

C O N F O R M E D A G E N D A

**Special Meeting of the Board of Supervisors
El Dorado County, California**

Monday, May 3, 2004 - 9:00 A.M.
GENERAL PLAN HEARING #1

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING ROOM
330 Fair Lane, Building A
Placerville, CA 95667
530 621-5390
FAX 622 3645
co.el-dorado.ca.us/bos

RUSTY DUPRAY
First District
Chairman

HELEN K. BAUMANN
Second District

JACK R. SWEENEY
Third District

CHARLIE PAINE
Fourth District
First Vice Chairman

DAVID A. SOLARO
Fifth District
Second Vice Chairman

Clerk of the Board
Dixie L. Foote

Chief Administrative Officer
Laura S. Gill

County Counsel
Louis B. Green

HEARING ASSISTANCE DEVICES ARE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC USE

General Plan Hearing #1 - The Board of Supervisors will conduct the first hearing on certification of the General Plan EIR and adoption of a General Plan. This hearing will focus on selection of a base alternative (land use diagram and policy set) from one of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR or the Planning Commission Alternative, modifications to the alternative if appropriate, and consideration of proposed mitigation measures identified in the EIR. It is anticipated that the Board will also reach a consensus on the Land Use Element, Housing Element, and Economic Development Element. Items not finished will be carried over to the next meeting.

All times are estimates. Actual times may vary. Items may be taken earlier or later than estimated. Items may be taken on different days than shown. The meeting may last longer or end earlier than shown. Not all meeting dates may be necessary.

9:00 a.m. 1. CALL TO ORDER
All Supervisors Present.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDAS
3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

43125

4. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-GENERAL PLAN RELATED ITEMS
Refer to Speaker Logs, Exhibits A-D, attached.

 5. GENERAL PLAN AND EIR
 - a. Welcome by Chair
 - Format and organization
 - Ground rules
 - Staff and Commission Introductions

 - b. Staff report by General Plan Project Manager

 - c. Report on Planning Commission Recommendation by Chair of Planning Commission

 - d. Public and Board testimony on alternatives
Refer Exhibit "A", "Log of Speakers on Plan Alternatives" attached.

 - e. Board of Supervisors to deliberate and select a General Plan alternative as the base from which to consider policy alternatives and feasible mitigation measures
BOARD ACTION: By motion of Supervisor Solaro, seconded by Supervisor Baumann and by a vote of 3-2 with Supervisors Dupray and Paine voting "no," the 1996 Plan was approved as the Base Plan with the inclusion of additions to the Transportation and Circulation Element proposed by Supervisor Baumann.

523 1(n) 4(n)

(Refer to Exhibit "E" attached for interim actions of the Board taken prior to this final action.)
- 12:00 p.m. LUNCH BREAK
- 1:00 p.m. Resume hearing
- f. Staff Report on Land Use Element

 - g. Public and Board testimony and deliberations on Land Use Element
Refer Exhibit "B", "Log of Speakers on Land Use Element" attached.

 - h. Staff Report on Housing Element

 - i. Public and Board testimony and deliberations on Housing Element
Refer Exhibit "C", "Log of Speakers on Housing Element" attached.

 - j. Staff Report on Economic Development Element

k. Public and Board testimony and deliberations on Economic Development Element
Refer Exhibit "D", "Log of Speakers on Economic Development Element" attached.

l. Public testimony on General Plan topics not scheduled for this hearing by individuals who cannot attend the other hearings (actual time may vary - this item may be taken at any time during the hearing at the discretion of the chair - testimony on this item may be allowed more than one time during the hearing)

4:00 p.m. m. Adjourn and continue to Wednesday May 5, 2004 at 9:00 a.m. (actual time of adjournment may be earlier or later).
Meeting adjourned to Wednesday, May 5, 2004 at 9:00 a.m.

Times are approximate and may be adjusted by the Chair as the meeting progresses.

