

LETTER 1: DAMON POLK, BUILDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF SUPERIOR CALIFORNIA

Response to Comment 1-1 (GP): The commenter provides information on how affordable housing units can be constructed without implementing inclusionary requirements. The draft Housing Element contains policies and/or implementation measures that address some of the issues raised by the commenter. Specifically, the Housing Element directs the County to maintain an inventory of sites suitable for the construction of all types of housing (Policies HO-1b and HO-1s and Measures HO-A, HO-D, and HO-P); pursue State and federal funding for affordable housing construction (Policy HO-1j and Measure HO-M); work with nongovernmental organizations to construct affordable housing (Policy HO-1r and Measure HO-E); and provide incentives for the construction of affordable housing (Policies HO- 1g, HO-1n, HO-1p, and HO-1r and Measures HO-G, HO-H through HO-J, HO-N, HO-O, and HO-T through HO-V).

LETTER 2: KATHYE RUSSELL, THE EL DORADO BUSINESS ALLIANCE

Response to Comment 2-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on land use issues and the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The four equal-weight General Plan alternatives do reflect consideration of: (1) hilly terrain; (2) economic development; and (3) relevant federal, State, and local policies and regulations. Specific State and federal requirements are not generally listed because they apply independently of the General Plan and could result in the need to have to revise the General Plan with every change in the law.

Response to Comment 2-2 (GP): The commenter's opinion regarding the nature of water supply policies is noted for the record. Goals PS-2 and PS-3 in the Public Services and Utilities Element of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative address future and existing water supplies. Goal 5.2 and Objectives 5.2.1, 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 in the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative also address these issues. All four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives call for the County and water providers to seek water supplies to accommodate planned growth.

Response to Comment 2-3 (GP): All four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives include the information requested. In both the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the heading "Surface Water Resources" in the Public Services and Utilities Element contains discussion about potential future water supply sources. The EIR discusses future potential water supplies in Section 5.5, beginning on page 5.5-17 of Volume 1. Exhibit 5.5-3 also shows the location of potential water sources.

Response to Comment 2-4 (GP): Policy PS-2f in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires the County to work with service providers to develop a drought preparedness plan. Goal PS-3 provides policies on establishing water efficiency programs; conserving existing supplies through the use of reclaimed water and use of water-conserving landscape for capital improvement projects. The No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative do not contain any specific drought planning policies. However, Objective 7.3.5 and accompanying policy deals with the conservation of water resources. The EIR proposes a new policy supporting water conservation and recycling programs (page 5.5-47 of Volume 1).

Response to Comment 2-5 (GP): Future water storage sites are discussed under "Surface Water Resources" in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please refer also to Response to Comment 2-3.

Response to Comment 2-6 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment on encouraging development of local water supplies are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 2-7 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 2-4. It is also noted that the County is not a water purveyor and as such cannot provide direct incentives for use of recycled water. The El Dorado Irrigation District does provide developers a reduction in EDUs for use of reclaimed water.

Response to Comment 2-8 (GP): For all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, lands used for water and wastewater treatment facilities, including storage of reclaimed water, are designated Public Facilities. Take lines are identified on the Land Use Diagrams where potential future sites have been identified (i.e., Texas Hill). Please refer also to Comment Letter 210 from the El Dorado Irrigation District. Response to Comment 210-11 addresses recycled water.

Response to Comment 2-9 (GP): Impact 5.4-3 identifies the need for the County to develop funding mechanisms to ensure the full funding of all roadway improvements necessary to meet the LOS thresholds established by the General Plan policies. Mitigation Measure 5.4-3 lists potential funding sources the County could rely on for roadway improvement funding but does not dictate a specific source.

Response to Comment 2-10 (GP): All the major County roadways and State highways are shown on the Circulation Diagram in the Circulation Element of each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. These include all of the major arterials that provide parallel capacity to U.S. Highway 50 including Green Valley Road, Sophia Parkway, Saratoga Way, and White Rock Road.

Response to Comment 2-11 (GP): Policy 3.2.2.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives states that the County will encourage partnerships with the State and neighboring jurisdictions to solve State highway problems and funding limitations. However, in recognition of the level of service on U.S. Highway 50 in Placerville, the high cost of improvements, and the limited control the County has to change a State highway within the borders of an incorporated City, all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives acknowledge that U.S. Highway 50 through Placerville will remain at LOS F. Please refer also to Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 2-12 (GP): All four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives include multilane improvements into Sacramento County including four lanes on Green Valley Road, four lanes on Sophia Parkway (a new arterial connecting to Folsom), four lanes on Saratoga Parkway (a new arterial extension connecting to Folsom), and widening of U.S. Highway 50. The No Project, 1996 General Plan, and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives include up to eight mainline lanes on U.S. Highway 50 (along with the improvements noted above) to provide LOS E or better

operations during peak hour conditions in 2025. Of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR, only the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative would not provide adequate capacity on U.S. Highway 50 to avoid LOS F conditions during peak hour conditions in 2025 due to this alternative’s proposed restriction of U.S. Highway 50 to six lanes. If adopted, Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(a) would amend the Circulation Diagram, and add an implementation measure, for a new road into Sacramento County south of U.S. Highway 50.

Response to Comment 2-13 (GP): The feasibility of future light rail transit (LRT) service to El Dorado County has not been determined but the City of Folsom and El Dorado County are currently evaluating various transit strategies for the Folsom-El Dorado corridor as part of the Folsom-El Dorado Transit Strategy Study. If bus, LRT, or other transit service requiring a dedicated right-of-way is determined to be feasible and desirable, then the County would amend the General Plan Circulation Element and diagram to include the specific project.

It should also be noted that circulation diagrams for each alternative already contain the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor, which previously served as the Southern Pacific railroad line through western El Dorado County. This alignment has been purchased for future transportation use by a joint powers agency (JPA) made up of Sacramento County, Regional Transit, City of Folsom, and El Dorado County.

Refer to Master Response 17 for additional information.

Response to Comment 2-14 (GP): Policy LU-4g in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative (LU-4f in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative) addresses land use conflict in Rural Regions. In both of these alternatives, Policy AF-1e requires the continued enforcement of the Right to Farm Ordinance and Policy AF-1d provides for the protection of agricultural lands. Implementation Measure AF-A proposes changes to the Zoning Ordinance regarding enhanced agricultural protection. In the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative, Objective 8.1.3 provides for protection of agricultural lands. These Alternatives also contain policies on incompatibility issues. The EIR proposes a revision to Policy 8.1.4.2 regarding agricultural setbacks and a revised implementation measure. A new policy is proposed under Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b) regarding the compatibility of uses.

Response to Comment 2-15 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment on the protection of prime agricultural soils are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. See also Response to Comment 261-102.

Response to Comment 2-16 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment on the protection of private property rights for all landowners are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 2-17 (GP): Goal AF-3 and accompanying policy in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Objective 8.2.3 in the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative address agricultural housing. In addition, Policy HO-1u of the Housing Element requires the County to track the approval and status of housing for farmworkers.

Response to Comment 2-18 (GP): Policy AF-1c and Implementation Measure AF-D of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Policy 8.2.4.2 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative require the County to provide programs for tax benefits and to enhance the capabilities of farms and ranches.

Response to Comment 2-19 (GP): The open space goal and policies contained in all four of the equal-weight General Plan Alternatives provide for a wide range of open space types as suggested by the commenter. Open space is deemed to consist of both public and private lands. See also Response to Comment 261-97

Response to Comment 2-20 (GP): Recognition of the amount of lands under National Forest and other restrictive uses (nonjurisdictional lands) within the County is contained in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives (page 263 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative; page 266 in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and page 2 of the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative).

Response to Comment 2-21 (GP): The commenter’s opposition to more federal designated wilderness areas within the County is noted. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors do not have authority over the location or extent of federal wilderness areas. The State also has no jurisdiction over designated wilderness areas. Note that the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives both contain Policy 2.2.5.15 stating that designation of a river in the County as “wild and scenic” or the establishment of a National Recreation Area is inconsistent with the General Plan.

Response to Comment 2-22 (GP): The Housing Element contains a number of policies and implementation measures directed towards provision of affordable housing, including senior housing, throughout the County (please refer to Policies HO-1b, HO-1c, HO-1i, HO-1k and HO-1l). Through designating Community Regions and Rural Centers, the County has identified the areas most appropriate for affordable housing. Actual site development would be determined by the individual property owners.

Response to Comment 2-23 (GP): Policy HO-1i requires the County to work with neighborhood groups to incorporate affordable workforce housing and increase the acceptance of affordable housing. In addition, there is a wealth of information regarding the development and success of affordable housing projects available. It is not appropriate to identify model affordable housing projects in the General Plan.

Response to Comment 2-24 (GP): There are no policies contained in any of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives specifically regulating housing design, size and type which is a Zoning Ordinance level of regulation.

Response to Comment 2-25 (GP): The Housing Element contains Policies HO-1j, HO-1o, Goal HO-2 and Implementation Measures HO-K, HO-L, HO-M and HO-Y which address funding for affordable housing.

Response to Comment 2-26 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment opposing inclusionary zoning are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Response to Comment 1-1.

Response to Comment 2-27 (GP): At the time the Board of Supervisors reviewed the project description and the Notice of Preparation was released, the issue of the maximum density for High Density Residential (HDR), was discussed at length. At the direction of the Board, HDR was set at a maximum of five dwelling units per acre, a density determined to be appropriate for a predominantly rural county. The growth projections and subsequent traffic impact analysis were based on that maximum density. To change it at this time would change that analysis. While the Multifamily Residential (MFR), designation is intended to provide housing at a density reaching 20 units per acre, smaller attached or detached units could be constructed on lands designated MFR at the density suggested by the commenter.

Response to Comment 2-28 (GP): Please see Response to Comment 261-90

Response to Comment 2-29 (GP): Policy HO-4c of the Housing Element in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives encourages, but does not require, the incorporation of universal design features in a manner which does not increase housing costs. Implementation Measure HO-DD prescribes development of these standards and includes a set of features that may be included in the standards. As required by the measure, the County Planning and Building Departments, with input from the development and construction industries, will work cooperatively to develop these standards.

Response to Comment 2-30 (GP): Implementation Measure HO-I of the Housing Element in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives requires development of a fee waiver or fee reduction ordinance for affordable housing within two years of General Plan adoption.

Response to Comment 2-31 (GP): Please see Response to Comment 261-91.

Response to Comment 2-32 (GP): The No Project Alternative, the 1996 General Plan Alternative and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative encourage mixed-use projects (Policies 2.1.1.3 and 2.1.2.5 in the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General

Plan Alternative, and LU-3a and LU-3h in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative). Policy LU-3h and Implementation Measure LU-A in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires mixed-use for certain commercial developments. Table LU-1 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Table 2-2 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative specify allowable densities for mixed-use projects. In addition, Policy HO-1h in the Housing Element encourages mixed-use projects.

Response to Comment 2-33 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment encouraging the balance of “desires” with projected costs for implementing economic development policies, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 2-34 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment relating to identifying a source of revenue for all programs and policies mandated in the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Estimated costs for implementation of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are provided in Appendix B of this Response to Comments document. Specific sources of revenue for the implementation work effort could include applicant fees, general fund revenues, and/or special taxes and assessments. AB 2938 adopted in 2002 clarified existing law to confirm that General Plan preparation and implementation costs may be the proper subject of development fees. For a discussion of the costs of applicant compliance please refer also to Response to Comments 261-61 and 296-17.

Response to Comment 2-35 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 261-109.

Response to Comment 2-36 (GP): Implementation Measure ED-A in the Economic Development Element of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative addresses the creation of a Redevelopment Agency. Policy HO-1o in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives directs the County to explore the establishment of a redevelopment agency. Please refer also to Response to Comment 261-110.

Response to Comment 2-37 (GP): The Draft General Plan documents contain policies that address the known issue of jobs/housing imbalances. Implementation Measure ED-A in the Economic Development Element of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative directs the establishment of an Economic Policy Framework, which would address cost of living and cost of housing issues, among many other issues. Policies under Objective 10.1.9 in the Economic Development Element of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives also address cost of living and cost of housing imbalances. Policy HO-1h in the Housing Element of all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives recognizes the importance of creating

living spaces near job centers, which could provide for affordable workforce housing and address some of the disparity issues associated with incompatible housing prices and available employment. Policies under Objectives 2.1.1 and 2.2.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Goal LU-3 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives similarly identify design features that encourage the construction of housing near employment centers.

While the County is proposing a number of measures to address jobs/housing imbalances, there are other factors beyond its control that have historically affected and will continue to affect the jobs/housing balance. These include a desire to live in a rural environment in exchange for a commute to a place of employment, and housing market trends.

