



EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

<http://www.co.el-dorado.ca.us/planning>

Phone: (530) 621-5355
Fax: (530) 642-0508

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 9, 2003
TO: Interested Parties
FROM: Peter Maurer, Principal Planner
SUBJECT: Summary of Differences Between the Equal Weight General Plan Alternatives

The Draft El Dorado County General Plan was made available to the public on April 9, 2003. The draft comprises three volumes, which contain the four equal weight alternatives.

Staff prepared the attached summary to assist reviewers in understanding the key differences between the alternatives. The summary is not intended to be exhaustive but, rather, a summary of the most notable variations. Where applicable, policy number references are included so that readers may review specific policies. The summary does not address mapping differences except as they relate to policies and/or plan implementation. We hope you find the summary helpful as you review the draft General Plan documents.

For more information on the General Plan process, visit our website at:

<http://www.co.el-dorado.ca.us/generalplan>

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES

Notes:

- *This document was prepared by staff as a guide to assist readers with the draft General Plan alternatives. It is not an exhaustive review of the differences but, rather, a summary of the more notable variations.*
- *This summary does not include mapping differences except as they relate to policy/implementation.*
- *For EC and RC, the summary includes detail provided in implementation programs (Alternatives #1 and #4 do not include implementation programs as part of the elements).*

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
GENERAL			
Plan Assumptions, Strategies, Concepts, & Objectives	Included	Not included (objectives enveloped in vision)	Not included (objectives enveloped in vision)
Vision	Included	Included but slightly different than NP/96 GP; serve as plan objectives as well	Same as RC.
Principles	Included	Not included	Not included
Objectives	Included	Not included	Not included
Implementation Program	Not included	Included	Included
Supporting Text	Not included in policy document	Included in policy document	Included in policy document
Housing Element	Same for all alternatives		
Tahoe Basin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes Tahoe Element. • Directs County to achieve and maintain conformance with the goals and policies of TRPA by revising the Zoning Ordinance. • Land use designations assigned to all parcels in the Basin. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tahoe Element not included. • General approach is to pursue consistency with TRPA regulations by adopting those regulations as County land use/zoning. • All lands in Basin show as AP (Adopted Plan). 	Same as RC.
LAND USE			
Community Regions	<p>13 Community Regions: Camino/Pollock Pines, El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, El Dorado, Diamond Springs, Shingle Springs, Georgetown, the City of Placerville and immediate surroundings, the City of South Lake Tahoe and immediate surroundings, Meyers, Camp Richardson, Meeks Bay, and Tahoma. (Policy 2.1.1.1)</p>	<p>7 Community Regions: Cameron Park, Camino/Pollock Pines, El Dorado/Diamond Springs, El Dorado Hills, Georgetown, City of Placerville and immediate surroundings, Shingle Springs</p> <p>Community Regions are reduced in size from NP/96 GP based on changes in land use (which are a result of the subdivision restriction) and to provide</p>	<p>5 Community Regions: Cameron Park, El Dorado/Diamond Springs, El Dorado Hills, Placerville, Shingle Springs</p> <p>Community Regions are reduced in size from NP/96 GP to provide separation between communities and based on changes in land use (reducing intensities of development). Reduced in number to reduce intensity of</p>

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
		some separation between communities. Does not include any communities in the Tahoe Basin.	development. Only alternative that does not include Georgetown, Camino, and Pollock Pines as Community Regions. Does not include any communities in the Tahoe Basin.
Rural Centers	<p>25 Rural Centers: Coloma, Cool, Fairplay, Garden Valley, Greenwood, Grey’s Corner, Grizzly Flat, Kelsey, Kyburz, Latrobe, Little Norway, Lotus, Mosquito, Mount Ralston, Mt. Aukum, Nashville, Oak Hill, Phillips, Pilot Hill, Pleasant Valley, Quintette, Rescue, Somerset, Strawberry, and Chrome Ridge. (Policy 2.1.2.1)</p>	<p>27 Rural Centers: Camino Heights, Chrome Ridge, Coloma, Cool, Fairplay, Garden Valley, Greenwood, Grey’s Corner, Grizzly Flat, Kelsey, Kyburz, Latrobe, Little Norway, Lotus, Mosquito, Mt. Ralston, Mt. Aukum, Oak Hill, Omo Ranch, Phillips, Pilot Hill, Pleasant Valley, Quintette, Rescue, Sierra Springs, Somerset, Strawberry</p> <p>Rural Centers of Camino Heights and Sierra Springs added to address development intensity variation in the rural areas near Pollock Pines and Camino (after application of the subdivision restriction, the NP/96 GP Camino/Pollock Pines Community Region had many blocks of land not suitable for inclusion in a Community Region or Rural Center. These areas were cut out, resulting in the creation of 2 new smaller communities suitable for Rural Centers).</p>	<p>19 Rural Centers: Camino, Coloma, Cool, Fairplay, Garden Valley, Georgetown, Greenwood, Grizzly Flat, Kyburz, Lotus, Mosquito, Mt. Aukum, Oak Hill, Phillips, Pilot Hill, Pleasant Valley, Pollock Pines, Rescue, Strawberry</p> <p>Rural Centers reduced in size and number to reduce intensity of development. Georgetown, Camino, and Pollock Pines identified as Rural Centers because of lack of services to support more extensive development.</p>

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
Land Use Designations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HDR and MDR include specifications for dwelling types (e.g., attached versus detached) and different allowable densities for planned development subdivisions. (• MDR allows agricultural activities but does not identify them as accessory to the residential use. • MDR identifies a minimum and maximum parcel size (1 to 5 acres). • LDR identifies a minimum and maximum parcel size (5 to 10 acres). • LDR allowed in Community Regions and Rural Centers. • Includes RR designation. • C only appropriate in Community Regions and Rural Centers except in areas also having the –PL overlay. • Mixed use allowed in C and RD. • I allowed anywhere in county. • Specifies Floor Area Ratios for C, RD, and I only. <p>(Policy 2.2.1.2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MFR includes specification for mixed use. • No specification for dwelling types in HDR and MDR. • MDR identifies agricultural activities as accessory to the residential use. • MDR identifies a residential density based on 1 DU/acre. • LDR identifies a residential density based on 1 DU/5 acres. • Density ranges the same as NP/96 GP except for HDR, as outlined under NP/96 GP. • Limited LDR allowed in Community Regions and Rural Centers (where surrounded by higher density designations). • RL designation addresses rural development (instead of RR). • Limited RL allowed in Community Regions and Rural Centers (where surrounded by higher density designations). • Limited NR allowed Community Regions and Rural Centers (where surrounded by higher density designations). • C appropriate in Community Regions and Rural Centers; limited C allowed in Rural Regions where such development already exists (no new C allowed). • Mixed use allowed in C and MFR. • Specifies Floor Area Ratios for MFR, A, NR, C, RD, I, TR, OS, and PF. • I allowed anywhere in county. 	<p>Same as RC except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LDR not allowed in Community Regions and Rural Centers. • RL and NR allowed only in Rural Regions. • I allowed only in Community Regions and Rural Centers. <p>And:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only alternative that includes a base land use designation for Agricultural Lands (A).