DOCUMENTATION FOR HEARINGS: The following documentation may be utilized during the Board hearings:

- General Plan Draft EIR, May 2003, 3 volumes
- General Plan EIR Responses to Comments, January 2004, 6 volumes
- General Plan Adoption Hearings Staff Report #1, February 2004
- Annotated Draft General Plan Alternatives, March 2004, 3 volumes
- Planning Commission Final Recommendation, March 31, 2004
- Planning Commission General Plan Alternative, to be released
- General Plan Adoption Hearings Staff Report #2, to be released
- Other Supporting Documentation, to be released

Log of Speakers for General Plan Hearing #1
May 3, 2004

Public Testimony on Plan Alternatives:

Ed Keller: Mr. Keller expressed concerns with property directly south of Grey's Corner on Fairplay Road. Currently he states it is zoned Commercial. He would like to see more Commercial property in the South County. Mr. Keller prefers the '96 Plan.

Alice Fuller: Ms. Fuller spoke in regard to property personally owned on Lambert Lane and El Dorado Road, 13.79 acres. She and her family would like to be able to split the property into 4 parcels. She would like the property to stay in the Medium Density Residential zoning. She also supports the '96 Plan.

Gregory Diegel: Mr. Diegel spoke and provided a letter to the Board proposing that people that had purchased property based on the '96 Plan, their property should automatically be rezoned to the '96 Plan.

Gary Lyon: Mr. Lyon spoke in regard to a "Writ of Mandate" on his personal property. Mr. Lyon also feels that if the property is rezoned the County could be losing money in property taxes due to a change in zone. Mr. Lyon prefers the '96 Plan.

Tom Mahach: Representing El Dorado Fire Safe Council and the El Dorado County Fire Protection District. He recommends the Board choose Contents and Substance over trying to stick to the General Plan Schedule. He prefers the use of the '96 Land Use Map with delineations of Community Regions, and using the Rural Centers from the Roadway Constraints.

Bob Smart: Mr. Smart commends the Board on their choice when choosing their Planning Commissioners. He prefers the Planning Commissions Recommended Alternative Plan.

Brad Pearson: Mr. Pearson represents Shingle Springs Neighbors for Quality Living. Mr. Pearson spoke in regard to the area between French Creek Road, Old French Town Road and Motherlode Drive. He recommends the Environmentally Constrained Plan.

Virginia Crespo: Ms. Crespo prefers the '96 Alternative Plan. She also spoke in regard to the vote on the '96 Plan.

Laurel Brent-Bumb, El Dorado Chamber of Commerce. Thanked the Planning Commission for their effort in choosing a plan that they felt would best fit the community. The County Chamber of Commerce supports the '96 Plan.

Ronald Dennis, represented the John Gordon Family Trust. Mr. Dennis is an owner of property in El Dorado adjacent to the El Dorado High School and the Charles Brown School. He is in support of affordable housing in this area, and in favor of the '96 Plan.

Rene Thorne represented himself and his wife. Mr. Thorne is an owner of 120 acres and would like to possibly split the property and retire. He is in support of the '96 plan.

Barry Wasserman, Measure Y Committee: Mr. Wasserman expressed preference for the Road Constrained Alternative with Specific and Significant Modification. Mr. Wasserman's second choice would be the Planning Commissions Recommendation, modified.

Bill Rathbun, resident of Lotus and owner of 32 acres. Mr. Rathbun has 66 parcels around him that are 5 acres. He is in the middle of the 66 acres and he is zoned Rural. He also supports the '96 Plan.

Steven Proe, El Dorado County Taxpayers for Quality Growth. Mr. Proe sent a letter to the Board this Morning dated, May 3, 2004 in regard to the General Plan. He is in support of the Roadway Constrained Plan. He requests the Board look into pollution, and establishing a baseline.

John Lambeth, spoke on behalf of the Business Alliance and encourages the Board to support the '96 Plan as amended. Also he recommends that the Board leave some flexibility in choosing options.

Terry Gherardi of Pollock Pines is in support of the '96 Plan, and provided a handout on the history of the 96 Plan.

Kirk Bone, is in support of the '96 Plan and looks forward to rolling up his sleeves and working on changes to the plan.

Allen Amaro, spoke on behalf of himself and the Affordable Housing Coalition. Mr. Amaro spoke in support of the '96 Plan.

Art Marinaccio, Taxpayers for Responsible Government. Mr. Marinaccio supports the '96 Plan and feels that the '96 Plan has more flexible policies.

Laura Obrochta, spoke on behalf of herself to share her preference on the Environmentally Constrained Plan.

Dennis Rogers, Building Industry Association. Mr. Rogers supports the '96 Plan and feels that it is the most flexible base for the Board to choose.