Response to Comment 2-38 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 261-112.

LETTER 3: JANINE M. JONES

Response to Comment 3-1 (GP): As noted by the commenter, APNs 048-121-11 and 048-121-43 are designated as Low Density Residential (LDR) on each of the alternative Land Use Diagrams. Based on the contents of the letter, the commenter appears to prefer application of the Medium Density Residential (MDR) designation to the parcels. None of the alternatives allow the assignment of MDR to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcels are not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the MDR land use designation could not have been assigned. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

The concerns and opinions regarding how surrounding land use patterns compare with the subject parcels and the commenter's opposition to the No Project Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 4: OYSTEIN SOLHEIM

Response to Comment 4-1 (GP): The commenter is requesting Medium Density Residential (MDR) on APN 070-160-59. This request is met by the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative Land Use Diagrams. In the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated Low Density Residential (LDR). That Alternative does not allow the assignment of MDR to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcel is not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the MDR land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 5: JOHN PROTZEL

Response to Comment 5-1 (GP): This letter was superceded by a subsequent letter from the commenter. Please refer to Letter 15 for responses to the request.

LETTER 6: FRANK J. SEVERSON

Response to Comment 6-1 (GP): The commenter is expressing support for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 7: MICHAEL ANTHONY VALDES

Response to Comment 7-1 (GP): The commenter expresses support for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and identifies concerns regarding the impacts of growth in Cool, Coloma, and Pilot Hill. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 8: THERESA STORLIE

Response to Comment 8-1 (GP): The commenter suggests that density along Bass Lake Road be two-acre minimum. The southern portion of Bass Lake Road passes through the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan area, which allows for a range of one unit per five acres to four units per acre. Because it is a Specific Plan area (approved in 1992), this density is assumed under all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Proposed land use densities along the current alignment of the northern portion of Bass Lake Road are High Density Residential (HDR; 1-5 units/acre) under the 1996 General Plan; a mix of HDR (areas already developed or previously approved for development), Medium Density Residential (MDR; one unit/acre), Low Density Residential (LDR; one unit/5 acres), and Rural Land (RL; one unit/10 acres) under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative; and HDR (mostly areas already developed or previously approved for development) and MDR under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

The suggestion to maintain two-acre minimum parcel sizes along this roadway is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during their General Plan deliberations. Please refer to Master Response 8.

The County does have plans to improve Bass Lake Road in both the near and distant future, depending upon the timing of development in the area. As set forth in the *El Dorado County Department of Transportation Draft Interim Capital Improvement Program*, November 2002, a description of improvements and estimated date of construction is as follows:

1. Improve to standard 2-lane divided roadway with shoulders from U.S. Highway 50 to approximate future connection of Serrano Parkway. Also, realign the roadway south of Bass Lake to remove the sharp curve in the existing alignment. Anticipated construction is for fiscal year 2004/2005, but dependent upon timing of development within the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan.
2. Construct new Bass Lake Road through the Silver Springs Development, connecting to the realigned Bass Lake Road north of Bass Lake as a condition of approval of the Silver Springs Subdivision. Anticipated construction is for fiscal year 2004/2005.
3. Realign Bass Lake Road through proposed Silver Springs subdivision south of Green Valley Road and west of existing Bass Lake Road with two-lane standard divided roadway with shoulders, with grading for potential future widening. Anticipated construction is for fiscal year 2006/2007.

The ultimate plan for Bass Lake Road from U.S. Highway 50 to Green Valley Road varies with each General Plan Alternative as follows:

- No Project: 4-lane divided from U.S. Highway 50 to Bass Lake realignment
- 1996 General Plan: 6-lane divided from U.S. Highway 50 to Country Club; 4-lane divided from Country Club to Bass Lake realignment.
- Roadway Constrained: 4-lane divided from U.S. Highway 50 to Bass Lake realignment
- Environmentally Constrained: 4-lane divided from U.S. Highway 50 to Bass Lake realignment

LETTER 9: KIMBERLY BEAL, THE EL DORADO BUSINESS ALLIANCE

Response to Comment 9-1 (GP): The commenter requests an extension of the comment period for the draft General Plan so that it is coincidental with the comment period for the DEIR. Please refer also to Master Response 1.

LETTER 10: KIMBERLY BEAL, THE EL DORADO BUSINESS ALLIANCE

Response to Comment 10-1 (GP): The commenter requests an extension of the comment periods for the draft General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 1.

Response to Comment 10-2 (GP): This issue has subsequently been addressed through a special election in District 3 and the election of Supervisor Jack Sweeney.

LETTER 11: RICHARD B. GIRVIN

Response to Comment 11-1 (GP): The commenter requests the High Density Residential (HDR) land use designation for APN 108-030-03. This request is met by the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel is designated Low Density Residential (LDR). This Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 12: CHRIS HURLEY

Response to Comment 12-1 (GP): The commenter is expressing support for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 13: STEVE AND JUDY ARRIGOTTI, ET AL.

Response to Comment 13-1 (GP): The commenters request the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation for APNs 067-090-16 [Arrigotti], 067-090-17 [Winters], 097-090-19 [Andrus], and 067-090-211 [Collins]). This request is met by the 1996 General Plan Alternative. The parcels are designated Low Density Residential (LDR) in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives and are outside of the Community Region. These alternatives do not allow the assignment of MDR to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcels are not within a Community Region of Rural Center, the MDR land use designation could not have been assigned in these Alternatives. Please also refer to Master Response 8 and Responses to Comment Letters 27, 52 and 127.

LETTER 14: JAMES AND BETTY WEBB, LOK-N-LOGS

Response to Comment 14-1 (GP): As noted by the commenters, APN 319-200-31 is designated Low Density Residential (LDR) on each of the alternative Land Use Diagrams. In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, no new commercially-designated parcels were identified. Additionally, those Alternatives prohibit the establishment of new commercial land uses in Rural Regions (Policy LU-4f in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Policy LU-4e in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative). Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 15: JOHN PROTZEL

Response to Comment 15-1 (GP): This comment (Letter 15) requests modification of the request outlined in Letter 5. The requested land use designation of Medium Density Residential (MDR) for APN 108-010-34 was not included in any of the General Plan alternatives. In the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated Low Density Residential (LDR). In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel is designated Rural Lands (RL). These alternatives do not allow the assignment of MDR to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcel is not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the MDR land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained or Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

LETTER 16: ROBERT J. CAMPBELL

Response to Comment 16-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 regarding the difference between land use designations and zoning.

Based on the contents of the letter, the commenter appears to be requesting a Commercial (C) land use designation for APNs 327-213-06 and 327-213-08. All of the Alternatives included APN 327-213-06 as C. APN 327-213-08 was incorporated with a split designation of C and residential uses as opposed to being evaluated as entirely commercial. A portion of APN 327-213-08 is included in the Missouri Flat Master Circulation and Funding Plan (MC&FP) area. Any change to the designation of this parcel would require a change to the MC&FP which is not currently proposed.

LETTER 17: CHRIS HURLEY

Response to Comment 17-1 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 12-1.

LETTER 18: ADAM C.E. SMITH

Response to Comment 18-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Commercial (C) land use designations for APNs 078-030-57, -58, -59, -60 and 078-260-75 and that they be included in a Rural Center. The request is included in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. In the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcels are designated Low Density Residential (LDR) and are not within a Rural Center. This Alternative contains a policy that prohibits the establishment of new commercial land uses in Rural Regions (Policy LU-4e). Because the parcels are in a Rural Region, it was not appropriate to assign a commercial land use designation. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

LETTER 19: ADAM C.E. SMITH

Response to Comment 19-1 (GP): This letter is a reiteration of Letter 18. See the Response to Comment 18-1.

LETTER 20: THERESA STORLIE

Response to Comment 20-1 (GP): The commenter's information regarding the effects of poor planning upon quality of life are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 20-2 (GP): The commenter expresses support for an environmentally sound plan. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 21: RICHARD B. GIRVIN

Response to Comment 21-1 (GP): This letter is a reiteration of Letter 11. Please refer to Response to Comment 11-1.

LETTER 22: W.W. STURCH

Response to Comment 22-1 (GP): Staff recognizes that there is some overlap and similarity between the alternatives; however, each contains significant differences. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 12.

Response to Comment 22-2 (GP): Noise policies similar to those contained in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives are contained in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives under Goals HS-12, "To develop and implement a set of noise standards that reflects the varying nature of different land uses" and HS-13, "To protect noise-sensitive uses from incompatible noise environments."

Response to Comment 22-3 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 25-3.

Response to Comment 22-4 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on noise issues and the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 22-5 (GP): In the context of Policy 6.5.1.5, the term "high volume" is used generically. It is not intended to refer to a specific number of vehicles on a road or a roadway size. There is not a specific definition of a high volume in the General Plan and none was intended.

Response to Comment 22-6 (GP): The issue of traffic calming is implied in many of the Goals and Policies of the General Plan alternatives and also the implementation measures included in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Policy TC-1p of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives directs the County to include traffic calming measures in revising the standards and design manuals once the General Plan is in place.

Response to Comment 22-7 (GP): The Housing Element contained in each alternative addresses the concerns raised in this comment. In addition to many of the programs and incentives contained in the previously approved Housing Element, policies under Goal HO-1 provide a wide range of incentives and mandates, including a requirement that all new housing developments include units affordable to moderate and low-income households (Policy HO-1f). These also include HO-1k, HO-1l, and Implementation Measure HO-C. The other concern and opinion expressed in the comment, that affordable housing should be distributed throughout the County, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 22-8 (GP): According to Policy HS-12c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, noise restrictions for activities associated with construction of a project will apply only after 7 p.m. and before 7 a.m. and after 5 p.m. and before 8 a.m. on Saturdays. Addressing penalties for noncompliance with these standards is beyond the scope of a General Plan.

Response to Comment 22-9 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding support for the No Project Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 23: BOB MOORE

Response to Comment 23-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between land use designations and zoning.

On each of the draft Land Use Diagrams, the commenter's parcel, as well as a number of others in the vicinity (Book 109, page 3) are designated Multifamily Residential (MFR). These parcels have been identified as such since the Shingle Springs Area Plan was drafted and the staff has proposed no changes.

LETTER 24: LAWRENCE MANCUSO, MT. MURPHY ASSOCIATES

Response to Comment 24-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between land use designations and zoning.

Based on the content of the letter, the commenter appears to be requesting that the Rural Residential (RR) or Rural Lands (RL) designations be applied to APNs 006-011-37, -44, and -45. This request is included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcels are designated RL and Natural Resource (NR). That Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, all of the parcels are designated NR. While there is RL in the vicinity, the NR designation is not inconsistent with the designations on surrounding lands. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

LETTER 25: BOB AND PATTI ANDERSON

Response to Comment 25-1 (GP): The purpose of having different alternatives is so that there is variation between them, so that the Board of Supervisors has a range of options from which to choose. Please refer also to Response to Comment 22-1.

Response to Comment 25-2(GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 22-2.

Response to Comment 25-3 (GP): Goal 6.7 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives addresses air quality issues in that alternative. While not identical, similar policies exist in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives under Goal HS-8 and HS-9. There are no existing policies under Objective 6.7.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, however, the County adopted a Clean Air Act Plan in 1993. Activities in the County are also subject to the 1994 Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan.

Response to Comment 25-4 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 22-4.

Response to Comment 25-5 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 22-5.

Response to Comment 25-6 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 22-6.

Response to Comment 25-7(GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 22-7.

Response to Comment 25-8(GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 22-8.

Response to Comment 25-9 (GP): This comment is directed at the implementation of the noise policies in the General Plan alternatives. The County currently relies on citizen complaints regarding violations of the County's noise policies and ordinances. Complaints are addressed by the County's Code Enforcement Officers and if necessary, the Sheriff's Department. This will continue to be the enforcement mechanism after the new General Plan is adopted.

Response to Comment 25-10 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on noise and traffic safety issues due to traffic volumes above 2,000 vehicles per day, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The issue of traffic volumes on residential streets is implied in many of the goals and policies of the General Plan alternatives and also the implementation measures included in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Policy TC-1a and Implementation Measure TC-C direct the County to include measures regarding traffic volumes and access issues for residential neighborhoods in the revised standards and design manuals once the General Plan is in place.

Response to Comment 25-11 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment expressing support for the No Project Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 26: RICK TODD, GEORGETOWN FIRE DISTRICT

Response to Comment 26-1 (GP): The comment accurately reflects the language of the alternatives. It is not the intent of either alternative to eliminate new development, but to direct it to areas of the County that are most suitable for development or to ensure that adequate safeguards are in place to protect the citizens moving into areas with high or very high fire hazards.