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
Land Use Overlays	Include Planned Community (-PC), Agricultural Districts (-A), Platted Lands (-PL), Ecological Preserve (-EP), Non-Jurisdictional Lands (-NJ), and Mineral Resource (-MR). (Policy 2.2.2.1)	Includes Agricultural District (-A), Ecological Preserve (-EP), and Mineral Resource (-MR). -PC eliminated because areas with adopted plans either identified with the -AP land use designation or are otherwise adequately identified on the land use map. -PL eliminated and the issue of higher density development in Rural Regions addressed through policy. -NJ eliminated because not necessary to add additional layer to identify nonjurisdictional lands; they are nonjurisdictional regardless of the designation applied.	Includes Ecological Preserve (-EP), Mineral Resource (-MR), and Important Biological Corridor (-IBC). As with the RC Alternative, -PC, -PL, and -MR eliminated. Additionally, -A eliminated because Agricultural Lands are now identified through a base land use designation.
Mixed Use	Mixed use allowed on C and RD lands; encouraged but not required. (Table 2-2 and Policies 2.1.1.3 and 2.2.2.5)	Allowed on C, RD, and MFR. Encouraged but not required. (Policy LU-3h and Implementation Measure LU-A)	Allowed on C, RD, and MFR. Required for C some projects (standards to be developed). (Policies LU-3h and LU-3i and Implementation Measure LU-A)
Subdivision	No Project: Not allowed; constrained by Writ. 1996 GP: Allowed consistent with state law.	Allowed such that no more than 4 parcels are created. (Policies LU-1b and LU-4b)	Allowed consistent with state law.
Planned Developments	Policies include requirements and detail regarding Planned Developments. (Objectives 2.2.3 and 2.2.4)	Planned Developments addressed very generally. Implementation program addresses revisions to PD combining zone district. (Policies LU-3a, LU-3b, LU-3c and Implementation Measure LU-A)	Same as RC. (Policies LU-3a, LU-3b, and LU-3c and Implementation Measure LU-A)
Miscellaneous Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes specifications for rezone evaluations. (Policy 2.2.5.3) • Includes direction to create a Neighborhood Service zone district. (Policy 2.2.5.8) • Specifies that Use Permit required for nonresidential support services in areas having the MFR, HDR, MDR, LDR, and RR designation. (Policy 2.2.5.9) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes statement that housing will be fairly distributed throughout county. Also requires provision of affordable housing as part of residential development projects. (Policies LU-3k and LU-8b) • Includes direction on school compatibility. (Policy LU-3n) 	Same as RC except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Requires</i> removal of off-premise signs that are visible from county roadways and state highways; requires on-premise signs in scenic corridors to be of size and scale that does not affect quality of corridor.

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
	<p>(Policy 2.2.5.9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes requirement for application of the Planned Development combining zone district in Airport Safety Zone 3. (Policy 2.2.5.13) • Identification of any Wild & Scenic River or National Recreation Area inconsistent with GP. (Policy 2.2.5.15) • Includes site-specific policies (Villages P, Q, and V of EDH SP, parcel 111-110-01 [which now has a new parcel number], Fallen Leaf Lake, and Texas Hill Reservoir take area, Clarksville). (Objective 2.2.6 and Policy 2.4.1.4) • Includes specification on contents of a Scenic Corridor Ordinance. (Objective 2.6.1) • Discretionary development on ridgelines is to be <i>limited</i> within scenic corridors. (Policy 2.6.1.5) • Requires removal or relocation of billboards in Scenic Corridors. (Policy 2.7.1.2) • Encourages new subdivisions to include design components that take advantage of passive or natural summer cooling and/or winter solar access (from Public Services and Utilities element). (Policy 5.6.2.2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifies that residential uses are allowed in Rural Regions but that their primary purpose is to accommodate resource-based land use activities. (Policy LU-4a) • Includes section on Tahoe Basin. Approach is to simplify regulating environment in the Basin (see the “General” section above). (Goal LU-5) • <i>Prohibits</i> development on ridgelines where such development would break the skyline or be visible from public spaces. (Policy LU-6b) • Encourages removal of off-premise signs from scenic corridors; requires on-premise signs in scenic corridors to be of size and scale that does not affect quality of corridor. (Policies LU-6c and LU-6d) • Includes statement that every parcel allowed one primary and second unit. (Policy LU-7h) • Addresses developing siting standards for energy conservation. (Policy LU-7g) 	<p>(Policies LU-3l, LU-3n, LU-4a, LU-6b, LU-6c, LU-6d, LU-7h, LU-7g, and LU-8b and Goal LU-5)</p>
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION			
Highway 50 Size	8 lanes on Circulation Diagram. Not limited to size in the future.	6 lanes on Circulation Map (Figure TC-1). Encourage Caltrans to keep at a maximum of 6 lanes. (Goal TC-0)	8 lanes on Circulation Map (Figure TC-1). Not limited to size in the future.

