 of Volume 4.A of the EIR the introduction and spread of noxious weeds, such as the yellow-star thistle, is a source of habitat degradation in the County and elsewhere. The intent of the new policy is to support existing efforts to reduce and eliminate noxious weeds, which could affect wildlife habitat. This policy would not directly change the amount, location, and intensity of development. Programs of the noxious weed management group could affect the manner in which development occurs but would not be expected to avoid any significant impacts. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 7.4.2.2 (Page 293)** – Modify Policy 7.4.2.2 as follows:

Where critical wildlife areas and migration corridors are identified during the review of projects, the County shall protect the resources from degradation by requiring all portions of the project site that contain or influence said areas to be retained as non-disturbed natural areas through mandatory cluster development on suitable portions of the project site or other means such as density transfers if clustering cannot be achieved. The setback distance for designated or protected migration corridors shall be determined as part of the project’s environmental analysis. The intent and emphasis of the Open Space land use designation and of the non-disturbance policy is to ensure continued viability of contiguous or interdependent habitat areas and the preservation of all movement corridors between related habitats. The intent of mandatory clustering is to provide a mechanism for natural resource protection while allowing appropriate development of private property. Horticultural and grazing projects on agriculturally designated lands are exempt from the restrictions place on disturbance of natural areas when utilizing “Best Management Practices” (BMPs) recommended by the County Agricultural Commission and when not subject to Policy 7.1.2.7.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Development occurring pursuant to the General Plan, including agricultural activities, could result in loss and fragmentation of habitat.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Pages 5.12-42 through 5.12-54 of the Draft EIR discuss the potential impacts from various activities, including agriculture, on wildlife habitat. Policy 7.4.2.1, sets forth similar goals of clustering and setbacks, was considered in this analysis. The impact is identified as significant (Impact 5.12-1). Several mitigation measures, 5.12-1(a through g), were added on pages 5.12-54 through 5.12-63 of the Draft EIR, and as modified on pages 2-66 and 2-67 of Volume 4.A of the Final EIR, to reduce the impacts through a variety of programs. After mitigation the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

The amendment to this policy does not affect the analysis regarding the significance of the impact to wildlife habitat because the adopted exemption for horticultural and grazing activities applies only if the activity incorporates BMPs adopted by the Board, and because those BMPs are required to provide a comparable level of resource protection. The USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service and the University of California Cooperative Extension have developed BMPs that include measures to protect

riparian habitats by, for example, controlling the rate and quantity of runoff, controlling the use of pesticides, surveying for and avoiding sensitive biological resources, and protection of stream channels. Accordingly, this change will have no practical effect on the analysis of impacts in the EIR.

Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 7.4.2.6 (Page 294)** – Modify Policy 7.4.2.6 as follows:

El Dorado County Biological Community Conservation Plans shall be required to protect, to the extent feasible, rare, threatened, and endangered plant species only when existing Federal or State plans for nonjurisdictional areas do not provide adequate protection ~~because the species in question do not occur in significant numbers in nonjurisdictional areas.~~

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The change is intended to clarify the policy, which relates to preparation of Biological Community Conservation Plans and protection of rare, threatened, and endangered plant species. The change makes clear that the County may consider a variety of factors when evaluating the adequacy of federal and state protection plans. It is not expected to result in any change to protection of special-status plants or any other biological resources. This change is not expected to result in a physical effect on the environment.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Impacts to sensitive biological species (Impact 5.12-2) are addressed on pages 5.12-70 through 5.12-74 and pages 5.12-84-5.12-86 of the Draft EIR. The policy as written was considered in the analysis of impacts of the General Plan. Because the text change would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 7.4.2.7 (Page 294)** – Modify Policy 7.4.2.7 as follows:

The County shall form a Plant and Wildlife Technical Advisory Committee to advise the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors on plant and wildlife issues and the committee should be formed of local experts, including agricultural, fire protection, and forestry representatives, who will consult ...

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The proposed modification represents a minor change to Policy 7.4.2.7. It is intended to clarify that agricultural, fire protection, and forestry representatives should be included on the team of local experts forming the Plant and Wildlife Technical Advisory Committee. This addition does not change the meaning or intent of the policy, nor would it result in a physical effect on the environment.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 7.6.1.4 (Page 307)** – Add new Policy 7.6.1.4 as shown below:

The creation of new open space areas, including ecological preserves, common areas of new subdivisions, and recreational areas, shall include wildfire safety planning.

**Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Preservation of open space pursuant to General Plan policies has the potential to increase the likelihood of and public exposure to wildfires. This policy would clarify that open space plans must be consider wildfire safety planning.

**Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Impacts associated with wildland fire were analyzed in section 5.8 of the EIR. Specifically, the applicable federal, state and county regulations and planning requirements are described on pages 5.8-155 through 5.8-121 of the EIR (also see page 2-54 of Volume 4.A of the EIR). The State Wildland Fire Standards referenced in the new text are one of the multiple regulations that were analyzed in the EIR. Because this change would ensure that development is consistent with state and federal fire requirements, thereby serving to further limit development, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Implementation Measure CO-K (Pages 309-10) – Modify Measure CO-K as follows:**

Work cooperatively with the State Department of Fish and Game, ~~and~~ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Bureau of Land Management to implement ...

**Potential Physical Effect on the Environment**

This change adds a reference to the Bureau of Land Management to the list of federal agencies involved in the gabbro soils rare plant ecological preserve and recovery program. The change has no potential physical effect on the environment.

**Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**CHANGES TO AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY (AF) ELEMENT**

**Policy 8.1.2.3 (Page 319) – Add new Policy 8.1.2.3 as follows:**

The County shall encourage the assignment of the Agricultural Land (AL) designation to rangelands currently used for grazing or suitable for sustained grazing of domestic livestock.

**Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The proposed General Plan could result in changes to the land use character of the County and/or substantial land use incompatibilities based on the land use designations included in the General Plan Land Use Map. There would be no physical effect on the environment from this policy change because the assignment of the Agricultural Land (AL) designation is appropriate for rangelands and this designation would not affect existing rangeland uses.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Impact 5.1-2 (pages 5.1-36 and 5.1-45 through 5.1-47) and Impact 5.1-3 (pages 5.1-50 through 5.1-52 and pages 5.1-60 through 5.1-62) in the Draft EIR evaluate the effects related to land use character and land use compatibilities, respectively, and concludes that these are significant environmental effects. This policy would apply an appropriate land use designation to rangelands and mitigation is available to minimize any potential land use incompatibility effects (see Mitigation Measures 5.1-3(a) and 5.1-3(b)). The policy change would not change the amount, location, or intensity of development or the manner in which development occurs. Therefore the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 8.1.3.3 (Page 319)** – Modify Policy 8.1.3.3 as follows:

The County shall revise the Right to Farm Ordinance to include a provision ~~to place a deed restriction~~ for a mandatory local option real estate transfer disclosure statement on all new parcels created adjacent to Agricultural Districts or agriculturally designated lands requiring the new owner to sign a statement acknowledging that his or her parcel is adjacent to a parcel engaging in agricultural activities.

In addition, a conforming amendment would be made to Implementation Measure AF-A as follows:

B. Update and revise the Right to Farm Ordinance to include a ~~provision to place a deed restriction~~ requirement for a mandatory local option real estate transfer disclosure statement on all new parcels created adjacent to agricultural lands ...

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The proposed General Plan has the potential to affect agricultural resources through direct conversion and/or related agricultural activities (e.g., ranch marketing efforts).

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

The EIR evaluates potential conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses under Impact 5.2-1 and Impact 5.2-2 and concludes that the proposed General Plan would result in significant environmental effects. The EIR considered Policy 8.1.3.3 in its analysis. The proposed policy change revises Policy 8.1.3.3 to replace the provision for deed restrictions on properties adjacent to agricultural lands with mandatory real estate transfer disclosure statements regarding adjacent agricultural uses. As a result, the overall intent of this policy is retained, and there would be no physical effect on the environment as a result of its implementation.

Because this policy revision would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Objective 8.1.5 (Page 321)** – Modify Objective 8.1.5 as follows:

The County shall encourage cluster development, or grouping together of allowable dwelling units in Rural Centers ~~agricultural districts or lands zoned for agriculture located outside of agricultural districts~~, instead of the dispersal of such dwelling units on larger parcels.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The proposed General Plan could result in land use incompatibilities, including from incompatibilities arising from dispersed residential development that could result in potential conversion of agricultural lands.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Pages 5.2-25 through 5.2-26 and pages 5.2-50 through 5.2-59 (Impact 5.2-1) address the issues of incompatibility between agricultural and other land uses, and the potential for this incompatibility to result in possible conversion of land uses. This impact is determined to be significant and several mitigation measures were adopted to reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Objective 8.1.5 was considered in the analysis.