Response to Comment 26-2 (GP): The County would rely on the experts in fire protection for new development in areas of high fire hazard. As stated by the commenter, this would have a potential impact on the workload of local fire protection districts, but the level of impact is unknown and would be based on the amount of new development proposed in any given district.

LETTER 27: STEVE AND JUDY ARRIGOTTI

Response to Comment 27-1 (GP): The General Plan alternatives were developed by the Planning Department with direction from the Board of Supervisors, consistent with the requirements of the CEQA and direction from Judge Cecily Bond. Please refer to Master Response 8.

The land use designations are based on a variety of factors, including the overall goals of the Alternatives, and surrounding land use patterns. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations and Community Region boundaries under that alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers, which were generally more limited in size and extent as compared to the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

Please also refer to Master Response 9.

Response to Comment 27-2 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 8. The boundaries of the El Dorado Hills Community Region as proposed on the draft General Plan Land Use Diagrams have no relationship to the boundaries of the El Dorado Hills Community Services District. The County has no authority to establish or change Community Services District (CSD) boundaries. Boundaries such as those of the CSD are established through a process that involves the subject entity (in this case, the CSD) and the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). LAFCOs are independent regulatory commissions created by the California Legislature to control the boundaries of cities and most special districts. Each county has a LAFCO. To complete a boundary change, then, the CSD would have to initiate a process and the LAFCO would ultimately regulate, through approval or denial, such a change. Therefore, the General Plan alternative selected will not change the El Dorado Hills CSD boundaries in any way.

Response to Comment 27-3 (GP): This request is a reiteration of the request contained in Letter 13. Please refer to Response to Comment 13-1.

LETTER 28: CHARLES AND LORNA GARRETT

Response to Comment 28-1 (GP): The commenters request the Tourist Recreational (TR) designation for their three parcels (APNs 104-240-19, -20 and -21. Under the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, two of the parcels are designated TR and one parcel is designated Rural Residential (RR). In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. For the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the Rural Lands (RL) parcel (APN 104-240-19) was not assigned the TR designation because the parcel does not support an existing tourist and resident-serving recreational use. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the RL designation assigned to all three parcels is not inconsistent with the designations of other surrounding residential parcels.

Please refer also to Master Response 8.

LETTER 29: JANINE JONES

Response to Comment 29-1 (GP): The commenter's opposition to the No Project Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 29-2 (GP): The commenter is expressing support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative and opposition to the No Project Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 30: PETER SCHWABE

Response to Comment 30-1 (GP): The El Dorado County Board of Supervisors approved the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan on November 7, 1995. Much of the ridgeline referred to in this comment is designated L7PD, which designates a maximum of 0.7 dwelling units per acre. The purpose of this designation is to “specifically avoid sensitive visual...resources and to provide a means to cluster development...” (El Dorado County, Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan, page 25, November 7, 1995). Policies within the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative restrict ridgeline development (Policy LU-6b). Objective 2.3.2 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative states that the County shall “Maintain the visual integrity of hillsides and ridge lines.” It is important to note that many of the property owners within the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan area have entered into development agreements, i.e. contracts, with the County which confer certain rights to those property owners for the development of the land consistent with the previously-approved specific plan.

LETTER 31: ADAM C.E. SMITH

Response to Comment 31-1 (GP): This letter is a reiteration of Letter 18. See the Response to Comment 18-1.

LETTER 32: ROBERT E. AND ALICE T. FULLER

Response to Comment 32-1 (GP): The commenters request the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation for APN 329-091-01. The 1996 General Plan Alternative included this parcel in the MDR designation. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated Low Density Residential (LDR). These alternatives do not allow the assignment of MDR to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcels are not within a Community Region of Rural Center, the MDR land use designation could not have been assigned in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

LETTER 33: BILL RATHBUN

Response to Comment 33-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between land use designations and zoning.

Based on the contents of the letter, it appears that the commenter is requesting the Low Density Residential (LDR) designation be applied to APN 105-080-42. The requested land use designation was not included in any of the General Plan alternatives. Under all of the Alternatives, the parcel is designated Rural Residential (RR)/ Rural Lands (RL). In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designation is the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. As there is no LDR in the vicinity, the RL designation is consistent with the designations of surrounding parcels. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 34: JOHN AND CARMEN BETHEL

Response to Comment 34-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Responses 7 and 9.

The commenters request the Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation for APN 329-070-14. The 1996 General Plan Alternative includes the LDR designation. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the parcel is designated Rural Lands (RL). The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. While there is LDR in the vicinity, the RL designation is not inconsistent with the designations of surrounding parcels. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 35: DOLORES SAENZ AND ROSALIE SAENZ BIANCHI

Response to Comment 35-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between and relationship of zoning and General Plan land use designations.

The commenters request the Low-Density Residential (LDR) land use designation for APN 102-200-0. All of the equal-weight Alternatives identify the parcel as Rural Residential (RR)/Rural Lands (RL). In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. While there is LDR in the vicinity, the RL designation is not inconsistent with the designations of surrounding parcels. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 36: DON HARTLEY

Response to Comment 36-1 (GP): This letter provides a commentary on the County General Plan process. No responses are required.

LETTER 37: CATRINA VIERRA

Response to Comment 37-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Responses 7 and 9.

The commenter requests Low-Density Residential (LDR) land use designation for APNs 319-180-13 and 319-180-32. The 1996 General Plan Alternative includes the LDR designation for these parcels. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the parcel is designated Rural Lands (RL). The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. While there is LDR in the vicinity, the RL designation is not inconsistent with the designations of surrounding parcels. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 38: ROBERT TANGER, CAMERON PARK AIRPORT DISTRICT

Response to Comment 38-1 (GP): The staff acknowledges that the Airport Master Plan for the Cameron Park Airport is currently being updated and that this information, including mapping and a noise study, will be furnished to the Planning Department upon completion.

Response to Comment 38-2 (GP): The commenter is correct. The appropriate alternatives have been revised to correct this error. Please refer also to Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for changes to the General Plan by alternative.

Response to Comment 38-3 (GP): The commenter recommends that the County fund the maintenance of the center 50 feet of the 100-foot wide public streets within the Cameron Park Airport District, with the reasoning that these streets serve as both public roadways, and airport taxiways for the residents of the Airpark Estates subdivision. The issue of funding for roadway maintenance for specific subdivision roadways is beyond the scope of a General Plan, and therefore, staff recommends no changes to the General Plan.

Response to Comment 38-4 (GP): Pursuant to policies in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the Airport, all applicants would be required to convey a Noise and Avigation easement for any construction within an overflight area. There is no need to repeat this requirement in the General Plan.

Response to Comment 38-5 (GP): The staff agrees that bikeways and pedestrian walkways are not compatible with airports. In the event that a development project is proposed in the vicinity of the Cameron Park Airport, the County, as a matter of policy, notifies the Cameron Park Airport as an affected agency for review and comment. The opportunity is then available for the Airport Board to identify any incompatibilities that may be present in a development proposal.

Response to Comment 38-6 (GP): Page 239, third paragraph, of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and page 241, third paragraph, of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative under the heading “Airport Safety” will be changed to state “Runway Protection Zone” in place of “clear zone,” as suggested by the commenter. Please refer also to Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for changes to the General Plan by alternative.

Response to Comment 38-7 (GP/EIR): The current status of the noise study is noted. The EIR relied on the only noise contours available at the time, which are from 1986 (please refer to Exhibit 5.10-3 in Volume 1). However, data on airport use suggest that 1986 contours likely reflect current noise conditions (please refer to page 5.10-10, of Volume 2). At the time this response was prepared, no new data were available.

Response to Comment 38-8 (GP): The Traffic Noise Contour Map located in Appendix B of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative will be changed to reflect the area of the Pine Hill Preserve, under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management. See Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for proposed changes to the General Plan.

Response to Comment 38-9 (GP): The land use surrounding the Cameron Park Airport is an established pattern of industrial, commercial, public facilities and high-density residential.

Response to Comment 38-10 (GP): Although implementation of height restrictions and other standards related to construction near airports is done at the time of a building permit review, the standards are contained within the Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 17.38 of the El Dorado County Code) and are administered by the Planning Department. State law already requires notification to the relevant ALUC of all permits within their jurisdiction.

Response to Comment 38-11 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 38-5.

Response to Comment 38-12: Please refer to Responses to Comments 38-9 and 38-10.

Response to Comment 38-13 (GP): The commenter concurs with the general information contained in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and states that more specific information will be included in the Cameron Park Airport’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan. As stated in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives (Policies 3.12.1.1 and 3.12.1.4 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and the policies under Goal HS-11 in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives), the County recognizes that the CLUP will serve as the guide for development near the airport.

Response to Comment 38-14 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 38-7.

Response to Comment 38-15 (GP): For the purposes of implementing Measure HS-A, the General Services Department, Division of Parks, Airports, and Grounds would be considered a local agency as identified in the measure.

Response to Comment 38-16 (GP): The staff acknowledges that the Noise Contour Map for the Cameron Park Airport contained in Appendix B of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative will probably need to be changed in accordance with the noise study being conducted for the Airport Master Plan. The new map will become part of the General Plan that is ultimately adopted by the Board of Supervisors. Please refer also to Response to Comment 38-7.

Response to Comment 38-17 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 38-8.

LETTER 39: BAHMAN FOZOUNI

Response to Comment 39-1 (GP): The commenter is requesting the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation for APN 110-020-15. The 1996 General Plan Alternative includes the MDR designation for the parcel. The parcel is designated Low Density Residential (LDR) in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives and is outside of the Community Region. These alternatives do not allow the assignment of MDR to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcel is not within a Community Region of Rural Center, the MDR land use designation could not have been assigned in these Alternatives.

The draft General Plan documents, including the Land Use Diagrams, are intended to provide a range of land use scenarios for the Board's consideration. Similarly, CEQA requires jurisdictions to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives when completing an Environmental Impact Report for a proposed project (in this case, the proposed project is a new El Dorado County General Plan). One of the key differences in the alternative diagrams is variation in land use patterns, including the Community Region boundaries. These variations are intended to accommodate the goals and policies of the General Plan alternatives, as outlined in the General Plan documents. Please refer to Master Response 8.

The General Plan land use designations have no direct tie to the Covenants, Codes, and Restrictions (CCRs) that apply in the commenter's neighborhood. If the homeowners have contractually agreed to be bound by CCRs the designations or uses permitted in the County's General Plan would not change this. Similarly, the General Plan will not control the area that may be included in any future El Dorado Hills incorporation. The boundaries of any future incorporation would be proposed by the incorporation proponents and would be approved by LAFCO. Please refer to Master Response 11 for more information related to the El Dorado Hills incorporation.

Response to Comment 39-2 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions regarding the historic potential use and method of EIR preparation are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan. Please also refer to Master Response 9.

LETTER 40: JANISE A. GEE

Response to Comment 40-1 (EIR): Impacts associated with the Silva Valley Parkway Interchange Project were analyzed in a project-level Environmental Impact Report which analyzed the proposed interchange project. This document was certified in the 1980s and is available at the County's Department of Transportation. It has not been determined if additional environmental documentation will be required before the interchange project moves forward towards construction. A more specific and detailed environmental impact analysis of the future Silva Valley Parkway/U.S. Highway 50 interchange project is beyond the scope of the General Plan EIR. Please refer also to Master Response 2.

The concerns about traffic, and related issues of safety, noise, and air quality, on Silva Valley Parkway and the opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on specific traffic issues and the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 40-2 (GP): The concerns and opinions favoring limited growth expressed in the comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 41: ED KELLER, REALTY WORLD: KELLER & ASSOCIATES

Response to Comment 41-1 (GP): The commenter requests a Commercial (C) land use designation for APN (094-020-05). This designation is proposed under the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the Grays Corner Rural Center was eliminated. This Alternative contains a policy that prohibits the establishment of new commercial land uses in Rural Regions (Policy LU-4e). Because the parcel is in a Rural Region, it was not appropriate to assign a commercial land use designation.

Consistent with State Planning and Zoning Law, the County will update its Zoning Ordinance following adoption of the General Plan. Rezoning will not occur automatically. If the Board adopts a Land Use Diagram that shows the parcel as Commercial, then assignment of a Commercial zoning designation would be consistent with the General Plan. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 42: ARLO AND MARILYN LAWLESS

Response to Comment 42-1 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 47-1.

LETTER 43: RENE AND CHRISTINE THORNE

Response to Comment 43-1 (GP): As noted by the commenters, the land use designation of their property is different on the different alternatives. This is consistent with direction provided in CEQA with respect to examining a reasonable range of alternatives. Please refer to Master Response 8.

State Planning and Zoning Law requires cities and counties to adopt a General Plan and Zoning Ordinances that are consistent with the General Plan. The intent is to facilitate orderly development that is consistent with the goals and objectives of the governing body, which represents the residents. Please refer to Master Response 9.