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
Road Design Standards	Directs County to adopt roadway design standards; with the exception of freeway offramp distance standards, there are no design standards in the policies. (Objective 3.1.2)	Specifies design standards for 7 functional roadway classifications. (Policy LU-1a and Table TC-1)	Same as RC. (Policy LU-1a and Table TC-1)
Concurrency and Timing of Demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project proponents required to make necessary road improvements, pay a traffic impact mitigation fee, or a combination of both. If acceptable improvements or mitigation not available, projects are to be denied. (Policies 3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.3, and 3.2.1.4). • Improvements and/or mitigation are to alleviate project-induced roadway impacts concurrent with development. (Policy 3.2.1.4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact fees for improvements needed as part of development are to be fully paid by project proponents. County tax revenues cannot be used to pay for road capacity improvements resulting from such development. (Policy TC-1g and TC-1h) • Prior to issuance of building permit, developer must construct all road improvements necessary to regional and local roadways <p>The determination of compliance with concurrency requirement is based on the sum of: (1) existing traffic; (2) traffic generated from the project; and (3) latent demand (traffic forecasted from all approved projects and all ministerial approvals). (Policies TC-1i and TC-1j)</p>	<p>Differs from RC in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to issuance of building permit, developer must either (1) provide necessary improvements concurrent with development or (2) to encumber funding and ensure programming of necessary improvements. <p>The determination of compliance with concurrency requirement is based on existing traffic plus traffic generated from the project.</p> <p>(Policies TC-1g, TC-1h, and TC-1i)</p>
LOS	Shall not be worse than LOS E on all roadways. In addition, all roadways operating at LOS A, B, or C in 2015 shall not be allowed to fall below LOS C; all road segments at LOS D shall not fall below LOS D. The LOS requirements are based on completion of the 2015 Capital Improvement Program. (Policy 3.5.1.1)	Shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions. (Policy TC-1c)	Same as RC. (Policy TC-1c)

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
Road Improvement Cost Distribution	With addition of policies enacted through Measure Y, provides conflicting direction on the distribution of funding for improvements to the road system. (Policies 3.2.2.1, 3.2.2.4, and 3.2.2.5)	Policies provide clear direction on payment for road improvement costs. (Policies TC-1g, TC-1h, TC-1i, TC-1k, TC-1l, TC-1m, and TC-1o)	Same as RC. (Policies TC-1g, TC-1h, TC-1j, TC-1k, TC-1l, and TC-1n)
Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	Included (Goal 3.9)	Not Included	Not Included
Transit	Does not address waterborne transit.	Includes provision for waterborne transit in Tahoe Basin. (Policy TC-2e)	Same as EC. (Policy TC-2e)
Non-Motorized Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires County to accommodate bicycles on roadway shoulders. (Policy 3.11.3.3) • Directs County to work with other governments, schools, and utility companies to plan, develop, and maintain bikeways. (Objective 3.11.3) • Also addresses hiking and equestrian trails. (Goal 3.11) • Includes policy to encourage the provision of facilities related to bicycle transportation (e.g., bike racks, showers and lockers, and bike storage) in some discretionary projects. (Policy 3.11.2.4) • Directs County to locate bikeways and trails along scenic highways. (Policy 3.11.1.5) • Directs County to continue to develop a bikeway along Pioneer Trail (to connect Meyers and South Lake Tahoe). (Policy 3.11.1.7) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires County to sign and stripe Class II bicycle routes when road width, safety, and operational conditions permit. Also requires County to develop and maintain a program to construct bikeways in conjunction with road projects. (Policies TC-4d and TC-4f) • Cooperative processes for the development of non-motorized systems addressed in the Parks and Recreation Element (Goal PR-4). • Hiking and equestrian trails largely addressed in the Parks and Recreation Element (with the exception of sidewalks/curbs). • Includes requirements for sidewalks and curbs. (Goal TC-5) 	Same as RC. (Policies TC-4d and TC-4f; Goals PR-4 and TC-5)
Road Maintenance	Addressed (Objective 3.14.2)	Not addressed except for funding priorities. (Policy TC-1o)	Same as RC. (Policy TC-1n)
Capital Improvement Program (CIP)	CIP only implied.	More explicit in requiring a CIP.	Same as RC.
Sidewalks	No specific requirements for sidewalks.	Specific requirements for sidewalks. (Goal TC-5)	Same as RC. (Goal TC-5)

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES			
Long-Range Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires County to <i>develop</i> facilities plans for public services and utilities (in cooperation with the service/utility providers). (Policy 5.1.1.1) Directs County to prepare long term capital improvement plans to provide infrastructure (in coordination with service providers) (from the Economic Development Element). (Policy 10.2.1.1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directs County to <i>work with</i> service and utility providers to develop plans. (Policies PS-1b, PS-1c, PS-2a, PS-2f, PS-3a, PS-6a, PS-7a, PS-9c, PS-10a, and PS-10b) Requires County to make findings regarding the consistency of projects with the County’s capital improvement and other long range plans. (Policy PS-1d) 	Same as RC. (Policies PS-1b, PS-1c, PS-1d, PS-2a,, PS-2f, PS-3a, PS-6a, PS-7a, PS-9c, PS-10a, and PS-10b)
Concurrency (general)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires County to make findings of adequacy for discretionary projects re: public services and utilities. (Policies 5.1.2.1 and 5.1.2.2) Requires new development to pay its proportional share of the costs of infrastructure improvements. (Policy 5.1.2.3) Requires new discretionary development to pay for improvements needed as part of a project; existing residents are not responsible for such costs (from the Economic Development Element). (Policy 10.2.1.4) Directs County to develop method to collect fair share costs from existing residents of both unincorporated areas of the County and of the cities for health and safety services. County to avoid using General Fund monies to fund incremental costs of new municipal services (Economic Development Element). (Policy 10.2.4.1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires will serve letter from water, wastewater, and power providers (stating that the provider[s] can and will serve the proposed project) before a discretionary project can be approved. (Policy PS-1f) Requires project proponents to provide evidence that there is, or will be made available, adequate public service and utility infrastructure and capacity to serve the project prior to project approval. (Policy PS-1g) 	Same as RC. (Policies PS-1f and PS-1g)

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
Water Supply–Surface	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the Water Agency, in coordination with water providers, to support countywide water resources development to serve land uses outlined on land use map. (Policy 5.2.1.1) • For discretionary development, requires an adequate quantity and quality of water for all uses, including fire protection. (Policy 5.2.1.2) • Allows annexation to public water providers in Rural Regions as long as groundwater is not available/sufficient or if existing infrastructure abuts the property. (Policy 5.2.1.5) • In time of water shortages, directs the BOS to give priority within affected water districts to affordable housing and nonresidential development. (Policy 5.2.1.7) • Allows for the approval of specific plans without the availability of water guarantees. (Policy 5.2.1.8) • Directs County to encourage and draft an ordinance to allow and encourage the use of reclaimed water for landscape irrigation purposes (from the Conservation and Open Space Element). (Policy 7.3.1.3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the County to actively engage in and support the efforts of the public water providers to retain existing and acquire new surface water supplies for planned growth. (Policy PS-2a) • Directs the County to discourage the extension of water service to Rural Regions. Requires proponents to demonstrate sufficient private services or be able to connect to an <i>existing</i> public water system within the Rural Regions. (Policies PS-2b and PS-2c) • Directs County to work with public water service providers to develop a plan for addressing and responding to drought conditions. (Policy PS-2f) • Directs the County to encourage the use of reclaimed water. (Policy PS-3b) 	<p>Same as RC except:</p> <p>Requires the County to identify the types of projects that <i>must</i> utilize reclaimed water.</p> <p>(Policies PS-2a, PS-2b, PS-2c, PS-2f, and PS-3b)</p>
Water Supply–Groundwater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the County to develop and maintain a map and database of private well production. (Policy 5.2.3.2) • Requires discretionary development dependent upon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires proponents of discretionary projects reliant on groundwater to provide evidence (and the County to find) that the groundwater supply is adequate to meet the highest demand that could 	<p>Same as RC. (Policies PS-2d and PS-3a)</p>