Kim Beal, El Dorado County Association of Realtors. Ms. Beal spoke in support of the '96 Plan. She is not in support of the Environmentally Constrained Plan.

Mario Da Costa, land owner in Lotus. Mr. Da Costa spoke in support of the '96 Plan, and in support of the houses fitting the property.

Alice Howard spoke on behalf of the Sierra Club and the Maidu Group. She supports the Planning Commissions choice of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative as their Base Plan. She spoke on the inclusion of the Important Biological Overlay and the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan in the Planning Commissions Environmentally Constrained Alternative Base Plan.

Shawn Nejatian, spoke on behalf of himself. He is in support of '96 Plan, and supports the Low density in his area.

Exhibit "B"

Log of Speakers for General Plan Hearing #1

May 3, 2004

Public Testimony on Land Use Element:

Buzz Fozouni, property owner of 10 acres in the Equestrian Village on Salmon Falls Road and Lake Hills Drive. Mr. Fozouni requests that the commission restore the community region boundary and its natural buffer back to its historical boundary.

Clark Cameron, El Dorado Hills Business Park Owners Association. Mr. Cameron requests that the Board adopt the .3 FAR (Floor area ratio) as the Planning Commission did; also, Mr. Cameron request that the Board keep the Maximum Impervious Surface at .7.

Tom Mahach, El Dorado Fire Safe Council and El Dorado County Fire Protection District. Mr. Mahach requests that the Board discuss each element before taking final action, and defer detailed discussion on maps until other portions are looked at, and, have staff provide detailed maps showing occupied parcels and delineated roads on those maps.

John Mc Cready, spoke of behalf of himself. Mr. Mc Cready requests the Board add a new Land Use Designation of "Agriculture A."

Kcammee Vreman is a property owner in District IV, south of Highway 50. Ms. Vreman requests that the 77 acres south of Hwy 50 be designated Low Density Residential and that it not be included in the Community Region.

Jerry Opsahl concurs with what Ms. Vreman has stated in her public testimony. In addition, he hopes that the Board will do all they can to stop the Casino.

Joseph Kozar representing himself and some members of the South Buckeye Ranchero. Mr. Kozar would like to see the 77 acres south of Hwy 50 to be designated Low Density.

Steven Proe, El Dorado County Taxpayers for quality Growth and representing himself. Mr. Proe wanted more clarification on whether or not documents given to the Planning Commission will be used by this Board in making its' decisions. In addition, Mr. Proe spoke on the subject of Fire Safe Requirements.

Dave Pratt, representing the El Dorado Wine/Grape Growers Association. Mr. Pratt is in concurrence with Mr. Mc Cready on the Agriculture Use Designation. However, he would also like to see the Agriculture Use Designation be applicable to Community Regions, Rural Centers and the Rural Regions. Mr. Pratt would also like to have a small change made to RE-5 zoning to include it in the Rural Residential.

Exhibit "B" Cont'd.

John Lambeth, Business Alliance. Mr. Lambeth spoke in regard to the Building Intensity Table and would like to see the FAR (Floor Area Ratio) to be .3. In addition, he feels that the Impervious Surface portion should be taken out of the General Plan.

Barry Wasserman, representing the Measure "Y" Committee. Mr. Wasserman spoke in support of the Planning Commission's Recommendation regarding the requirements for the General Plan Amendments LU-7. He hopes that the Board will be able to amend this Base in a way that leaves as much of a compromise in our Community possible. In addition, he feels that the '96 Plan is the most expensive Plan.

Valerie Zentner, El Dorado County Farm Bureau. Ms. Zentner spoke in support of the Agriculture Land Use being added to the Plan. Ms. Zentner would like to see the Rural Centers continue to be developed. Ms. Zentner expressed concern with scenic corridors, she would like the scenic corridors not be applied to the Agriculture Element.

Laurel Brent-Bumb, El Dorado County Chamber. Ms. Brent-Bumb expressed her concerns with regard to the Scenic Corridor being applied to Agriculture.

Kirk Bone, spoke in regard to Building Intensities, and leaving the residential coverages out of the General Plan. Mr. Bone also supports Mr. Cameron's suggestion on preserving and enhancing the Business Park. Mr. Bone also spoke to being nervous with regard to the scenic corridors and he suggests encouraging the construction of parallel capacity to Highway 50. Also, Mr. Bone suggested that the Board keep policies and decisions as broad as possible, leaving some flexibility while still going forward

David Zweck stated that he was very appreciative that the Board decided to use the '96 General Plan as the base. Mr. Zweck owns property in the Community Region in Shingle Springs, he strongly requests that you leave the property in the Community Region.