The boundaries of the Ecological Preserve overlay were developed based on a 1991 study and report completed by EIP Associates. In the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, lands assigned the Agricultural Lands designation are either in active agricultural production or contain at least 50 percent choice agricultural soils. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, land use designations were largely based on the relationship of parcel size and Policy LU-1b (page 24), which states that no parcel may be subdivided into more than four parcels (e.g., a 20-acre parcel could not be assigned a land use designation allowing more density than Low Density Residential [LDR]).

The commenter requests the Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation for APN 102-020-31. In the 1996 General Plan Alternative the parcel is designated Rural Residential (RR). In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designation is the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the parcel is designated Natural Resource (NR). The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal.

LETTER 44: THOMAS J. AIKEN, US BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Response to Comment 44-1 (GP): El Dorado County appreciates the time spent by the staff of the Bureau of Reclamation in reviewing the draft General Plan.

Response to Comment 44-2 (GP): Please refer to text change to page 290 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and page 292 of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 44-3 (GP): Please refer to text change to page 291 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and page 293 of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 44-4 (GP/EIR): The information requested is located in the EIR in Table 5.5-1 (page 5.5-141 of Volume 1). Tables 5.5-2 and 5.5-3 also contain data regarding water supply calculations for the two major water districts in the County.

Response to Comment 44-5 (GP): Thank you for this information. Please refer to Section 5.5 of Volume 1 of the EIR for a more detailed discussion of water supply. The yield figures identified in the EIR rely on information from the Water Agency. To the extent that the actual yield figures are higher than indicated in the EIR, supplies will be greater and projected shortages will be lower.

Response to Comment 44-6 (GP): The commenter is correct that all interest and title of the Sly Park Unit was transferred to the El Dorado Irrigation District subsequent to the release of the General Plan alternatives and the DEIR. However, that change in title does not alter the amount of water available for use by EID’s customers or affect the water supply calculations for the County.

Response to Comment 44-7 (GP): The water that is planned to become available to El Dorado County from PL 101-514, Section 206 is discussed on page 5.5-18 of Volume 1 of the EIR. Final action in securing that water is waiting adoption of this General Plan.

Response to Comment 44-8 (GP): The additional water supply from the Placer County Water Agency and the Bureau of Reclamation is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Comment Letter 210.

Response to Comment 44-9 (GP): The additional water supply from Folsom Reservoir is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Comment Letter 210.

LETTER 45: JOHN G. PARRISH, STATE MINING AND GEOLOGY BOARD

Response to Comment 45-1 (GP): The Policy and Legislation Committee of the State Mining and Geology Board has determined that the proposed changes and overall policies in the General Plan alternatives are in accordance with the requirements of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA, Public Resources Code Section 2710 et seq.). The text of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative will be modified to include reference to the most recent Mineral Classification report. Please refer to Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for proposed changes to the General Plan. Please also refer to Master Response 21.

LETTER 46: SAM MILLER, SERRANO ASSOCIATES, LLC

Response to Comment 46-1 (GP): El Dorado County appreciates the time spent by the commenter reviewing the draft documents.

Response to Comment 46-2 (GP): The commenter requests a split land use designation of High Density Residential and Multifamily Residential (MFR) for APNs 112-130-19 and 107-010-02. This request is included in the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" shows a Rural Lands (RL)/Multifamily Residential (MFR) split. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that alternative. The requested split designation (HDR and MFR) would accommodate high-density and multifamily housing on the property. Because the Zoning Ordinance will be updated following adoption of a new General Plan, it is assumed that the zoning designation of the property (which, as the commenter points out, is inconsistent with HDR and/or MFR) would be changed so that it is consistent with the adopted General Plan land use designation. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 46-3 (GP): The staff concurs that there is a mapping error. The property is a part of the Marble Valley project and subject to a development agreement. The map correction is reflected on Figure LU-1 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 46-4 (GP): The commenter is correct in that development agreements were entered into by the County in the 1980s as well as the 1990s. Please refer to text change to page 9 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and the Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 46-5 (GP): The discussion of development agreements in the General Plan alternatives is presented to acknowledge that the existence of a large number of vested, but not yet built, units limits the County's discretion in proposing alternative locations or distributions of growth. This is not intended to characterize the agreements as positive or negative. The commenter's opinion that these facts cast a negative view on the development agreements is noted.

Response to Comment 46-6 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Policy LU-1d of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives does not require denial of all residential development. The general term, "undermine", provides the County flexibility in making findings for discretionary projects that may be subject to this policy.

Response to Comment 46-7 (GP): Staff has attempted to avoid the use of “should” in the policy text where the policy simply provides guidance to encourage or discourage a particular action, as in Policy LU-3i. The additional language recommended by the commenter may be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The proposed language could have the effect of dispersing services in a manner that increases vehicle miles traveled

Response to Comment 46-8 (GP): The recommended revision to Policy LU-3k expressed in the comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 46-9 (GP): The requirement of a “will serve” letter from the various service providers at the time of discretionary project approval, as set forth in Policy PS-1f in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, has been modified in response to this comment to require approval at the tentative map/parcel map stage. The County staff believe that this affords sufficient planning time to assure services can be timely provided and allows the County to consider availability of these resources at a discretionary approval stage. If the “will serve” were to be provided at the final map stage, it would be after the County’s discretionary authority has been exercised and those issues would not be adequately considered.

Regarding water, Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) addresses the appropriate timing for determining the assurance of water availability and this measure has been revised. See Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. As described, water availability assurance would be required at the tentative map stage. This differs with the commenter’s request (final map stage) but is provided for water resource planning and conforms with similar provisions in water planning law (Water Code Section 10910). Please refer also to Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 46-10 (GP): Policy HS-2e varies slightly between the two constrained alternatives, with the Environmentally Constrained Alternative prohibiting new gated subdivisions, and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative discouraging them. In the context of wildfire safety, this issue may be limited to rural areas, although catastrophic fires have occurred in other jurisdictions in urbanized areas as well. However, the issue of new gated subdivisions in High and Medium Density Residential areas in one that has been debated at length by the Planning Commission, with no resolution reached. The two alternatives here provide a vehicle for the County to establish policy regarding the issue. The criteria identified by the commenter could be used by the County to determine whether gates are appropriate for individual projects.

Response to Comment 46-11 (GP): The commenter is correct. The County is in the process of implementing the requirements of NPDES for Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize erosion, sediments, and other construction-related pollutant discharge

associated with grading projects. The proposed policy stops short of prohibiting grading activities during these periods (as is the current requirement in the Tahoe Basin), but by discouraging grading during these periods (or precluding grading activities unless appropriate mitigation measures are in place, in the case of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative), project proponents would be obligated to demonstrate that the grading activity could not be reasonably undertaken during the dry season, and that a higher level of BMPs would be undertaken as a component of the grading project.

Response to Comment 46-12 (GP): The term used in the policy is “USGS hydrologic unit” and is described in the discussion of Water Resources (page 257 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative). USGS Hydrologic Units are terms that are specifically defined by the United States Geological Survey, and represent distinctly identified regions, subregions, and watershed areas within the United States. The principal hydrologic units within El Dorado County are the Cosumnes, the South Fork of the American, and the Tahoe watersheds. To a lesser extent, the Mokelumne, and the North Fork of the American watersheds touch the southerly and northerly edges of the County respectively, and some areas within the County may fall within those hydrologic units as well.

Response to Comments 46-13 (GP): The list on page 290 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative identifies public agencies providing park facilities. The Serrano Owner’s Association is not a public agency. With the exception of two existing facilities in the Serrano development, the parks are not open to the general public, although the neighborhood parks do provide limited recreational opportunities for the residents of that development.

Response to Comment 46-14 (GP): Text has been added to page 290 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and page 292 of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative to recognize that some park service is provided by private entities. Please refer also to Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

LETTER 47: ARLO AND MARILYN LAWLESS

Response to Comment 47-1 (GP): The commenter is expressing support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative instead of the No Project Alternative as indicated in their earlier letter. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. Please refer also to Comment Letter 42.

LETTER 48: DON W. THOMAS

Response to Comment 48-1 (GP): Based on the contents of the letter, it appears that the commenter supports those alternatives that would assign the Medium Density Residential (MDR) designation to APN 070-300-15. This land use designation is included in the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 49: BETTY ANN BEAUCHAMP

Response to Comment 49-1 (GP): The commenter expresses support for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and identifies concerns regarding the impacts of growth. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 50: STELLA L. ONETO, STELLA L. ONETO TRUST

Response to Comment 50-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Rural Residential (RR) land use designation for APNs 087-010-11; 087-040-16; and 087-060-37, -38, -39, and -40 (all formerly 087-060-01). The 1996 General Plan Alternative includes this designation for APNs 087-010-11 and 087-040-16. For parcels 087-060-37, -38, -39, and -40 (all formerly 087-060-01), the land use designation is Natural Resource (NR). In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the parcels are all designated NR. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. While there is RR in the vicinity, the NR designation is not inconsistent with the designations on surrounding land uses. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 51: JUNE 2, 2003 PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING ORAL COMMENTS

Note: The following responds to comments and questions raised during the Planning Commission General Plan comment hearing.

Response to Comment 51-1 (GP/EIR): The Board of Supervisors may choose to adopt one of the General Plan alternatives as presented in the draft General Plan documents or may draw together portions of the different alternatives to create a preferred alternative, which they could adopt as the new General Plan. If the Board chooses the latter, any combination resulting in new significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the EIR would require additional analysis consistent with CEQA. Additional analysis would likely require recirculation of those portions of the EIR that address the new significant impacts.

Response to Comment 51-2 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between Zoning and General Plan Land Use designations.

State law requires a city or county's Zoning Ordinance to be consistent with its General Plan. Once a new General Plan is adopted, the County will begin the process of updating the Zoning Ordinance. The update process will include an analysis of existing zoning and whether or not it conforms to the adopted General Plan Land Use Diagram. If zoning does not conform, the County will need to remedy the inconsistency as required by State law. It is likely that some parcels will be "down zoned" (i.e., have the zoning designation changed so that the allowable parcel size is larger/allowable density is lower than allowed under the current zoning designation). It is also possible that some parcels will be designated in a manner that allows for increased density or intensity of use.

Response to Comment 51-3 (GP): The vision statement contained in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives (page 3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives) is the same as the statement adopted as part of the 1996 General Plan. Plan objectives for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, which support the vision statement, are contained in a separate section of the document (pages 7 and 8). The vision statements for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives combine the vision and objectives into a more general statement. The vision statement for these two alternatives is based on the statement and objectives of the 1996 General Plan but is much more general (i.e., does not go into the detail contained in the 1996 General Plan). The General Plan alternatives set forth different methods of leading the County toward a common vision. Please refer also to Response to Comment 296-13.

Response to Comment 51-4 (GP): See Section 3.2.3 of the EIR (pages 3-6 and 3-7 of Volume 1) for a complete background and history of the General Plan process.

Response to Comment 51-5 (GP): As Ms. Mundt noted, the Community Region and Rural Center boundaries vary by alternative. Consistent with her comment, the Georgetown area is considered a Rural Center in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

All of the General Plan Alternatives include a policy that encourages the distribution of affordable housing throughout the County (Policy HO-1k), including areas having limited infrastructure (e.g., public water but no sewer services). This is consistent with public comments regarding the need for affordable housing countywide. The staff recognizes the challenges associated with developing housing in rural areas, whether affordable or market rate. Although the Georgetown area does not have sewer service, lower-density affordable housing could still be developed in the community. For example, multifamily parcels could be developed at the lowest density (5 units per acre).

Response to Comment 51-6 (GP): See Response to Comment 32-1 for written documentation of Mrs. Fuller's parcel-specific request.

Response to Comment 51-7 (GP/EIR): As described by Project Manager Heidi Tschudin at the hearing, the Planning Commission is charged with developing a recommendation regarding a preferred General Plan. This recommendation will then be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors, consistent with California Government Code Section 65354. It is anticipated that the Commission will first deliberate a "base" alternative (i.e., choose one of the existing alternatives as a starting point) and then propose changes to the base or combinations with the other alternatives to develop a preferred plan. As discussed under Response to Comment 55-1 above, the final General Plan may be a combination of the various alternatives.

The task of developing the recommendation will be a difficult task. Staff recognizes the challenge and will be available to assist the Commission as it deliberates. It is expected that the Commission will deliberate each element individually. Depending upon the subject, the Commission may also choose to deliberate specific policy areas that differ substantially among the alternatives.

As required by the Writ of Mandate and CEQA, the General Plan alternatives considered a range of land use designations. As noted by the commenter, some of these designations would allow less development than would be permitted under the current zoning if discretionary approvals were allowed under the current zoning. This issue is discussed further in Master Response 9.