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
	<p>groundwater to demonstrate that groundwater is adequate. (Policy 5.2.3.4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the county to assess and analyze well data once every 5 years in order to identify areas of groundwater supply limitations and modify General Plan uses based on the findings, if necessary. (Policy 5.2.3.6) 	<p>be permitted on the land in question and drafting of groundwater will not adversely affect the operation of wells on lands in the vicinity of the proposed project. (Policy PS-2d)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the County to work with public water providers to develop and implement a water use efficiency program. (Policy PS-3a) 	
Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires MFR, HDR, C, and I projects to connect to public wastewater systems except in Community Regions of Georgetown and Pollock Pines and in areas having –PL overlay. (Policy 5.3.1.1) • Requires 2nd unit and temporary mobile homes to upgrade septic systems. For 2nd units, must be at same sizing capacity as primary unit. For temporary mobile homes, must be upgraded to “current standards” if occupied for more than 6 months. (Policy 5.3.1.5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where public wastewater collection facilities do not exist within a Community Region, an applicant for development (note: this means ministerial <i>and</i> discretionary) must demonstrate that the proposed wastewater disposal system can accommodate the highest demand that could be permitted on the land in question. (Policy PS-4a) • For alternative wastewater treatment systems associated with mobile home parks, commercial and industrial centers, and multifamily residential in Rural Centers, the applicant must prove and the County must find that the proposed system can accommodate the highest demand that could be permitted on the land in question. (Policy PS-4d) • Directs the County to work with public wastewater treatment service providers to develop public wastewater treatment facilities in Georgetown, Camino, and Pollock Pines. (Policy PS-4b) 	<p>Same as RC except:</p> <p>Does not direct the County to work with public wastewater treatment service providers to develop public wastewater treatment facilities in the Georgetown, Camino, and Pollock Pines.</p> <p>(Policies PS-4a and PS-4c)</p>

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
Storm Drainage	Included (Goal 5.4)	Not included; folded into flooding (Health, Safety, and Noise Element) and water quality (Conservation and Open Space Element) discussions.	Same as RC.
Solid Waste	Concurrent with development approval, proponent must provide evidence that capacity exists (to serve the project) within the solid waste system. (Policy 5.5.2.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires new commercial, industrial, research and development, and multifamily residential uses to provide adequate areas on-site to accommodate the collection and storage of recyclable materials. (Policy PS-6b) • Directs County to encourage the recycling of construction materials. (Policy PS-6c) 	Same as RC. (Policies PS-6b and PS-6c)
Emergency and Law Enforcement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs project review by fire protection districts, the Sheriff’s office, and EMS agency to determine if the project will adversely affect these departments’ ability to provide services. (Goal 5.7) • Requires proponents of new development to demonstrate that adequate emergency medical services are available and that adequate emergency access is provided concurrent with development. (Policy 5.7.4.1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the County to work with fire, emergency medical, and law enforcement providers to develop standards for emergency response times for unincorporated areas of the county. (Policy PS-7a) • Includes a target for law enforcement (1 officer/1000 residents). (Policy PS-7b) • Adds to concurrency requirement that project proponents must demonstrate that provision of the service cannot affect existing/current residents. (Policy PS-7c) 	Same as RC. (Policies PS-7a, PS-7b, and PS-7c)
Library and Cultural Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies funding mechanisms for new libraries. (Policy 5.9.1.2) • Directs County to support efforts by the Sierra Cultural Arts Center Association in development of performing arts centers. (Policy 5.9.2.1) • Directs County to provide incentives to encourage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to distribute library services throughout the county. (Policy PS-8a) • Directs County to support the strategic plan of the El Dorado Arts Council. (Policy PS-8b) 	Same as RC. (Policies PS-8a and PS-8b)

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
	incorporation of indoor and outdoor art in new multifamily, commercial, industrial, and capital improvement projects. (Policy 5.9.2.2)		
Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the County to deny development proposals that may affect school facilities unless the applicant and affected district have entered into a written agreement regarding mitigation or impacts are mitigated through conditions of approval to the extent allowed by state law. (Policy 5.8.1.1) • Development applications that may result in impacts to school districts must be evaluated by the affected school district. (Policy 5.8.2.2) • Directs County to explore potential for expanding higher education (including attracting a four-year college/university to the county). (Policy 5.8.2.3) • If impacts to school facilities cannot be mitigated, the County is to consider reduced densities, phasing, or use of DAs to achieve necessary mitigation to reduce the fiscal and physical impacts of the contemplated development. Policy 5.8.1.5) • Directs specific plans and planned communities to identify and set aside land for new schools to serve new communities and to identify funding for such schools. (Policy 5.8.2.4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires new development to off set demands on public school facilities to the maximum extent permitted under the law and as coordinated with the affected school district(s). (Policy PS-9a) • Directs the County to work cooperatively with public school districts in planning for future school facility needs and in identifying appropriate sites for new schools. (Policy PS-9c) 	Same as RC. (Policies PS-9a and PS-9c)