This change reflects the new Agricultural Lands (AL) land use designation described and analyzed in connection with the change to Table 2-1 and related policies in the Land Use Element. The AL designation applies to all lands in the Rural Region that had not been designated as Commercial or Industrial. The designation specifies a 20-acre minimum parcel size. The revision to Objective 8.1.5 recognizes the shift in land uses allowable in Rural Regions. Because of the change in land use designations in the Rural Regions the clustering policy would no longer be relevant to the agricultural land uses in those regions. The shift in language to refer to Rural Centers recognizes that the policy is no longer needed in Rural Regions due to the change in land use designations.

By encouraging clustering in Rural Centers the proposed General Plan will encourage more compact development and reduce the likelihood of land use incompatibilities but this change will not reduce any significant impacts to a level that is less than significant. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 8.2.1.1 (Page 331)** – Modify Policy 8.2.1.1 as follows:

The County shall support the ~~extension~~ development of water ~~lines~~ supplies and the use of reclaimed and untreated water for the irrigation of agricultural lands.

In addition, the proposed General Plan would include a related change adding new policies Policy 8.2.1.4 and 8.2.1.5 as follows:

Policy 8.2.1.4 When reviewing projects, the County shall consider a project's impacts on availability of water for existing agricultural uses.

Policy 8.2.1.5 The County will work with water purveyors and the Agricultural Commission to establish plans to ensure the provision of adequate water supplies to existing and future agricultural uses.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The General Plan would Increase demand for water, which would result in the likelihood of surface water supply shortages.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Table 5.5-1 of the EIR shows the total demand for water on the west slope of the County and surface water supplies. The demand includes projected demands to serve residential, commercial and industrial development and to serve existing and new agriculture. Pages 5.5-44 through 5.5-46 of the EIR describe

the impact to surface water supplies and conclude the impact is significant. Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) on pages 5.5-46 and 5.5-47 of the EIR, as modified on pages 2-36 and 2-37 of Volume 4.A of the Final EIR and by revisions to those policies in the proposed General Plan, would reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 5.5-1 of the EIR evaluated water supply effects of the proposed General Plan and concluded that a significant impact would occur. The water supply analysis considered both urban and agricultural water demand. This policy change addresses the need for adequate agricultural water supplies in the County. Because the EIR considered impacts associated with developing such supplies this proposed modification does not change the analysis in the EIR.

Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 8.2.2.1 (Page 322)** – Modify Policy 8.2.2.1 as follows:

Agricultural operations allowed by right on agricultural lands shall include, but not be limited to:

- a) Cultivation and tillage of the soil, grazing, dairying....

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The proposed General Plan has the potential to affect agricultural resources through direct conversion or through land use incompatibility issues.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Pages 5.2-25 through 5.2-26 and pages 5.2-50 through 5.2-59 address the issues of incompatibility between agricultural, including grazing land and other land uses, and the potential for this incompatibility to result in possible conversion of land uses. This impact is determined to be significant and several mitigation measures were adopted to reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Policy 8.2.2.1 was considered in the analysis.

Agricultural viability, including conversion of grazing land, is evaluated under Impact 5.2-1 in Section 5.2 of the EIR, which is considered to be a significant environmental impact. This policy change modifies Policy 8.2.2.1 to specify grazing as an allowable use on agricultural lands. This modification serves as a point of clarification to specifically call out grazing as a suitable agricultural activity. The analysis in the EIR examined impacts from various types of agricultural activities, including grazing. Including a specific reference to grazing in the policy does not change the EIR assumptions regarding how and where grazing may take place.

Because this policy would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 8.1.1.8 (Page 326)** – Add new Policy 8.1.1.8 to address the new Agricultural Lands land use designation.

Lands assigned the Agricultural Land (AL) designation shall be of sufficient size to sustain agricultural use and should possess one or more of the following characteristics:

A. Are currently under a Williamson Act or Farmland Security Zone Contract;

B. Contain the characteristics of choice agricultural land (i.e., contain choice agricultural soils and/or contain Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Locally Important Farmland); or

C. Are under cultivation for commercial crop production or are identified as grazing land;

And one of the following:

1. Are located in the county's Rural Region; or

2. The County Department of Agriculture has determined that the land is well suited for agricultural production.

This change is consistent with Land Use element changes discussed above regarding the addition of the Agricultural Land use designation. Please see that discussion for an assessment of the effects of the change.