Response to Comment 51-8 (GP): As Mr. Miller notes, the differences between alternatives sometimes take a subtle form in the way policies are presented. Please refer also to Response to Comment 46-10.

Response to Comment 51-9 (GP): As noted by Ms. Tschudin at the hearing, four equal-weight General Plan alternatives were developed with the intent of providing a range of

options for the Commission and Board of Supervisors to consider. In some cases, the differences among the alternatives provide a “bracketing” of a particular issue (i.e., ranging from more restrictive to less restrictive) that may not appear directly related to the title of the particular alternative. By presenting the policies in this manner, the Commission and Board have a range of options from which to choose.

Response to Comment 51-10 (GP): The policy of limiting subdivision to a maximum of four parcels is one of the defining policies of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. Ms. Crespo’s concerns and opinions regarding this limit on subdivision are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 51-11 (GP): Please refer to Letter 274 for documentation of Mr. Perlberger’s request.

Response to Comment 51-12 (GP): Mr. Hartley’s statement was submitted at the hearing. Please refer to Letter 67 for Mr. Hartley’s statement.

Response to Comment 51-13 (GP): As noted in Response to Comment 51-7, staff will be available to assist the Planning Commission during its process of deliberating and recommending a preferred alternative. Additionally, all hearings at which the Commission deliberates will be open to the public and it is expected that members of the public will contribute to the discussion.

There are a number of tools available to assist the public in understanding the General Plan process. These tools include the Project Manager’s summary report of the General Plan and DEIR (dated May 14, 2003), a summary of the differences between the alternatives (dated April 15, 2003), a General Plan website (<http://www.co-el-dorado.ca.us/generalplan/index.asp>), and County staff. The Project Manager’s summary and the summary of differences are available on the website or at the Planning Department. Throughout the process, staff has worked with many members of the public and with other County staff to clarify the process, how General Plan changes may affect them, and how to participate in the process. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

The process of public review of the draft General Plans and the DEIR, which included a series of public hearings, has provided opportunity for public involvement. Comments received during the public review period were considered and included as appropriate. Prior to public release of the draft documents, the public also had opportunities to learn about and participate in the General Plan process. These opportunities included a comment period on the Notice of Preparation (August 2001), Community Housing Workshops (April and May 2002), and a comment period on a draft of General Plan policies (August 2002). The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors understand the history of the 1996 General Plan Alternative and may consider that history as deliberations commence.

Response to Comment 51-14 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 21. The updated Department of Conservation (DOC) information has been incorporated into the Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. This Response to Comments document contains revised Land Use Diagrams for each alternative showing the new extent of the -MR overlay.

The “problem with Marble Valley” referred to by Mr. Marinaccio is directed to the fact that the limestone deposit in the Marble Valley area was removed from the DOC’s mineral resource mapping as a result of the County’s 1998 findings that the area did not supply an important mineral resource. Because the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative Land Use Diagram was developed before DOC removed Marble Valley, the map included in the draft General Plan document and DEIR still shows Marble Valley as part of the -MR overlay area. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative Land Use Diagrams correctly excluded the Marble Valley area from the -MR overlay area. Application of updated MRZ-2a and MRZ-2b information remedies the situation in that the Marble Valley limestone deposit was not identified in the updated DOC report.

Response to Comment 51-15 (GP/EIR): See Letter 283 for Mr. Marinaccio’s written comments.

Response to Comment 51-16 (GP): Please refer to Letter 74 for documentation of Ms. Harris’ request.

Response to Comment 51-17 (GP): Please refer to Letters 52 and 179 for documentation of Mr. Nejatian’s request.

Response to Comment 51-18 (GP): The dam failure inundation maps for the Chili Bar and Slab Creek dams included in the draft General Plan were slightly different although the difference was so minor that it was easily overlooked. Because the Chili Bar and Slab Creek dam inundation zones are nearly continuous (the dams are close together and separated by a short stretch of free-flowing river), the figure has been revised to include both zones on one page to eliminate confusion. See Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 51-19 (GP): Mr. Mercado’s and the Coloma-Lotus Valley Community Association’s comment regarding the characterization of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative as the “Rural Quality of Life Plan” is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 51-20 (GP): See Response to Comment 51-2. Also refer to Master Response 9. That response addresses property rights and the General Plan process. The Housing Element policies and implementation measures include a number of strategies for accommodating affordable housing.

Response to Comment 51-21 (GP): There is no Multifamily Residential land in the area referred to by Mr. Tolhurst. The nearest Multifamily Residential lands are in the Diamond Springs/El Dorado Community Region to the southeast and the Shingle Springs Community Region to the southwest. This comment was a result of confusion on the part of the commenter between different shades of brown representing Multifamily Residential and Rural Lands. No changes to the Land Use Diagrams are proposed in response to the planned casino.

Response to Comment 51-22 (GP): See Master Response 11 for a discussion regarding the incorporation of El Dorado Hills.

Response to Comment 51-23 (GP): Planning alone does not result in affordable housing. However, without a plan, other advances may not occur. The concerns and opinions regarding a lack of construction of affordable housing are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 51-24 (GP): A number of policies and implementation measures are proposed to address site design of affordable housing developments. Policy HO-1h in the Housing Element provides for mixed commercial and residential uses, which may allow for more housing in areas where pedestrian-accommodating infrastructure exists (mixed use is also addressed in the Land Use Elements of all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives). Policies in the Land Use Element promote pedestrian-oriented development (Goal LU-3 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives; Policy 2.4.1.4 and Objective 2.5.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives). Finally, Policy HO-4b in the Housing Element directs the County to provide opportunities for disabled persons to reside in all neighborhoods, which would require specific design characteristics that could also accommodate pedestrian traffic.

All of the General Plan alternatives indicate that the County's primary responsibility as a parks provider is to establish and maintain regional parks. Development of neighborhood parks such as those referred to by Mr. Smart could receive County-sponsored assistance (Policies 9.1.1.1 and 9.1.1.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives; Policy PR-4a and Measure PR-F of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives). However, all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives suggest that independent recreation districts, cities, and private organizations should have primary responsibility for the development of neighborhood parks.

Regarding incentives for affordable housing, the Housing Element proposes a number of measures to facilitate affordable housing development.

Response to Comment 51-25 (GP): It is recognized that General Plan implementation will be a challenge, and that staffing and funding will affect the schedule and success of implementation. Ms. Crespo's concerns and opinions regarding the adequacy of the draft Housing Element are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 51-26 (GP): Implementation Measure HO-C states that the County shall adopt an inclusionary housing ordinance. The Board of Supervisors may choose to modify the language such that adoption of an ordinance is not required. HCD has been informed that the policies under review are drafts for consideration by the County. HCD has not indicated whether removing the requirement would affect the County's ability to receive a certified Housing Element.

Measure HO-C includes some detail regarding the potential methods of providing affordable housing and needed analysis, but does not include draft text of the proposed ordinance. If the Board of Supervisors adopts Measure HO-C, the Planning and Community Services Departments will complete the necessary analyses, hold public hearings, and write a draft ordinance. It is likely that the final ordinance would be a result of a number of iterations based on the public comment and Board direction.

Response to Comment 51-27 (GP): See Master Response 11 for a discussion regarding the incorporation of El Dorado Hills. The opinion regarding the level of General Plan analysis needed for the proposed incorporation is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 51-28 (GP): It is recognized that establishing an appropriate jobs-to-housing balance is a major factor affecting construction of affordable housing (Objective 10.1.9 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Measure LU-D of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives address jobs-housing balance). It is also recognized that public opinion of affordable housing is a hurdle in the process; Policies HO-1i and HO-1l are intended to address this issue. Mr. Polk's concerns and opinions expressed regarding challenges to constructing affordable housing are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 51-29 (GP): The difficulties associated with the distribution of affordable housing and the challenges posed by the lack of infrastructure in areas that are in need of affordable housing are recognized. Because infrastructure availability is a major factor in the placement of any type of housing, it is likely that higher density housing will continue to be constructed in areas having adequate infrastructure. As development in the County continues over the next 20 years and infrastructure is improved accordingly, it is anticipated that new areas will be able to accommodate higher density housing; the alternative Land Use Diagrams address this by identifying land for higher density uses in areas that are currently more rural in nature.

Most of the available residential land in El Dorado Hills is contained in Specific Plan areas. Most of these Specific Plans do not address the placement and construction of affordable housing. Administrators of the Specific Plan areas may choose to include affordable housing as the areas are developed, depending upon market conditions and incentives to provide such housing, such as those contained in the draft Housing Element.

Response to Comment 51-30 (GP): The intent of the Housing Element is to provide for the accommodation of affordable housing countywide. As discussed in Response to Comment 51-29, areas having developed infrastructure (e.g., public water and sewer) are most suitable for development of higher density housing. However, it is also recognized that affordable housing is needed in rural communities.

Response to Comment 51-31 (GP): As Ms. Tschudin stated at the hearing, affordable housing is not necessarily multifamily or even high-density housing. Housing types such as traditional single-family residences, second units, and manufactured homes can be used to provide affordable housing.

Response to Comment 51-32 (GP): As Ms. Tschudin stated at the hearing, the Development Agreements referred to by Commissioner Machado can only be renegotiated by mutual agreement. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 51-29 and 51-33.

Response to Comment 51-33 (GP): Measures HO-C and HO-K propose two mechanisms through which the County could establish funds that could be used to offset the cost and help accommodate the construction of affordable housing. Projects subject to development agreements would also be subject to such a fee as long as the fee applies to all similarly situated private projects; is reasonably related to the cost of the housing to be provided; is applied prospectively only; and is not used to provide services already being provided by the developer.

The inclusionary housing ordinance contemplated by the Housing Element may also apply to new developments in the Specific Plan areas. The development agreements typically allow development to proceed without regard to new County policies and regulations. This rule does not apply, however, to new policies, ordinances, or regulations that apply uniformly to similar properties in the County; do not prevent development for the uses, density, and timing of development set out in the Specific Plans; and are not inconsistent with the terms of the Specific Plans. If an inclusionary housing ordinance were to satisfy these criteria, it would apply to developments in the Specific Plan areas.

Response to Comment 51-34 (GP): Potential barriers to affordable housing are examined in Section 3 of the draft Housing Element, which is dedicated to a discussion and evaluation of housing constraints, including development fees.

Response to Comment 51-35 (GP): Mixed commercial and residential use such as is required by Policy LU-3h of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative can provide affordable housing. Ms. VanMeurs' comment regarding the appropriateness of mixed use is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 51-36 (GP): Modular, or manufactured, homes can be used to provide affordable housing. Ms. Mundt's comment regarding the use of manufactured homes to provide affordable housing is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 51-37 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Letter 173 for the Agricultural Commission's comments on the General Plan alternatives and DEIR.

Response to Comment 51-38 (GP): Implementation Measure HO-I proposes a fee waiver/fee reduction ordinance that would provide taxpayer subsidies for developers of affordable housing to cover the costs of services typically financed by fees. Additionally, the Housing Element includes programs that may help to establish funds that can be used to offset the construction of affordable housing construction (Measures HO-C and HO-K).

Response to Comment 51-39 (GP): See Response to Comment 51-29. Because there is a demand for affordable housing in rural areas, the County is attempting to meet the stated need.

Response to Comment 51-40 (GP): It is recognized that development fees are a major obstacle to affordable housing development. Commissioner Tolhurst, the commenter in this case, may choose to consider development fees as he and the other Planning Commissioners conduct their decision-making deliberations.

Response to Comment 51-41 (GP): See Letters 53 and 245 for information presented by Oak Ridge High School Students Deanna Dalton, Brian Nelson, Greg Allen, and Sara Ziaja and their instructor, Stan Iverson. Comments made by the students are addressed in those letters.

Response to Comment 51-42 (GP): The staff recognizes the importance of an economic development General Plan component. Mr. Marinaccio's concerns and opinions regarding the need to evaluate the economics of the County are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 51-43 (GP): All of the proposed implementation measures could not feasibly be completed within the first few years of General Plan adoption. Accordingly, some of the timeframes for implementation seem to be very far in the future. Responsible departments may in fact complete tasks before the stated timeframe,

depending upon staffing, budget, and priority. The Board may also choose to prioritize and change timeframes as it deliberates a final General Plan.

Also refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 51-44 (GP/EIR): The reports referred to by Mr. Mercado were reviewed and considered during development of the EIR (please refer to page 5.1-17 of Volume 1). Because these community action plans were never adopted by the Board of Supervisors, they were not evaluated against the proposed General Plans for consistency.