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
Utility Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directs the County to promote and coordinate the undergrounding of existing and new utility lines with utility providers in Community Regions, Rural Centers, and scenic areas. (Policy 5.6.1.1) Directs the County to reserve adequate rights-of-way to facilitate expansion of services. (Policy 5.6.1.2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directs the County to work with local utility providers in the design and location of new or expanded facilities. (Policy PS-10a) Directs County to coordinate with utility providers to ensure that adequate rights-of-way are reserved to facilitate expansion of electricity and communication services in anticipation of development as shown on the Land Use Map. (Policy PS-10b) 	Same as RC. (Policy PS-10a and PS-10b)
HEALTH, SAFETY, & NOISE			
General/Emergency Preparedness	County <i>should</i> coordinate with Caltrans re: efficient movement of traffic on area roadways in the event of an emergency or road closure. (Objective 6.9.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Requires</i> County to coordinate with Caltrans to develop a strategy ensuring the safe and efficient movement of traffic on county roads in the event of closures on state highways. (Policy HS-1d) County-operated emergency dispatch centers, communications systems, vital utilities, and other essential public facilities necessary for the continuity of government are designed in a manner that will allow them to remain operational during and following emergency incidents. (Policy PS-1b) Includes direction on the siting/design of new critical emergency response facilities in a manner that minimizes exposure and susceptibility catastrophic events. (Policy PS-1c) 	Same as RC. (Policies HS-1b, HS-1c, and HS-1d)
Fire Safety	Development in areas having with high and very high fire hazards must be <i>conditioned</i> to designate fuel break zones that comply with the fire safe requirements. (Policy 6.2.4.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discourage development in areas of high and very high wildland fire hazard. (Policy HS-2c) Discourage the creation of any new gated subdivisions or 	Same as RC except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Preclude</i> development in areas of high and very high wildland fire hazard unless it can be

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
		<p>neighborhoods. (Policy PS-2e)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that a minimum of two unencumbered points of access from a County-maintained road are provided for ingress and egress and for emergency vehicles. (Policy HS-2e) • Requires County to evaluate fuel management activities for conformance with other applicable General Plan policies. (Policy HS-3b) • Includes Fire Safe Council as a cooperating entity in the identification of opportunities for fuel reduction. (Policy HS-3a) 	<p>demonstrated that the hazard can be reduced to a moderate or better level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Prohibit</i> the creation of any new gated subdivisions or neighborhoods. <p>(Policies HS-2c, HS-2e, HS-3a, and HS-3b)</p>
Geological and Seismic Hazards	Directs establishment and application of an avalanche overlay zone. All new structures in such a zone must be designed to withstand expected forces of an avalanche. (Policy 6.3.2.3)	Applications for development reviewed for potential hazards associated with steep or unstable slopes, areas susceptible to high erosion, and avalanche risk. Geotechnical studies required when development may be subject to geological hazards. If hazards are identified, applicants required to mitigate or avoid identified hazards as a condition of approval. (Policy HS-4b)	Same as RC. (Policy HS-4b)
Flood Hazards	Apply an overlay zone district for areas located within dam failure inundation zones. (Policy 6.4.2.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discourages development in flood prone areas and dam failure inundation zones. (Policy HS-5b) • Allows creation of new public recreation and open space parcels in the 100-year floodplain. (Policy HS-5c) 	Same as RC. (Policies HS-5b and HS-5c)
Hazardous Materials	Directs County to provide for disposal of aviation generated hazardous materials. (Policy 6.6.1.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to ensure that hazardous materials used at <i>all</i> County-operated facilities are stored, disposed of, and transported safely. (Policy HS-6c) 	Same as RC. (Policies HS-6b and HS-6c)

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applications for projects that propose to handle, store, and/or transport hazardous materials must include a hazardous materials management plan. (Policy HS-6b) 	
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to encourage synchronization of signalized intersections to reduce congestion, conserve energy, and improve air quality. (Policy 6.7.2.3) • Directs County to encourage a local and interstate rail system. (Policy 6.7.2.4) • New development on large tracts of undeveloped land near the rail corridor (shown on the Circulation Map) must, to the extent practicable, be transit supportive with high density/intensity uses. (Policy 6.7.4.3) • Requires review of discretionary applications to determine need for pedestrian/bike paths connecting to adjacent development and to common service facilities. (Policy 6.7.4.4) • Directs the County to monitor ongoing scientific research regarding the adverse effects of air pollution on vegetation. Policy 6.7.8.1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to support improvements to and uses of the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor that maintain its viability as a rail facility. (Policy TC-6a) • County to support the establishment of additional electric vehicle charging stations throughout the county. (Policy HS-8e) • County to investigate the replacement of its fleet vehicles with more fuel-efficient or alternative fuel vehicles. (Policy HS-8f) • Encourage alternative methods of managing green waste that avoid creation of significant air pollution. (Policy HS-9a) • Potential stationary sources of air pollution and nuisance odors cannot be sited near sensitive receptors. (Policy HS-10b) 	Same as RC. (Policies TC-6a, HS-8e, HS-8f, HS-9a, and HS-10b)
Airport Safety	Develop airport combining zone district. (Policy 6.8.1.2)	Where there is a difference between the County development standards and the development standards of the Comprehensive Land Use Plans, as applied to proposed development, the standards that will most reduce airport-related safety hazards shall apply. (Policy HS-11c)	Same as RC. (Policy HS-11c)

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
Noise Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nontransportation (Table 6.2): Different from both EC and RC6+. For NP/96 GP, defined for “community” and “rural”. • Transportation (Table 6-1): same as EC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nontransportation (Tables HS-1, HS-2, and HS-3): Different from both NP/96 GP and EC. Standards defined by land use designation and are different for Community Regions, Rural Centers, and Rural Regions. Generally less restrictive. • Transportation (Table HS-4): different than NP/96 GP and EC. Generally less restrictive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nontransportation (Tables HS-1, HS-2, and HS-3): Different from both NP/96 GP and RC. Standards defined by land use designation and are different for Community Regions, Rural Centers, and Rural Regions. • Transportation (Table HS-4): same as NP/96 GP.
Noise–General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not provide exception(s) for temporary exceedance of noise standards (e.g., construction noise). Specifically identifies transportation noise resulting from roadway improvement projects must be mitigated to meet the standards of Table 6-1. (Policy 6.5.1.9) • Develop and apply a combining zone district for areas within the 55 dB CNEL contour of airports. (Policy 6.5.2.2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conditionally allows temporary construction noise and noise associated with emergency services to exceed noise standards. (Policies HS-12c and HS-12d) • For proposed development, where there is a difference between the County noise standards and the noise standards of the Comprehensive Land Use Plans, the more stringent standards shall apply. (Policy HS-14a) • Discourages development within the 55 dB CNEL contour of airports. (Policy HS-14c) • Includes a policy to work with Sacramento County to address noise issues associated with Mather Airport. (Policy HS-14e) 	Same as RC. (Policies HS-12c, HS-12d, HS-14a, HS-14c, and HS-14e)
Highway Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to identify roadways with existing or projected safety problems, prioritize them in terms of the immediacy of needed improvements, and develop programs to finance such improvements. (Policy 6.9.1.1) • Recognizes that substandard road conditions exist. (Policy 6.9.1.2) 	Not addressed.	Not addressed.