Kim Beal, El Dorado County Association of Realtors, Ms. Beal spoke in support of the maximum impervious surface area percentage, but would warn that it could be limiting to what will be built later.

Dennis Rogers spoke in regard to the Blueprint SACOG Project. Mr. Rogers also stated that it is estimated that 1.7 million people will be moving into our region. And, he pointed out that El Dorado County is unique and that there is flexibility; and, that the Board has the rare opportunity within the General Plan to have discussion and be able to acknowledge that the rural areas are a little different than the urban areas.

Brad Pearson, Shingle Springs Neighbors for Quality Living. Mr. Pearson does not support the use of the '96 General Plan. He also believes that the Transportation polices that were proposed should be included no matter which plan is chosen. Mr. Pearson also spoke in regard to the Zweck, White and Scheiber Ranches, (683 acres).

Virginia Crespo spoke in support of using the '96 Plan as the base for the General Plan. She also spoke in regard to the Scenic corridors; she would like the Board to utilize all of the various committees and commission to take a look at possible consequences.

Exhibit "B" Cont'd.

Art Marinaccio, Taxpayers for Responsible Government. Mr. Marinaccio spoke in support of choosing the '96 Plan as the base plan to work from. He also spoke in regard to the Blueprint Project and how the County is going to implement the "Neo-urbanism", or "Smart Growth."

Charles Potts, resident of Fairplay. Mr. Potts has concerns over 80 acres in Fairplay that is completely surrounded by smaller parcels. He would like to see this acreage at a 10 acre minimum.

Laura Obrochta: Ms. Obrochta spoke in regard to long-term goals for El Dorado Hills. She is opposed to the Commercial zoning of the Storage Facility approved by the Board on March 30, 2004. She would like to see the property be zoned to one acre minimum or park designation.

Susan Vomund: Ms. Vomund is concerned about the growth of El Dorado Hills; she would like more of a "quaint" look for the community. She would like to keep high-density zoning out of El Dorado Hills, and go with low-density housing, with a more natural look to the community.

Steve Williams: Mr. Williams represented himself. He would like the Multi-Family zoning for his property.

**Log of Speakers for General Plan, Hearing #1
May 3, 2004**

Public Testimony on Housing Element:

Beverly Van Meurs, League of Women Voters of El Dorado County, Placerville resident.

Ms. Van Meurs spoke to the high costs of housing. Ms. Van Meurs spoke to 17% of the residents of El Dorado County being Low Income, and 20% are very Low Income residents. And that over 50% of the residents spend at least 50% of their income on rent. Ms. Van Meurs states that the League of Women Voters are in support of a well-designed Inclusionary Housing plan, and against the use of in-lieu fees.

Ellen Yevdakimov, spoke on behalf of herself. Ms. Yevdakimov thanked both the Board and the Planning Commission for their efforts on the General Plan. Ms. Yevdakimov also spoke to the importance of air quality, traffic, and affordable housing. Ms. Yevdakimov also commented on Measure G, in that the people did not vote for it because it is the most expansive on growth and the most expensive.

James Knapp, Shenandoah High School, spoke to the Affordable Housing and Homeless Issue. He also spoke to collaborating with other organizations to possibly find a job or housing. Mr. Knapp states that he is willing to speak with Vets and Feed Stores to possibly donate time for the homeless individual's pets.

Allen Amaro, spoke of behalf of himself in regard to Affordable Housing. He states that possibly a committee or commission could be formed for Affordable Housing. He feels that the Committee or Commission could better inform the community.

Scott Mercer, resident of Diamond Springs spoke on the Housing Element. Mr. Mercer spoke of the need for lower cost housing for working professionals. Mr. Mercer spoke is support of lower cost housing, lower cost land and building smaller houses. Mr. Mercer also spoke in support of the Board adopting a "Cottage Housing Code."

Virginia Crespo, spoke on behalf of herself. Ms. Crespo spoke on behalf of the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing and some of the problems that it creates. She does not support having Mandatory Inclusionary Housing in the General Plan.