Response to Comment 51-45 (GP/EIR): Scenic corridor issues are addressed in Objective 2.6.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, Goal LU-6 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, and Section 5.3 of the EIR, Volume 1. Scenic corridors in the Tahoe Basin are specifically mentioned in the Tahoe Basin Element of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives (Objective 11.1.13). Because U.S. Highway 50 and State Route 89 are State-identified Scenic Highways, any projects proximate to those roadways must be reviewed for compatibility with the Scenic Highway classification and protection of the scenic corridors surrounding those highways. Additionally, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) has scenic resource thresholds that are considered during TRPA review of proposed projects.

Response to Comment 51-46 (GP): Community Region boundaries vary by land use alternative. Please refer to Master Response 8.

Please refer to Letter 56 for documentation of Mr. Veit's request.

Response to Comment 51-47 (GP): See Response to Comment 51-2 and Master Response 7.

Response to Comment 51-48 (GP): Please refer to Letter 56 for documentation of Mr. Veit's parcel-specific request. As noted by Commissioner Machado, assignment of a certain land use designation would not guarantee construction of a certain type of housing (e.g., affordable versus market rate). The opinion regarding the inclusion of the subject parcels in the Community Region is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 51-49 (EIR): See Response to Comment 51-1.

Response to Comment 51-50 (GP/EIR): See Response to Comment 51-2 and Master Response 7.

Inventories such as those identified by Mr. Hartley are included in the EIR in both tabular and graphic format. Current land use is summarized in Tables 5.1-1 (page 5.1-3 of Volume 1 of the EIR), 5.1-2 (page 5.1-4 of Volume 1 of the EIR), and 5.1-3 (page 5.1-7 of Volume 1 of the EIR) and depicted on Exhibits 3-3 (Development Agreement areas, page 3-10 of Volume 1 of the EIR), 5.1-1 (nonjurisdictional lands, page 5.1-5 of Volume 1 of the EIR), and 5.12-3 (existing developed parcels, at the end of Section 5.12 of Volume 2 of the EIR). Regarding an inventory of vegetation, Section 5.12 includes mapping of habitat types (Exhibit 5.12-1), distribution of vegetation by elevation (Exhibit 5.12-2), special-status plant occurrences (Exhibit 5.12-4), limits of the Pine Hill Preserve (for rare plants, Exhibit 5.12-5) (please refer to Master Response 20). Other existing conditions and uses that could affect future development potential are summarized in the DEIR, including important farmland; watersheds and major streams; flood hazard areas; areas likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos; critical slopes; airport noise contours; and roadway noise contours.

The concerns and opinions regarding the balance of environmental protection and development are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 51-51 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 8 and Response to Comment 51-13. The additional alternatives were developed after a series of public meetings before the Board of Supervisors to present a range of choices to the Board and the public based on changed circumstances since 1996 and to comply with the Writ of Mandate. The Community Region and Rural Center boundaries developed during the 1996 planning process are included in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and alternative boundaries to address different policy objectives are presented for public review and comment in the remaining alternatives. During its deliberations, the Board may choose to change or amend Community Region and Rural Center boundaries in response to comments such as this.

Response to Comment 51-52 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives contain policy direction that discourages expansion of public water service into Rural Regions (Policy PS-2c). The intent of this policy was to prevent the expansion of higher-density development into rural areas. This is consistent with that portion of the vision statement contained in all of the alternatives focusing on preservation of the County's rural character.

Regarding commercial development in rural areas, the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives include a policy that prevents the establishment of new commercial businesses outside of defined Community Regions and Rural Centers (Policy LU-4f in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and LU-4e in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative). Since these two alternatives feature less growth than the 1996 General Plan Alternative, it would be anticipated that the demand for new commercial uses, especially in rural areas, would be much lower.

The staff recognizes the difficulties of maintaining a commercial establishment in Rural Regions.

Regarding housing in rural areas, refer to Response to Comments 51-29, 51-30, and 51-31. Because there is a demand for affordable housing in such areas, the County is attempting to meet the stated need by providing for higher densities within Rural Centers.

Response to Comment 51-53 (GP): The staff recognizes the complexity of the General Plan process. Ms. Columbo's concerns regarding complexity of the process are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 51-54 (GP/EIR): Because the previously adopted 1996 General Plan Land Use Diagram is largely the same as the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternative Land Use Diagrams, lands that were approved as Tourist Residential are also evaluated in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 51-55 (GP): The Industrial land use designation is not applied to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. This difference is noted in the land use designation description on page 23 of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative Land Use Element. Existing mining operations could continue, regardless of the base land use designation. In discussion with the County's reclamation plan and SMARA specialist (Pierre Rivas, Acting Principal Planner, El Dorado County Planning Department, pers. comm. with Peter Maurer, El Dorado County Planning Department, November 2003), reclamation to an industrial use typically requires a higher level of reclamation, due to the greater intensity of potential land uses in industrial than residential. In other words, no changes to reclamation plans would be anticipated based on the land use change from Industrial to a residential designation. The decisionmakers may also choose to eliminate the restriction of assigning the Industrial land use designation to parcels outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Response to Comment 51-56 (GP): In their comment letter, the U.S. Forest Service did not indicate that they are planning to complete a plan addressing the economic viability of grading land in Shingle Springs.

As noted, by Mr. Marinaccio, some larger properties south of Shingle Springs were included in the Community Region as Low Density Residential (LDR) in the adopted 1996 General Plan. Inclusion of these properties in the Community Region as LDR is incorporated into and evaluated accordingly in the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

The Planning Commission Minutes summarizing Mr. Marinaccio's comment were unclear, so the tape of the meeting was reviewed for clarification. His comments were primarily directed towards the Scheiber Ranch in the Shingle Springs area, which he states can no longer graze cattle economically because of a change in the Forest Service forest

practices, specifically the elimination of grazing allotments. He stated that this area and others like it were included in the Community Region and designated LDR in the 1996 General Plan, as allowed in the LDR designation definition (parcels used as a “holding zone” until a specific project is proposed and infrastructure is available). Mr. Marinaccio is correct that this area is designated LDR in the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative this land is designated Natural Resources, and in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative this land is designated Rural Lands. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may consider this difference during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 51-57 (GP): See Letter 57 for written documentation of Mr. Graves’ parcel-specific request.

Response to Comment 51-58 (GP): See the Response to Comment 51-3.

LETTER 52: SHAN NEJATIAN ET AL.

Response to Comment 52-1 (GP): The commenter is requesting the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation for APNs 110-020-13 (Hackett), 110-020-15 (Fozouni), 110-020-30, 32 (Nejatian), 067-090-16 (Arrigotti) and 067-090-17 (Winters). The 1996 General Plan Alternative includes the MDR designation for the parcels. The parcels are designated Low Density Residential (LDR) in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives and are outside of the Community Region. These alternatives do not allow the assignment of MDR to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcels are not within a Community Region of Rural Center, the MDR land use designation could not have been assigned in these Alternatives.

The draft General Plan documents, including the Land Use Diagrams, are intended to provide a range of land use scenarios for the Board's consideration. Similarly, CEQA requires jurisdictions to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives when completing an Environmental Impact Report for a proposed project (in this case, the proposed project is a new El Dorado County General Plan). One of the key differences in the alternative maps is variation in land use patterns, including the Community Region boundaries. These variations are intended to accommodate the goals and policies of the General Plan alternatives, as outlined in the General Plan documents. Please refer to Master Response 8.

The General Plan land use designations have no direct tie to the Covenants, Codes, and Restrictions (CCRs) that apply in the commenter's neighborhood. If the homeowners have contractually agreed to be bound by CCRs the designations or uses permitted in the County's General Plan would not authorize deviation from the CCRs. Similarly, the General Plan will not control the area that may be included in any future El Dorado Hills incorporation. The boundaries of any future incorporation would be proposed by the incorporation proponents and would be approved by LAFCO. Please refer to Master Response 11 for more information related to the El Dorado Hills incorporation.

Response to Comment 52-2 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions regarding the historic potential use and method of EIR preparation are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan. Please also refer to Master Response 9.

LETTER 53: STAN IVERSON ET AL., OAK RIDGE HIGH SCHOOL

Response to Comment 53-1 (EIR): The involvement of the high school students in the General Plan process is appreciated. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the student's position on the need to protect wildlife corridors and support for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 54: DOUGLAS R. ROECA

Response to Comment 54-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Industrial land use designation for APN 319-260-5. The 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives include this designation for the parcel. The parcel is identified as Low Density Residential (LDR) on the Environmentally Constrained Alternative map. That Alternative does not allow the assignment of Industrial to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcel is not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the Industrial land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 54-2 (GP): The commenter's concern regarding the allowable floor area ratios (FARs) of the General Plan alternatives is noted for the record. Please refer to Master Response 12, which addresses FARs. The FARs proposed under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives differ from those currently in effect, the latter being what is proposed in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 54-3 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the effect of tree protection policies on commercial and industrial development are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 18. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives and the EIR propose new options for addressing this issue.

LETTER 55: DOUGLAS R. ROECA

Response to Comment 55-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Commercial (C) land use designation on APN 083-350-03. The 1996 General Plan Alternative includes the C designation for this parcel. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives identify the parcel as Multifamily Residential (MFR). This designation was assigned to the parcel to provide a diversity of housing types near the employment and retail base of the Cameron Park Community Region. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 55-2 (GP): See Response to Comment 54-2 and Master Response 12.

Response to Comment 55-3 (GP): See Response to Comment 54-3 and Master Response 18.

LETTER 56: BRIAN W. VEIT AND KATIE RYAN

Response to Comment 56-1 (GP): The commenters request the High Density Residential (HDR) land use designation for APNs 067-270-22, -23, and -30. The 1996 General Plan Alternative includes the HDR designation for this parcel. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the parcels are designated Low Density Residential (LDR). These alternatives do not allow the assignment of HDR to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcels are not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the HDR land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 57: ZACHARY GRAVES, WRG DESIGN, INC.

Response to Comment 57-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Rural Residential (RR)/Rural Lands (RL) land use designation for APNs 092-021-07, 092-030-09, and 092-030-34. These designations were included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, two parcels are designated Natural Resource (NR) (092-021-07, 092-030-34) and the third is designated Rural Lands (RL) (092-030-09). The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. While there is RL in the vicinity, the NR designation is not inconsistent with the designations on surrounding land uses. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 58: DAVID BEAUCHAMP

Response to Comment 58-1 (GP): The commenter is expressing support for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 59: JOHN LITWINOVICH, EL DORADO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

Response to Comment 59-1 (GP): The staff concurs that victims of domestic violence and their children and at-risk homeless and runaway youth are special needs groups. That portion of the Housing Element addressing special needs groups (Section 2: Housing Assessment and Needs, Special Needs Groups) has been modified to include other groups in need of emergency or transitional housing, which would include victims of domestic violence and their children and at-risk homeless and runaway youth. Please refer also to Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 59-2 (GP): As currently written, Policies HO-4d and HO-4e would apply to victims of domestic violence and their children and at-risk homeless and runaway youth. Implementation Measure HO-GG has also been revised to provide better direction on where temporary shelters and transitional housing may be located. Please refer also to Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

LETTER 60: SONIA WILSON

Response to Comment 60-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between General Plan land use designations and zoning. Please also refer to Response to Comment 62-1.

LETTER 61: DON PHILLIPS, PHILLIPS STEEL

Response to Comment 61-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between General Plan land use designations and zoning.

This request is part of a “group request” submitted by the commenter and two other property owners (see Letters 60, 62, and 69). Based on the contents of the letter, it appears that the commenter is requesting application of the Industrial land use designation to APNs 088-050-04 and -06. The requested designation for parcel 088-050-04 was included in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. APN 088-050-06 was not evaluated with the Industrial land use designation under any of the General Plan alternatives. In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designation is the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, APN 088-050-06 is designated Low Density Residential (LDR) because, for that Alternative, the assignment of residential and nonresidential land use designations was based on the current General Plan designations. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcels are designated Rural Lands (RL) and Low Density Residential (LDR), respectively. That Alternative does not allow the assignment of Industrial to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcels are not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the Industrial land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 62: SONIA WILSON

Response to Comment 62-1 (GP): As noted in the response to the commenter's other letter (Letter 60), the current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan.

This request is part of a "group request" submitted by the commenter and two other property owners (see Letters 60, 61 and 69). Based on the contents of the letter, it appears that the commenter is requesting application of the Industrial land use designation to APNs 088-050-03 and -58. The requested designation for parcel 088-050-03 is included in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. APN 088-050-06 was not evaluated with the Industrial land use designation under any of the General Plan alternatives. In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designation is the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, APN 088-050-58 is designated Low Density Residential (LDR) because, for that Alternative, the assignment of residential and nonresidential land use designations was based on the current General Plan designations. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcels are designated Rural Lands (RL) and LDR, respectively. That Alternative does not allow the assignment of Industrial to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcels are not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the Industrial land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 63: ZAC GRAVES, WRG DESIGN, INC.

Response to Comment 63-1 (EIR): No response is required.