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE			
Soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No limitations on grading during the rainy season. Discretionary development discouraged on slopes >40%. (Policy 7.1.2.1) Development on slopes >30% must have site specific review to encourage proper site selection and mitigation. Roads needed to complete circulation and/or for emergency access may be constructed on such slopes if all other standards are met. (Policy 7.1.2.1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grading <i>discouraged</i> during the rainy season (roughly October 15 through May 1). (Policy CO-1c) Grading/disturbance of slopes ≥30% prohibited unless it is demonstrated by a California-registered civil engineer or an engineering geologist that impacts can be reduced to acceptable levels. (Policy CO-1d) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grading <i>precluded</i> during the rainy season unless impacts are adequately mitigated to avoid sedimentation of rivers, lakes, streams, and wetlands. (Policy CO-1c) Grading/disturbance of slopes ≥30% outside of IBC overlay areas allowed only if a California-registered civil engineer or an engineering geologist reports that impacts can be reduced to acceptable levels. (Policy CO-1d) Disturbance of slopes ≥30% within the IBC prohibited unless reasonable use of the property would otherwise be denied, location is necessary for the protection of the public health, safety, and welfare and there is no feasible alternative, or project is necessary for the repair of existing infrastructure to avoid or mitigate hazards to the public. (Policy CO-1e)
Mineral Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Surface mining</i> prohibited on lands having land use designations not identified as potentially compatible with mining. (Policy 7.2.2.2) <i>Subsurface mining</i> is allowed regardless of land use designation, subject to a CEQA evaluation (assume such activity is likely to require a Special Use Permit and reclamation plan) (Policy 7.2.3.13) Vent escape shafts allowed on lands not identified as compatible with mining as long as surface 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies land use designations suitable for application of –MR overlay and/or mineral resource extraction activity. No specification for surface versus subsurface mining. (Policy CO-2b) Agricultural Lands are not identified as compatible with mineral resource extraction (this alternative does not have the Agricultural Lands land use designation). New nonmining land uses adjacent 	<p>Same as RC except:</p> <p>Compatible lands include Agricultural Lands (other two alternatives do not have this designation).</p> <p>(Policies CO-2b, CO-2d, CO-2g, and CO-2h)</p>

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
	<p>disturbance is <i>minimal</i>. (Policy 7.2.3.4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mineral exploration permitted on compatible lands. Conditions for when a special use permit is needed. (Policy 7.2.3.7) • Exploration permitted on incompatible lands if listed provisions are met. (Policy 7.2.3.8) • Many of the policies in 96 GP are included in the County Code (Chapter 8.36). Not carried over in to EC or RC. 	<p>to existing mining operations must mitigate for potential incompatibility impacts. (Policy CO-2d)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vent escape shafts allowed on lands not identified as compatible with mining as long as surface disturbance is <i>fully mitigated</i>. (Policy CO-2g) • Any exploration requires a special use permit. (Policy CO-2h) 	
Water Resources/Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal directs County to conserve, <i>enhance, and manage</i> surface water resources. Protection of water <i>quantity</i> included in goal language (but no policies presented). (Goal 7.3) • Where practical/when warranted, projects with parking lots to contain facilities to separate oils and salts from stormwater. (Policy 7.3.2.3) • Directs the County to implement detailed analytical water quality studies and monitoring to identify and reduce water pollution of the county's recreational waters. When pollution sources identified, County must propose means to prevent, control, and treat. (Policy 7.3.2.5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to conserve the quality, function, and value of surface water resources. Focus is on water <i>quality</i>. (Goal CO-3) • Requires proponents of ground-disturbing discretionary projects to include a plan for the protection of water quality during and following construction. (Policy CO-4b) 	Same as RC. (Goal CO-3 and Policy CO-4b)
Streams/Lakes/Ponds/Wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wetland evaluations to use U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' methodology. (Policy 7.3.3.1) • Direct and indirect losses of wetlands and/or riparian vegetation associated with discretionary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to develop specific guidelines for evaluations, reports, and mitigation for wetlands and other surface water features. (Implementation Measure CO-H) • Requires development to fully 	Same as RC except: Compensation must be a minimum of 1:1 replacement or 3:1 restoration within the same USGS hydrologic unit.

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
	<p>development must be compensated by replacement, rehabilitation, or creation of habitat on a no net loss basis (minimum 1:1 mitigation). Mitigation may be on or off site. (Policy 7.3.3.2)</p>	<p>mitigate impacts to wetlands and to achieve no net loss consistent with state and federal no net loss guidance. (Policy CO-3b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If surface water features cannot be integrated into new development, project proponent must fully mitigate for loss of habitat value and function. Compensation for loss of surface water features must be a minimum of 1:1 replacement or 2:1 restoration within the same USGS hydrologic unit. (Policy CO-3f) 	<p>(Implementation Measure CO-H and Policies CO-3b and CO-3f)</p>
Special Status Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows exceptions to protection of special status plant and animal communities and habitats if the resources exist or can be protected on public lands or private Natural Resource lands. (Policy 7.4.2.1) 	–	–
Important Biological Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important resources identified in policy language. (Objective 7.4.2) Requires projects that may affect critical wildlife areas and migration corridors to be retained in a non-disturbed state. (Policy 7.4.2.2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County to identify and inventory important resources following adoption of General Plan. (Implementation Measure CO-F) Requires projects that may adversely affect important resources to avoid, minimize, and mitigate project effects. (Policy CO-6b) Directs County to develop guidelines for preparation of biological resources reports. (Implementation Measure CO-H) Directs County to develop an integrated natural resources management plan that addresses and integrates conservation and management planning for a number of natural resources. 	<p>Same as RC except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes the IBC overlay to protect core areas important for wildlife forage, cover, and migration, and areas of relatively intact native vegetation. County to develop guidelines for projects within the corridor following General Plan adoption. Requires projects that may adversely affect important resources to avoid, minimize, and mitigate project effects so that there is <i>no net loss</i> in the acreage of affected habitat. <p>(Policies CO-6b and CO-6d and Implementation Measures CO-F, CO-</p>