Diane Murillo, College Community Citizens. Ms. Murillo spoke on behalf of lower income families and senior citizens in need of affordable housing. She spoke to possibly developing senior community for active seniors. Ms. Murillo, also spoke developing more commercial property, for shopping and to bring in more tax dollars.

Kirk Bone, spoke on behalf of himself on the subject of affordable housing and how the Board should go about providing affordable housing.

Bob Smart, spoke of behalf of himself and resident of Diamond Springs. Mr. Smart spoke on the subject of Diamond Springs, El Dorado, and Cameron Park as being good candidates for high density development. He also states that maybe the Board should think about possibly putting in parks and sidewalks and these areas, and more affordable housing.

John Lambeth, on behalf of the Business Alliance addressed the subject of affordable housing, and how do you go about providing that for this County and who will pay for it. In addition, Mr. Lambeth states the Board should look at closely at what is required legally and what to do as far as policy. And, lastly he requests the Board not go forward with Policy HO-C and HO-K.

Dennis Rogers, spoke on behalf of himself. Mr. Rogers spoke on the issue of Affordable Housing and how to provide that, and who will pay for it. He seems to think that it is a simply a supply and demand issue. Mr. Rogers is in support of the Policies, HO-G, HO-I, HO-P and HO-V. He also spoke to concerns that he has with HO-DD and HO-HH. And, lastly, Mr. Rogers states that he would like to work with you in figuring out how to address the issues of Affordable Housing.

Kim Beal, El Dorado County Association of Realtors, spoke on the issue of smaller lots being available for the middle-class home buyer. Ms. Beal states that she feels that the properties that will be available for sale will be multi-family lands, condos, town homes, etc. She also stated her concerns over the Policy HO-3g.

Art Marinaccio, Taxpayers for Responsible Government. Mr. Marinaccio spoke on the issues of the costs to provide Affordable Housing to this Community. He also spoke to the need to provide housing that people can afford to purchase. And, Mr. Marinaccio spoke to the issues of the existing zoning codes for this County.

Harriett Segel, El Dorado Hills resident and spoke on behalf of herself. Ms. Segel tends to oppose mandatory inclusionary housing. She states that if you should include it in the General Plan that the Board really needs to study it more closely.

Barry Wasserman, Measure Y Committee. Mr. Wasserman, spoke in regard to most of the development that will built in the next 10 years has already been approved. He recommends that the Board put some type of policies in the Housing Element that deals with projects that have already been approved. If no policies are put in the Housing Element now, the County will not be dealing with Affordable Housing in the next 5-10 years. He states that there should be an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance adopted after the General Plan is over.

Valerie Zentner, El Dorado County Farm Bureau. Ms. Zentner encouraged the Board to look at opportunities for people to be able to live in the community that they work.

Bettie Thompson, President of the Homeowners' Coalition for Mobile Home Parks in El Dorado County. Ms. Thompson spoke in regard to Affordable Housing and would like the Board to modify the Rent Ordinance to pertain to all residential rentals in El Dorado County, not just Mobile Home Parks.

Bob Rose, Affordable Housing Coalition. Mr. Rose spoke in regard to minimum wage, and the need for Affordable Housing for people that are not paid more that minimum wage.

Don Morrison, Federated Church supporting Low Cost Housing.

Log of Speakers for General Plan Hearing #1
May 3, 2004

Public Testimony on Economic Development Element:

Laurel Brent-Bumb, El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce. Ms. Brent-Bumb spoke on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce in support of the 1996 Base Plan. She feels that the Economic Development Element in the plan is an aggressive economic process, and the process as it evolves will include Government Leaders and Representatives from the business community that can establish an economic development plan that provides measurable targets and priorities, the appropriate resources and support that is necessary. She feels that priorities must include: Increased household income, more job opportunities, reduction of the average commute to their jobs and housing availability. Ms. Brent-Bumb strongly suggests a commitment to Economic Development.

Art Marinaccio, Taxpayers for Responsible Government. Mr. Marinaccio spoke to the importance of starting an advisory group probably sooner than the General Plan process will be finished. And, he stated that the Board should keep in mind that this is an on-going process and many of the policies are ideas to be worked upon.

Kim Beal, El Dorado County Association of Realtors. Ms. Beal stated that she feels that the 1996 Base Plan seems to thoroughly identify programs and policies, and encourages economic development throughout El Dorado County. She also stated that she appreciates that it acknowledges the importance of utilizing local business expertise. And, lastly, she urges that Board to adopt it as proposed.