Response to Comment 63-2 (EIR): The commenter supports adoption of a General Plan that combines the components of each alternative that will ensure growth of the highest caliber. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 63-3 (EIR): The commenter has been added to the County's General Plan mailing list.

LETTER 64: HARRY MERCADO, COLOMA-LOTUS VALLEY COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Response to Comment 64-1 (GP): The comment from the Coloma-Lotus Valley Community Association is noted for the record. No further response is required.

Response to Comment 64-2 (GP): The staff recognizes that the comments provided in the letter came from two public meetings addressing the General Plan. Copies of the comments received on the General Plan and DEIR and the responses to those comments will be distributed to all members of the County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors and will be available to agencies and the general public.

Response to Comment 64-3 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the community's support for preserving the rural atmosphere, unique historical character, scenic beauty and recreational activities, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 64-4 (GP): All of the Alternatives being considered for the General Plan contain policies on the creation of Historic Design Control Combining Districts (please refer to Policy CO-9a and Implementation Measure LU-G in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Policy 7.5.2.1 in the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative). In addition, all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives contain policies on the development of a scenic corridor ordinance (please refer to Policy LU-6a and Implementation Measure LU-F in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Policy 2.6.1.1 in the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative).

Response to Comment 64-5 (GP): In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, Coloma and Lotus are separated by parcels designated as "Rural Lands." This designation would be considered inappropriate within a Rural Center. If the two rural centers were combined, the lands designated as Rural Lands would need to be redesignated to a land use designation consistent with Policy LU-1a such as Medium Density Residential or High Density Residential.

Response to Comment 64-6 (GP): The small pocket of high-density residential parcels referred to by the commenter is an historic high-density subdivision, Coloma Heights, currently zoned One Acre Residential (R1A). It is located within the designated Coloma Rural Center on all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives and is an appropriate land use designation for a rural center. There would be no reason to change this designation.

Response to Comment 64-7 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressing the community's opposition to adopting the No Project Alternative or the 1996 General Plan Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 64-8 (GP): The commenter's endorsement of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is noted for the record. The Important Biological Corridor Overlay designation was created to identify core areas (corridors) for important wildlife forage, cover, and migration and areas of relatively intact natural vegetation in the more urbanized areas of the County. Pages 5.12-50 and 5.12-51 of Volume 2 of the EIR provide an in depth discussion of the scope and purpose of the proposed overlay.

Response to Comment 64-9 (GP): Policy HO-1e of the Housing Element directs higher density residential development to both Community Regions and Rural Centers. This policy does not specifically mention "subsidized", low or moderate income housing.

LETTER 65: PAUL T. CONVERSE, EL DORADO COUNTY FEDERATED CHURCH

Response to Comment 65-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Multifamily Residential (MFR) land use designation for APN 329-301-19. This request was not included in any of the General Plan alternatives. Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the parcel has a split designation of MFR and High Density Residential (HDR). In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel has a split designation of MFR and Low Density Residential (LDR). Land use designations under this Alternative are based on Policy LU-1b, which limits future subdivision to a maximum of four new parcels. This affected the assignment of land use designations under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated HDR. One of the goals of this Alternative was to reduce overall density countywide. Since there were many other MFR parcels within this area, the density was reduced for this parcel.

This request is also the subject of Response to Comment 66-90 and Letter 123. Subsequent to this comment, the parcel changed ownership. Please refer to Letter 224 for the request of the new landowner. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 66: JUNE 4, 2003 PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING ORAL COMMENTS

Note: The following responds to comments and questions raised during the Planning Commission General Plan comment hearing.

Response to Comment 66-1 (GP): As Mr. McKibbin stated at the hearing, the County cannot control the number of lanes on U.S. Highway 50. County policies may have some influence on the number of lanes and on the timing of construction of those lanes. See Master Response 14 for a discussion of the factors affecting the number of lanes on U.S. Highway 50.

Response to Comment 66-2 (EIR): As stated by Mr. McKibbin during the hearing, having six-lanes on U.S. Highway 50 and a light rail system might be equivalent to having eight-lanes on U.S. Highway 50 depending on the level of ridership on the light rail system. The required volume on the light rail for this condition to exist can be estimated simply as the person capacity of a highway lane.

Depending on congestion and vehicle occupancy, single occupant versus multiple occupants, this rate is approximately equal to 2,200 riders. This would require trains operating on approximately six-minute headways during the peak hours. Additionally, those trains would need to match or exceed the Highway speeds and be located on an adjacent parallel route. It is unlikely that these and other issues can be overcome prior to the horizon year of the analysis, hence this was not specifically analyzed or assumed in the EIR. Please refer also to Master Response 17.

One of the major problems in developing any light rail system with adequate ridership to be viable is that the parallel highway facilities, in this case U.S. Highway 50, has to reach a point of congestion that influences a significant number of those using that facility to move to the light rail as their transportation mode of choice. This congestion must exist after the light rail goes into operation (page 5.4-37, of Volume 1 of the EIR). Otherwise, the users will simply change back to driving on the highway facility. Please refer also to also page 5.4-37 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 66-3 (GP/EIR): The EIR includes a comparative analysis of two alternatives that address the subjects of Commissioner Tolhurst's comment (please see Chapter 6 of Volume 2. Alternative #11, the Transit Emphasis Alternative, assumes a General Plan that promotes the development of light rail and extended transit opportunities. Alternative #12, the Compact Development Alternative, would establish policies and a land use pattern that promote a more compact urban form.

As Mr. McKibbin noted at the hearing, the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives include transit-oriented policies. These policies can be found under Goals 3.6, 3.7, and 3.9 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Goal TC-2 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives.

Response to Comment 66-4 (GP): See Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 66-5 (GP): Roadway planning in adjacent jurisdictions and by the California Department of Transportation will continue into the future. As noted by Project Manager Heidi Tschudin, both a six-lane and eight-lane U.S. Highway 50 are evaluated in the EIR.

Response to Comment 66-6 (GP): As noted by Mr. McKibbin, all of the alternatives include the General Plan policies added by Measure Y, the Control Traffic Congestion Initiative, at the direction of the Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 66-7 (GP/EIR): As stated by Mr. McKibbin during the hearing, traffic impacts to the future road system if the Texas Hill Reservoir project is built were not specifically analyzed during the EIR process. The Texas Hill Reservoir project is not anticipated to be constructed prior to the horizon year of the analysis. The County's Department of Transportation completed some preliminary analyses of these potential impacts in the late 1980s and concluded that the impacted roads could be rerouted around the reservoir and circulation maintained. The Reservoir project will require additional environmental documentation and mitigation prior to its construction, including impacts to the County road system. One of those mitigations might be to improve other roadways in the area, such as Newtown Road, to provide the needed capacity to replace any lost with construction and operation of the reservoir.

Response to Comment 66-8 (GP/EIR): As stated by Mr. McKibbin during the hearing, none of the proposed four equal-weight General Plan alternatives includes a U.S. Highway 50 "by-pass" around the City of Placerville. Such a by-pass is extremely speculative given current funding, right-of-way, engineering, environmental and political issues. It was not included in either the alternatives or the EIR analysis for this reason.

As he also stated, the policy in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative stating the County shall discourage Caltrans from widening beyond six-lanes would not affect such a proposal as it is unlikely the by-pass would need to be more than four-lanes wide. The six-lane restriction only impacts the high volume sections of U.S. Highway 50 near the west County Line.

Response to Comment 66-9 (GP): As noted by Mr. McKibbin, the road system of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is based on the Level of Service (LOS) policy of that alternative. In order to maintain acceptable levels of service, U.S. Highway 50 would need to be eight lanes by the year 2025. Physical construction of eight lanes could result in environmental impacts within the construction area. Such potential impacts would be addressed in the environmental document that would be required for the expansion.

Response to Comment 66-10 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 15 for a discussion on Measure Y.

Response to Comment 66-11 (GP): The information presented by Mr. Marinaccio regarding the City of Folsom’s transportation planning is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-12 (GP): The U.S. Highway 50 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes are restricted to HOVs, and certain other types of vehicles as described in the California Vehicle Code, only during the normal commute hours and can be used by all vehicles outside for those hours. The lanes are marked and have signs posted giving the hours of restriction.

The conversion of the HOV lanes to standard mixed flow lanes is not planned for at this time, is not on any agencies’ planning horizon, and is extremely speculative.

Response to Comment 66-13 (GP): Each of the General Plan alternatives plans for growth (ranging from 21,000 to 32,000 projected additional units by 2025 and 29,000 to 78,000 additional units at buildout). Each alternative also includes policies to seek water supplies to accommodate that growth. The No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives direct the El Dorado County Water Agency to develop a water resources management program that is consistent with the demands generated by the General Plan Land Use Diagram (Policy 5.2.1.1). The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives call for the County to actively engage in and support the efforts of public water providers to retain existing and obtain new water supplies for planned growth (Policy PS-2a).

Response to Comment 66-14 (GP): As required by State law, the County will pursue an update of the Zoning Ordinance upon adoption of a new General Plan. At that time inconsistencies between the newly adopted General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance now in effect will be rectified.

Response to Comment 66-15 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 15 for a discussion on Measure Y. The concern regarding the sunset of Measure Y is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-16 (GP): The four equal-weight General Plan alternatives provide a range of options for roadway improvement concurrency. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter’s position on roadway improvement concurrency issues and the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Also, please refer to Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 66-17 (GP): As stated by Ms. Crespo, the provisions of Measure Y apply to new residential development of more than four units or development

that results in more than four new parcels. Existing deficiencies are addressed to the extent that new projects contribute to those deficiencies.

Response to Comment 66-18 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on roadway improvement concurrency issues and the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. While individual projects may at times not have the ability to implement all the road improvements needed for that single project, failure to complete the road improvements in advance of the project can lead to significant traffic congestion with the consequent effects on air quality and property values. Also, please refer to Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 66-19 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on the need for a policy in the General Plan to insure that when a government agency other than the County acquires land within the County, the County's circulation plan and transportation issues are adequately protected, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. For the most part however, other government agencies have separate and distinct authority and are not generally bound by the County's regulatory or policy framework.

Response to Comment 66-20 (GP): Not all future roads formerly identified on the superceded area plans have been carried on to the currently proposed Circulation Maps. The opinion regarding inclusion of those roads is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan. These decision-making bodies may choose to amend the currently proposed maps with additional information such as that presented by Mr. Marinaccio. Please refer to Response to Comment 66-22 for a discussion of the Ray Lawyer Drive extension issue. Please refer to Response to Comment 66-7 for a discussion of the Texas Hill Reservoir issue.

Response to Comment 66-21 (GP): The Headington Road connection between Missouri Flat Road and El Dorado Road was analyzed during the preparation of the Missouri Flat Master Circulation and Financing Plan. At that time it was determined that the road was not of regional significance and was only necessary to provide access and circulation to a proposed large commercial development project (Sundance Plaza). It was not included on the General Plan Circulation Diagrams in any of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives because it does not serve a regional circulation purpose.

The commenter is correct that the proposed commercial development cannot likely move forward without this road. However, any large-scale development, commercial or residential, will need adequate access and will probably have this road included in the project's mitigation measures. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on this roadway and the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of

Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Also, please refer to Response to Comment 287-1.

Response to Comment 66-22 (GP): As stated by Mr. McKibbin during the hearing, none of the proposed four equal-weight General Plan alternatives includes a U.S. Highway 50 bypass around the City of Placerville. The Placerville Periphery Area Plan map included a proposed extension Ray Lawyer Drive south across U.S. Highway 50 past the County Jail site, and then turning east crossing State Route 49 and swinging between the Placerville Airport, on the north, and the proposed Texas Hill Reservoir, on the south, to connect back to U.S. Highway 50 at Camino Heights. While this road was not intended to be a bypass of the City of Placerville, it was felt there might be some benefits to local circulation when it was proposed in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

The County's Department of Transportation undertook some preliminary feasibility analyses of the road in the late 1980s and early 1990s in connection with early work on the General Plan update. They found that the traffic volumes would be relatively low and the costs of construction and right-of-way to be very high. They recommended the proposal be dropped given the very low cost-benefit of the road and the higher need for other roads where the cost-benefits are much higher. The construction of a bypass is speculative given current funding, right-of-way, engineering, environmental and political issues. It was not included in any of the alternatives or the EIR analysis for this reason.

Response to Comment 66-23 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 66-22. The other proposed road mentioned in this comment was one known as "The East-West Road". This proposed road ran almost directly east to west from State Route 49 in the vicinity of the community of Nashville to the community of Latrobe and then west into Sacramento County. The same timing and cost-benefit scenarios played out with this proposal as the proposed Ray Lawyer Drive extension and the Department of Transportation recommended the proposal be dropped in the early 1990s.