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifically encourages development clustering to retain contiguous areas of wildlands. (Policy 7.4.4.3) • Includes standards for oak canopy retention or replacement for discretionary projects on lands having at least 10% canopy coverage. (Policy 7.4.4.4) • Requires tree survey, preservation, and replacement plan for grading permits and discretionary projects of a certain type. (Policy 7.4.5.1) • Includes requirements for project landscaping to use vegetation native to the project area. (Policy 7.4.5.2) 	<p align="center">(Implementation Measure CO-I)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County develop and adopt an Oak Woodland Management Plan. Plan to contain detail regarding canopy protection; thresholds of significance for the loss of oak woodlands; requirements for tree surveys and mitigation plans for discretionary projects; and replanting and replacement standards. (Implementation Measure CO-J) • Directs County to protect heritage and landmark trees. (Policy CO-7a) 	<p>H, CO-I, and CO-K)</p> <p>Same as EC except:</p> <p>Additional tree protection likely to be included in IBC development standards.</p> <p>(Policy CO-7a and Implementation Measures CO-J and CO-K)</p>
Cultural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural resource evaluations required for discretionary projects. (Policy 7.5.1.3) • Directs County to form a Cultural Resources Preservation Commission. (Policy 7.5.1.5) • Directs County to request Certified Local Government status so that it may qualify for grants to aid in historic preservation projects. Policy 7.5.1.5) • Requires new buildings and reconstruction in historic communities to generally conform to the types of architecture prevalent in the gold mining areas of California during the period of 1850-1910. (Policy 7.5.2.3) • Design review required prior to demolition or alteration of historic buildings in Historic Design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discretionary projects that result in ground disturbance required to provide on-site monitoring. (Policy CO-8b) • No specifications for types of projects needing cultural resource evaluations. Specifics to be included in Cultural Resource Protection Ordinance (note: all alternatives include direction to include standards for cultural resource protection in the County Code). (Implementation Measure CO-K) • Directs County to <i>investigate</i> becoming a Certified Local Government. (Implementation Measure CO-M) • Requires replacement construction or alteration of existing historic buildings to be done in a manner 	<p>Same as RC.</p> <p>(Policies CO-8b, CO-9b, CO-9c, and CO-10a and Implementation Measures CO-L and CO-N)</p>

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
	<p>Control districts or buildings designated or qualified for designation as historic anywhere in the County. (Policy 7.5.2.4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to protect access and parking at existing cemeteries. (Policy 7.5.4.1) 	<p>that replicates its historic features or maintains the historic character of the building. (Policy CO-9c)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demolition, alteration, removal, expansion, improvement, or exterior alteration of any historically significant buildings or structures anywhere in the County subject to review. (Policy CO-9b) • Requires recordation of historic buildings approved for demolition. (Policy CO-9c) • Directs County to protect access to existing <i>public</i> cemeteries. (Policy CO-10a) 	
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY			
Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes Agricultural District land use overlay. (Policy 8.1.1.1) • Agricultural Districts identified based on a number of characteristics. (Policies 8.1.1.2 and 8.1.1.3) • Agricultural Commission to identify grazing lands. (Policy 8.1.2.1) • Identified grazing lands have a minimum parcel size stated. Allows for planned developments on such lands as long as such development is consistent with the underlying land use designation. (Policy 8.1.2.2) • County to allow and support the extension of water lines for agricultural water use. (Policy 8.2.1.1) • Directs County to protect water currently allocated for agriculture from reallocation to residential use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes Agricultural District land use overlay. Agricultural Districts identified based on a number of characteristics. (Policy AF-1a) • In addition to being used for determining suitability for Williamson Act Contract, the procedure for evaluating suitability of land for agriculture also used for nonagricultural development on lands within <i>Agricultural Districts</i>, application of agricultural zoning and grazing. (Policy AF-1b) • Directs County to develop procedure to identify and officially recognize grazing land. Encourages the <i>maintenance</i> of grazing lands. (Policy AF-1g) • Encourage water providers to improve the efficiency and distribution of existing agricultural water supplies. (Policy AF-2a) 	<p>Same as RC except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes the Agricultural Lands land use designation. To be categorized as Agricultural Lands, must possess at least two additional characteristics outlined in policy. • In addition to being used for determining suitability for Williamson Act Contract, the procedure for evaluating suitability of land for agriculture also used for nonagricultural development on lands assigned the Agricultural Land designation, application of agricultural zoning and grazing. • Encourages the <i>assignment of the Agricultural Land designation</i> to grazing lands. <p>(Policies AF-1a, AF-1b, AF-1g, AF-2a, and AF-3a and Implementation</p>

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
	<p>(Policy 8.2.1.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to actively pursue acquisition of long term water supplies. (Policy 8.2.1.3) • Specifies that a special use permit is required for farmworker housing units above those allowed by right. (Policy 8.2.3.1) • Policies include detail on minimum parcel sizes (for both agricultural and adjacent nonagricultural lands) and setbacks. (Objective 8.1.3) • Agricultural Commission to review applications for discretionary projects involving Agricultural Districts, Williamson Act Contract lands, or lands adjacent to either. Commission to make recommendation(s) to the approving authority. Approving authority to make specified findings. (Policy 8.1.4.1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County to support the construction of farmworker dwelling units through density bonuses. (Policy AF-3a) • Detail regarding agricultural land and adjacent land parcel sizes, densities, and setbacks to be included in Zoning Ordinance update following General Plan adoption. (Implementation Measure AF-A) • Directs County to develop a procedure for the Agricultural Commission to review discretionary projects that may affect agricultural and grazing lands. (Implementation Measure AF-E) 	<p>Measures AF-E)</p>

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elevational band above which the minimum parcel size of timber production lands increases is 3,000 feet. (Policies 8.3.2.2 and 8.3.2.3) Detail regarding minimum parcel sizes and setbacks included in policy. (Objective 8.4.1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elevational band above which the minimum parcel size of timber production lands increases is 2,500 feet. (Implementation Measure AF-A) Detail regarding minimum parcel sizes, suitable densities, and setbacks for timberland and adjacent nontimberlands to be included in Zoning Ordinance update following General Plan adoption. (Implementation Measure AF-A) Directs County to revise Right to Farm Ordinance to include provisions for lands having or potentially having forest management activities. (Implementation Measure AF-A) 	Same as RC. (Implementation Measure AF-A)
PARKS AND RECREATION			
Park Acquisition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directs County to assist in the acquisition of regional, community, and neighborhood parks and to follow national standards (for each, acres/# of people) for acquisition. (Policy 9.1.1.1) States that the County’s priority should be to provide regional park facilities, but directs County to plan for and acquire community and regional parks. Such parks should be “developed” facilities as opposed to “open space” (undeveloped/passive recreation). (Policies 9.1.1.6, 9.1.1.10, and 9.1.1.11) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directs County to concentrate its acquisition efforts on regional parklands. Standard for regional parkland only provided in policy. (Policies PR-1a and PR-1b) Neighborhood and community parks to be developed by independently funded service districts, cities, and private organizations; County may assist in acquisition and development as funding allows. (Policy PR-4a) 	Same as RC. (Policies PR-1a, PR-1b, and PR-4a)