Valerie Zentner, El Dorado County Farm Bureau. Ms. Zentner spoke in delight that Agriculture is recognized as business sector. She stated that she fully supports streamlining the permitting process procedures to help businesses get established. And, lastly she supports the T.O.T. being directed toward promotion of tourism.

John Lambeth, Business Alliance. Mr. Lambeth thanked staff on the work of this element; he feels that it is a great element. He appreciates all of the policies in this particular element including improving and monitoring the permit procedures, getting the County's fair share of funding and having developers pay their own way.

Mario da Costa speaking on behalf of himself. Mr. da Costa spoke to the designation of the rural industrial land use and what happens to land when it has outlived its usefulness.

Diane Murillo, spoke on behalf of herself. Ms. Murillo spoke in regard to turning old abandoned mine quarries into public parks.

**EL DORADO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN ADOPTION HEARINGS
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INTERIM ACTIONS**

(May 3, 2004, Hearing #1)

Base Alternative:

1996 General Plan ("96") Alternative (annotated; including map errata). (NOTE: All changes identified below are referenced to the page numbers in that document unless otherwise indicated.)
523 1(n) 4(n) 3-2 vote

Land Use Element (LUE):

Page 12 – Remove Georgetown from list of Community Regions in Policy 2.1.1.1.
34125 5-0 vote

Page 13 – Add Georgetown to list of Rural Centers in Policy 2.1.2.1.
34125 5-0 vote

Page 12 – Add new Policy 2.1.1.7 describing the general requirements for development within a Community Region:
Consensus of the Board

Staff to prepare insert

Page 19 – Add new land use designation "Agricultural Lands" to Table 2-1, marked as consistent within Rural Regions only.
23145 5-0 vote

Page 21 – Add new land use designation "Agricultural Lands" from PC/EC Alternative as follows:

Agricultural Lands (AL): This designation is applied to lands currently under agricultural production, under a Williamson Act or Farmland Security Zone Contract, or having at least 50 percent choice agricultural soils. A maximum of two residential dwellings used to support the agricultural use are allowed. The A designation may be applied in Rural Regions only.

23145 5-0 vote

EXHIBIT "E" CONT'D.

Page 22 – 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.~~ Industrial land uses in Rural Regions shall only be permitted where there is an existing, operating, isolated industrial facility in an appropriate location that serves the area. In the Rural Regions, no additional land shall be designated for industrial uses. This designation is considered appropriate within Community Regions, Rural Centers and Rural Regions.

24135 5-0 vote

Page 24 – Add new land use designation "Agricultural Lands" to Table 2-2 with Units Per Acre of 1 du/20 acres, Persons Per Housing Unit of 2.8, and Persons Per Acre of 2.8/20 acres.

43125 5-0 vote

Page 25 – Add new land use designation "Agricultural Lands" to Table 2-3 with a Floor Area Ratio of 0.1.

43125 5-0 vote

Page 25 – 1) Change Floor Area Ratio for Commercial, Research & Development, and Industrial from .25 to .30. 2) Change Maximum Impervious Surface for Research & Development from 50% to 70%. 3) Change footnote as follows:

... The FAR can be calculated over an entire integrated development, for example the El Dorado Hills Business Park, 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.

43125 5-0 vote

Page 26 – Add new land use designation "Agricultural Lands" to Table 2-4 with the following Zoning Districts shown as consistent:

Staff to prepare insert

Page 27 -- Add new land use designation "AL -- Agricultural Lands" to Table.

Page 27 – Errata. Delete "E. Planned Community".

Page 27 – Add the Important Biological Corridor (-IBC) overlay per Policy 7.4.2.9 (Mitigation Measure 5.12-3b) on page 307. Staff to prepare language addressing overlap between overlays.

2345 1(absent) 4-0 vote

Page 41 -- Accept Option 2 for Policy 2.2.5.20. Reject Option 1.

23145 5-0 vote

EXHIBIT "E" CONT'D.

Page 47 – Add new Policy 2.6.1.9 from PC Alternative Policy LU-6b:

The County shall prohibit placement of roads or structures on or along ridgelines if that development would break the skyline or be visible from public lands as identified within the Scenic Corridor Ordinance. This policy is not intended to restrict fire prevention measures installed for Fire Safe purposes.