## **CHANGES TO THE PARKS AND RECREATION ELEMENT**

**Policy 9.1.1.7 (Page 336)** – Modify Policy 9.1.1.7 to delete last sentence.

Encourage and support efforts of independent recreation districts to provide parks and recreation facilities. The joint efforts of Community Services Districts, independent recreation districts, school districts, cities, and the County to provide parks and recreation facilities shall also be encouraged. ~~For areas in which cities and districts have park and recreation taxing authority, County policy is that such cities and districts shall assume the total cost of developing community park facilities.~~

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The proposed General Plan could potentially result in the deterioration of existing park and recreation facilities and the need for new facilities based on projected population growth.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Page 5.7-80 of the Draft EIR determined that the General Plan could result in significant impacts to parks facilities notwithstanding policies such as Policy 9.1.1.7. Several mitigation measures were proposed as new policies to fund and finance new parks facilities. This policy change removes the burden from cities and districts with taxing authority to fully fund the development of community park facilities. This is a fiscal issue that does not change the analysis of impacts of the General Plan.

The amount, location, and intensity of development (including parks) and the manner in which land uses would occur as analyzed in the EIR would not change based on this policy change. As a result, the EIR's conclusions regarding the severity of identified significant impacts (Impact 5.7-5) would not change. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 9.1.1.11 (Page 336)** – Modify Policy 9.1.1.11 as follows:

Focus park acquisition on recreation oriented facilities ~~as opposed to open space.~~

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

The proposed General Plan could potentially result in the deterioration of existing park and recreation facilities and need for new facilities based on projected population growth.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Pages 5.7-82 through 5.7-84 and 5.7-86 of the Draft EIR (Impact 5.7-6) determined that the General Plan could result in significant impacts from parks development, including facilities developed on open space lands. Mitigation Measures 5.7-6(a) and 5.7-6(b) on page 5.7-87 of the Draft EIR would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. This policy change reflects a minor editorial change to Policy 9.1.1.11 that clarifies that the intent of park acquisition efforts is on developed, as opposed to natural (open space), facilities.

The amount, location, and intensity of development (including parks) and the manner in which land uses would occur as analyzed in the EIR would not change based on this policy change. As a result, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 9.1.2.9 (Page 337)** – Revise first sentence of Policy 9.1.2.9 as follows:

The County shall update the Bikeway Master Plan and include the bikeways system on the Trails Master Plan Map within two ~~one~~ years of General Plan adoption. ...

In addition, the proposed General Plan includes a conforming change to Implementation Measure PR-C.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Development pursuant to the General Plan will generate demand for bicycle transportation facilities.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

This policy change reflects a timing change that calls for developing a Bikeway Master Plan within two years after General Plan adoption. This will not affect the amount, location, and intensity of development (including bikeways) or the manner in which land uses would occur as analyzed in the EIR. The change could have a minor effect on the timing of Bikeway development but the one year delay in development of the Master Plan is not substantial. As a result, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

**Policy 9.2.2.7 (Page 340)** – Modify Policy 9.2.2.7 as follows:

The County shall strongly encourage the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to divest itself of all lands that are not environmentally sensitive within the County to provide ownership so the County can reap the benefits therefrom.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

Development pursuant to the General Plan can adversely affect environmentally sensitive lands.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

The revision would limit the scope of the general policy to encourage divestiture of federally owned land managed by the Bureau of Land Management. That policy would not apply to lands that are environmentally sensitive (e.g., some gabbro soil areas owned managed by the Bureau of Land Management). This will help avoid development patterns that could adversely affect environmentally sensitive lands. This policy would reduce the possibility of potential development on environmentally sensitive lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management. This would have a positive effect but would not reduce any significant impacts identified in the EIR to a level that is less than significant. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

## **CHANGES TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT**

**Policies 10.1.9.1 and 10.1.9.2 (Page 358)** – Modify Policy 10.1.9.1 as follows:

The County shall use appropriate land use, zoning, and permit streamlining strategies, and other financial incentives to provide for and encourage a broad mix of housing types that are compatible with wage structures associated with existing and forecasted employment.

This change was accompanied by a related change for Policy 10.1.9.2 as follows:

Encourage specific plans and large planned developments in Community Regions and Rural Centers to include a broad mix of housing types and relate it to local wage structures to achieve balance with existing and forecasted resident household needs.

### **Potential Physical Effects on the Environment**

These policy changes reflect editorial changes to the policy language that simplify the manner in which the intent of the policies is conveyed. These policy changes would not result in a physical effect on the environment.

### **Potential for New or Increased Severity of Significant Impacts**

Because these minor revisions would not change the amount, location, and intensity of development, or the manner in which development occurs, the impact conclusions of the EIR would not be altered. There would be no new significant impact and no increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.