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
Trails	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies the El Dorado/Pony Express Trail and trails connecting regional parks as the County’s primary responsibility for trail establishment. (Policy 9.1.2.1) • Directs County to assume responsibility for some acquisition and development of regional trails outside of boundaries of cities, CSDs, and parks and recreation districts. (Policy 9.1.2.3) • Directs County to establish a priority list for development of County-maintained trails (in addition to the <i>Hiking & Equestrian Trails Master Plan</i>). (Policy 9.1.2.6) • Directs County to establish procedure by which local trails can be recognized/designated. (Policy 9.1.2.10) • Discretionary development <i>may</i> be conditioned to provide trail connectivity. (Policy 9.1.2.5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discretionary development <i>required</i> to provide linkages of private and public trail systems. (Policy PR-3c) 	Same as RC. (Policy PR-3c)
Natural Resource-Related Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to support acquisition of a public river access point adjacent to the Marshall Gold Discovery State Historic Park in Coloma. (Policy 9.1.4.2) • Directs the County to actively pursue lands that can be transferred from government ownership to County ownership. (Policies 9.2.2.6 and 9.2.2.7) 	Directs County to protect existing and encourage the establishment of new access points to rivers, lakes, and streams. (Policy PR-2a)	Same as RC. (Policy PR-2a)
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes multiple policies regarding Quimby Act. (Objective 9.2.2) • Directs the County to do a feasibility study on adopting an 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No policies directly related to Quimby Act (required by law, so removed from this alternative). • County directed to encourage and support efforts of independently 	Same as RC. (Policies PR-4a, PR-5a, and PR-5b)

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
	<p>impact fee and establishing a countywide benefit assessment district for park funding. (Policy 9.2.2.5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to institute a system for user fees to contribute to operation of facilities. (Policy 9.2.3.1) • Directs County to encourage private sector donations and private development of parks and recreation facilities. (Policy 9.2.3.5) 	<p>funded parks and recreation providers. (Policy PR-4a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New projects having community or neighborhood parks must provide funding mechanisms for development, operation, and maintenance if such parks cannot be annexed to an existing recreation district. (Policy PR-5a) • Directs County to develop and implement program to identify and pursue alternative methods to fund and/or support acquisition and operation of parks and recreation facilities. (Policy PR-5b) 	
Tourism	<p>Directs County to encourage development of interpretive centers for local historic sites (specifically mentions interpretive centers for California National Historic Trail and Pony Express National Historic Trail). (Policies 9.1.4.1, 9.1.4.2, and 9.3.4.2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to develop and implement program to encourage major recreational event sponsors to hold events in the county. (Implementation Measure PR-G) • Directs County to work with resource-based recreation providers to promote resource-based tourism. (Policy PR-6b) 	<p>Same as RC. (Implementation Measure PR-G and Policy PR-6b)</p>
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to move fairgrounds. (Policy 9.3.6.2) • Includes an objective to expand the ski industry. Objective 9.3.7) • Directs County to modify Zoning Ordinance to encourage development of private lodging facilities. (Policy 9.3.9.1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to work with State Department of Housing and Community Development to develop standards for new private campgrounds. (Policy PR-6d) • Directs County to develop plan to address coordination of the Airports, Parks, and Grounds Division planning process with those of other County departments, service districts, cities, and private organizations. (Policy PR-4b) 	<p>Same as RC. (Policies PR-4b and PR-6d)</p>
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT			
Economic Development Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focuses on the Economic Development Providers Network 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs County to establish a new economic advisory body to assist 	<p>Same as RC. (Policies ED-1a and ED-1b)</p>

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
	<p>as the economic advisory body. (Objective 10.1.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes extensive detail on economic development approach. • Requires annual review of the Economic Development Element. (Policy 10.1.1.1) 	<p>in developing and implementing a countywide economic development strategy. (Policy ED-1a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instead of including detail in element, directs County to develop and implement an Economic Policy Framework in coordination with the economic advisory body. (Policy ED-1b) 	
Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In General, much more detailed. • Includes detail on how to improve and streamline development permit processing procedures. (Policy 10.1.2.2) • Directs the County to amend Zoning Ordinance to expand the classes of permitted uses in C, RD, and I lands. (Program 10.1.2.2.6) • Requires County to address business needs when adopting new regulation(s). (Policy 10.1.2.4) • Directs County to designate lands of sufficient size and location to accommodate needed retail and commercial development. (Program 10.1.5.5.1) • Directs County to apply majority of the transient occupancy tax to the promotion of tourism, entertainment, business, and leisure travel. (Policy 10.1.6.4) • Directs County to establish new zone district(s) to differentiate between low and high intensity recreational uses (to support tourism). (Policy 10.1.6.5) • Directs County to establish land use regulations that facilitate working at home or alternative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, development of detail would be part of the Economic Development Framework. • Directs a County development services review team to conduct biennial review of development application process and to make recommendations to the Board regarding processing changes. (Policy ED-2a) • Requires analysis of General Plan amendments for effects on business retention and development. Analysis to include consideration of the jobs-housing balance. Results of analysis to be considered by the Board in decision making process. (Policy ED-2b) • Requires County to coordinate capital improvement programs with the Economic Policy Framework. Policy ED-4a) • Directs County to fund both new and existing programs focused on arts and tourism. (Policy ED-5a) 	Same as RC. (Policies ED-2a, ED-2b, ED-4a, and ED-5a)

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EQUAL WEIGHT GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES, continued

Subject/Item	Alternatives #1 and #4: No Project and 1996 General Plan (NP and 96 GP)	Alternative 2: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” (RC)	Alternative 3: Environmentally Constrained (EC)
	<p>work places. (Program 10.1.7.3.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows fee deferral if fees are preventing establishment of targeted industries. (Policy 10.2.2.4) • Contains detailed direction on mitigating fiscal effects of government reorganization (e.g., annexation by cities). (Policy 10.2.3.1) 		

ERRATA AND REVISIONS

April 15, 2003: Under the **TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION** section, removed “Methodology to Develop the Road System (Circulation Diagram)”. The statement showed that Alternatives 1 and 4 used ADT and Alternatives 2 and 3 used Peak Hour to develop the maps. The maps for each alternative were developed using Peak Hour methodology (ADT was not used).