2415 3(n) 4-1 vote

Page 48 – Delete Policy 2.8.1.1 and replace with language from PC/EC Alternative Policy LU-6f:

Development shall limit excess nighttime light and glare from parking area lighting, signage, and buildings. Consideration will be given to design features, namely directional shielding for street lighting, parking lot lighting, sport field lighting, and other significant light sources, that could reduce effects from nighttime lighting. In addition, consideration will be given to the use of automatic shutoffs or motion sensors for lighting features in rural area to further reduce excess nighttime light. [Mitigation Measure 5.3-3b]

54123 5-0 vote

Page 49 – Add new Policy 2.9.1.6 from PC Alternative Policy LU-9g:

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.

Page 49 – Add new sub-section entitled Lake Tahoe Basin from PC Alternative, including: 1) PC/EC Alternative Goal LU-5 as new Goal 2.10; and 2) PC Alternative Policies LU-5a through LU-5e as new Policies 2.10.1.1 through 2.10.1.5.

53124 5-0 vote

Page 51 -- Accept Option 2 for Measure LU-C. Reject Option 1.

Page 54 – Add new Measure LU-N as follows:

Develop procedures to be used by applicants to substantiate a request for exemption from policies due to economic viability. [Policy 2.9.1.6]. Responsibility: County Counsel's Office and Planning Department. Time Frame: Within one year of General Plan adoption

23145 5-0 vote

After page 54 – Modify Land Use Diagram to: 1) show the Georgetown planning area as a Rural Center, not a Community Region; and 2) place the Agricultural Lands Designation on the same lands as it is shown to cover in the PC/EC Alternative thus changing the land use designation for those properties.

34125 5-0 vote

Circulation Element (CE):

Page ?? – Added new Policy #1:

The County Department of Transportation shall annually update the Highway 50 Variable Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee to ensure that the projected growth estimates and the construction costs are accurate to ensure that U.S. Highway 50 maintains a Level of Service of "E" or better.

Page ?? – Added new Implementation Measure 1 for Policy #1:

Upon adoption of the General Plan, the County Department of Transportation shall set as its highest priority the updating of all road impact mitigation fee programs to fund the road improvements identified in this plan consistent with its policies. The County Department of Transportation shall present for approval the updated road impact mitigation fee programs within six months of adoption of the General Plan.

Page ?? – Added new Implementation Measure 2 for Policy #1:

All tentative subdivision maps approved subsequent to the approval of the General Plan shall be conditioned to pay the updated road impact mitigation fee at the time the building permit is issued. Until such time as the road impact mitigation fee is adopted, any subdivision maps will be conditioned to either (1) execute an agreement agreeing to pay the higher fee, even after building permits are issued or (2) have a notice of restriction placed on the final map prohibiting the issuance of building permits until the road impact mitigation fee is adopted.

Page ?? – Added new Policy #2:

The planning for the widening of U.S. Highway 50, consistent with the Highway 50 Variable Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee, shall become a priority of the County. The County Department of Transportation shall coordinate with the El Dorado County/City of Folsom Joint Powers Authority, the City of Folsom, Sacramento County and/or SACOG to ensure that U.S. Highway 50 widening projects are coordinated with these agencies with the goal of delivering the planned widening projects on the schedule dictated in the Highway 50 Variable Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee program.

Housing Element (HE):

Pages 91 through 240 – Deleted and substituted with Housing Element from PC Alternative with the following changes: **45123 5-0 vote**

Page 161 of PC Alternative – 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 **3215 4(n) 4-1 vote**

Page 168 of PC Alternative – Modify Measure HO-C as follows:

The County ~~shall adopt a mandatory~~ will establish a task force to consider development of an inclusionary housing ordinance that requires encourages that a percentage of units in market-rate developments should 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.~~

45123 5-0 vote

Public Services and Utilities Element (PSUE):

No action yet.

Health, Safety, and Noise Element (HSNE):

No action yet.

Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE):

No action yet.

Agriculture and Forestry Element (AFE):

No action yet.

Parks and Recreation Element (PRE):

No action yet.

EXHIBIT "E" CONT'D.

Economic Development Element (EDE):

Page 370 – Modify Policy 1-.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.~~

14235 5-0 vote

Page 370 – Modify 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.~~

14235 5-0 vote

Tahoe Basin Element (TBE)

Pages 389 through 400 -- Deleted.