Response to Comment 66-24 (GP/EIR): The EIR analyzed the major roadways that provide access to and from the City of Placerville. The El Dorado County General Plan Travel Demand Forecasting Model includes the major roadways in the City and the EPS land use forecasts include projected development within the City (refer to Appendices B and D-2 in Volume 3 of the EIR). The major roadways that provide access to Placerville and were analyzed in the EIR are listed below.

- Green Valley Road
- Cold Springs Road
- State Route 49 (north of Placerville)
- State Route 193
- Mosquito Road
- Carson Road
- Newtown Road
- Cedar Ravine Road

- Diamond Road (State Route 49 south of Placerville)
- Forni Road
- U.S. Highway 50

No impacts were identified to these roadways under any of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, because they all operated at acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) at the City/County boundary during the p.m. peak hour at 2025 conditions. The only exception to operating at LOS D or better was U.S. Highway 50, which is projected to operate at LOS F, but it remains within the maximum volume-to-capacity ratios allowed by Policy 3.5.1.6.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policy TC-1c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. The detailed LOS results for these roadway segments for each alternative are contained in Volume 3 of the EIR in Appendices D-3A through D-3D. Please refer also to Response to Comment 129-4.

Response to Comment 66-25 (GP/EIR): As noted by Project Manager Heidi Tschudin, the County has been working with other area jurisdictions throughout the General Plan process. Policy 2.2.2.5 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Mitigation Measure 5.1-1, as applied to the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, directs the County to maintain working relationships with these other jurisdictions.

Response to Comment 66-26 (GP): The General Plan alternatives provide options for "concurrency" as it relates to roadway improvements. The options are outlined in Policies 3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.3, and 3.2.1.4 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives; Policies TC-1g, TC-1h, TC-1i, and TC-1j of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative; and Policies TC-1g, TC-1h, and TC-1i of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Response to Comment 66-27 (GP): As noted by Ms. Tschudin, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may choose to include both Transportation Systems Management (TSM) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policies in the final adopted plan. Currently, TSM is included in all General Plan Alternatives (Goal 3.10 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Goal TC-3 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives). TDM is included in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives as Goal 3.9. Note that although State law limits the County's ability to require employers to institute TDM programs, the County can work with project sponsors to develop voluntary programs.

Response to Comment 66-28 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on his preference for a particular alternative of the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Regarding the comments on a possible relocation of State Route 49 between the Marshall Gold Discovery State Park in Coloma and the City of Placerville, there have been numerous informal discussions between Caltrans, the Superintendent of the State Park and the County's Department of Transportation since the late 1980s. Those discussions have centered on two subjects: the designation of certain County roads as State Route 49 with their being turned over to Caltrans; and the construction of a bypass road designated as State Route 49, around the State Park to eliminate the through traffic in the park and the problems associated with the current route such a safety, noise, and damage to historic structures. None of these proposals has proceeded past the informal discussion level due to funding, right-of-way, engineering, environmental and political issues. They were not included in any of the alternatives or the EIR analysis for this reason.

Caltrans at one time did adopt an alignment for a new road running from approximately the intersection of Cold Springs Road and State Route 49 to the City of Placerville. This alignment roughly parallels the existing State Route 49 and is located in the area between the existing State Route 49 and Cold Springs Road and would become the new State Route 49. The exact status of this approval is uncertain. However, construction of this new road is extremely speculative given the probable funding, right-of-way, engineering, environmental and political issues. It was not included in any of the alternatives or the EIR analysis for this reason.

The commenter's final comment addressed the construction of new lanes on roadways. All the General Plan alternatives address the traffic needs of the proposed land uses within each particular alternative. With the few exceptions identified and discussed in the EIR, the roads are sized to meet those needs. Changing driving patterns may in the future increase or decrease the traffic on the road system as people adapt to changing conditions such as the price and availability of gasoline. These types of speculative changes are not included in the analysis because there is no way to forecast them.

Mr. Mercado's opinions regarding a preferred alternative and the effects of roadway widening are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-29 (EIR): As noted at the hearing, the County relies on the Water Agency (a non-County public agency) and public water providers to supply information about water calibration and usage. Area-specific information is available to the extent that the water providers serve different areas of the County. The only other area-specific information provided to the County was for water demand (not calibration or usage) in the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) service area (Appendix E-1 of Volume 3 of the EIR). This information was considered in the analyses summarized in the EIR, and reviewed by the EIR water resources team for reasonableness.

Response to Comment 66-30 (GP): The subject policy direction is contained in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. As outlined in Implementation Measure PS-D, the County will work with the Water Agency and water service providers to develop standards for the types and scales of projects that would be required to use recycled water. Recycled water requirements could only be applied in areas having access to recycled water. Development of standards would have to occur before the County could require developers to use recycled water.

Response to Comment 66-31 (GP/EIR): The use of “gray water”, or recycled/reclaimed water, is addressed in Policy 7.3.1.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policies PS-2a and PS-3b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. As noted on page 5.5-18 of Volume 1 of the EIR, EID has a recycled water master plan, which is intended to provide guidance through 2025. Impacts 5.5-1 and 5.5-7 also address the use of recycled water.

Response to Comment 66-32 (GP): As noted in Implementation Measure PS-D of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the County’s standards for use of recycled water would be developed in coordination with the water providers, including EID. Accordingly, any future requirements for use of recycled water should not be in conflict with EID’s planning.

Response to Comment 66-33 (GP): Commissioner Welsh’s comment was directed at the *Summary of Differences Between the Equal-weight General Plan Alternatives* (dated April 15, 2003). In that document, the words “direct” and “require” are used interchangeably.

Response to Comment 66-34 (GP): “Development” as used in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives means “the division of land into two or more parcels; the construction, reconstruction, conversion, structural alteration, relocation, or enlargement of any structure; any mining, excavation, landfill, or land disturbance; and any use or extension of the use of land, excepting agriculture” (refer to page 308 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternative document). As used in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, “development” means any discretionary, ministerial, or capital improvement project (please refer to page 24 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative).

Response to Comment 66-35 (GP): See Letters 13 and 27 for written documentation of Ms. Arrigotti’s parcel-specific request. The requested land use designation for Ms. Arrigotti’s parcel is evaluated in the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

Mrs. Arrigotti’s concerns and opinions regarding the suitability of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-36 (GP): Policy PS-2c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives discourages the extension of public water service outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. The County cannot prohibit extension of water service. The ultimate decision to extend water service would be rendered by EID and, if the extension requires a change in EID's service area boundary, the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). Please refer to Response to Comment 27-2 for more information regarding the role of the LAFCO.

Response to Comment 66-37 (GP): As noted by Mr. Marinaccio, the project referred to in the comment is included as LDR and in the Community Region in the 1996 General Plan Alternative and is evaluated accordingly in the EIR. Please refer to Response to Comment 66-36 regarding the County's control over extending water service to areas outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Placement of the Community Region boundary would not affect the potential use of recycled water on the subject project site.

Response to Comment 66-38 (GP): The main purpose of a General Plan is to provide a blueprint for community development. This includes directing growth to certain areas. The alternative Land Use Diagrams provide options for the Board of Supervisors to choose from as they deliberate the General Plan and thus adopt a blueprint for future development and growth. The County will work with EID and other service providers throughout the life of the General Plan so that implementation is consistent with its intent.

Response to Comment 66-39 (GP/EIR): Naturally occurring asbestos is an issue that is currently managed by the County Department of Environmental Management–Air Quality Management District (AQMD). The AQMD is responsible for implementing and enforcing Title 17 Section 93106 of the California Code of Regulations, Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure–Asbestos-Containing Serpentine. The County and other State and federal agencies are taking measures to define the locations of asbestos-bearing serpentine rock, the potential for public exposure, and procedures to minimize the impacts of naturally occurring asbestos. Because of this, it was determined that it was not necessary to include additional programs addressing asbestos in the General Plan alternatives. However, the EIR identified an impact resulting from naturally occurring asbestos (Impact 5.8-9) and proposes mitigation measures accordingly. If adopted, these measures would be in addition to the programs currently under development by the AQMD and State and federal governments. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-10 and 281-219.

Response to Comment 66-40 (GP): The staff recognizes the noise-related impacts associated with Mather Airport, which is located in Sacramento County. As noted by Project Manager Heidi Tschudin, the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives include direction to work with Sacramento County to address the issue (Policy HS-14e and Implementation Measure HS-M).

Response to Comment 66-41 (GP): By its nature, the *Summary of Differences Between the Equal-weight General Plan Alternatives* (dated April 15, 2003) identifies those

subjects that have either come to light or information that has changed since adoption of the General Plan in 1996. The summary can be downloaded from the General Plan website (<http://www.co.el-dorado.ca.us/generalplan/pdf/AltComp.pdf>).

Response to Comment 66-42 (GP): As noted by Planner Sue Lee at the hearing, the County has used and will continue to use the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection definitions of fire hazard rating. See pages 229 through 230 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and pages 5-8-107 through 112 of Volume 2 of the EIR for more information on fire hazard ratings.

Response to Comment 66-43 (GP): The four equal-weight General Plan alternatives were developed with the intent of providing a range of options for the Commission and Board of Supervisors to consider. In some cases, the differences among the alternatives provide a range of policy options to address a particular issue. Because of the many types of policy issues and potential means of addressing those issues, the policy presented in a particular alternative may not be closely related to the title of the particular alternative. That is the case with the gated subdivision policy. By presenting the policies in this manner, the Commission and Board have a range of options to choose from.

Response to Comment 66-44 (GP): As stated by Mr. McKibbin at the hearing, highway safety issues are dealt with in the Transportation and Circulation Element of the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives instead of in the Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. Specifically, these issues are addressed in the policies under Goal TC-1 and in several of the implementation measures (TC-A through TC-F and others). This was done to avoid duplication between the elements and to concentrate all the transportation related items into the one element.

Response to Comment 66-45 (GP): Commissioner Machado is referring to the *Summary of Differences Between the Equal-weight General Plan Alternatives* (dated April 15, 2003) document. The items under Special Status Species are blank for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives because there are no other differences between the plans. The summary is intended to only show the differences between the plans; it is not intended to summarize the plans themselves.

Response to Comment 66-46 (GP/EIR): The staff recognizes the challenges in applying the tree canopy retention standards contained in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. See Master Response 18 for a complete discussion of the canopy retention issue.

In response to the need to protect existing oak canopy countywide, the EIR proposes mitigation measures that would clarify oak canopy retention requirements (Mitigation Measures 5.12-1[f] and 5.12-1[k]) and establish an oak tree preservation ordinance (Mitigation Measures 5.12-1[g] and 5.12-1[l]).

Response to Comment 66-47 (GP): The County General Services Department maintains a list of public and known private cemeteries. If an historic cemetery is private, then access is controlled by the owner of the land upon which the cemetery occurs. The County cannot require owners of private cemeteries to provide public access.

Response to Comment 66-48 (GP): See Response to Comment 66-34 for an explanation of how the term “development” is used in the General Plan alternatives.

Commissioner MacCready is referring to the item in the *Summary of Differences Between the Equal-weight General Plan Alternatives* that addresses lakes, streams, and wetlands. Using the definitions contained in the alternatives, Policy CO-3b and Implementation Measure CO-H of in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives would be applied to all discretionary, ministerial, and capital improvement projects. Policy CO-3f in those alternatives would be applied to discretionary and capital improvement projects only. Policy 7.3.3.1 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives would apply to any “division of land into two or more parcels; the construction, reconstruction, conversion, structural alteration, relocation, or enlargement of any structure; any mining, excavation, landfill, or land disturbance; and any use or extension of the use of land, excepting agriculture.” Policy 7.3.3.2 would apply to discretionary projects only.

Response to Comment 66-49 (GP): The Certified Local Government (CLG) Program is a national program designed to encourage the direct participation of local government in the identification, registration, and preservation of historic properties located within the jurisdiction of the local government. The CLG program encourages the preservation of cultural resources by promoting a partnership among local governments, the State of California, and the National Park Service (NPS), which is responsible for the National Historic Preservation Program.

Local governments strengthen their local historic preservation efforts by achieving Certified CLG status from the NPS. NPS and State governments, through their State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs), provide valuable technical assistance and small matching grants to CLGs. Another incentive for participating in the CLG program is the pool of matching grant funds SHPOs set aside to fund CLG historic preservation subgrant projects—at least 10 percent of the State’s annual Historic Preservation Fund grant allocation. Grant funds are distributed through the Historic Preservation Fund grant program, administered by NPS and SHPOs.

Response to Comment 66-50 (GP): The EIR contains a mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure 5.1-3([c], page 5.1-66 of Volume 1) that addresses establishment of interim policies should they be needed (i.e., if there was a significant time lag in implementation of a proposed policy). The Mitigation Measure applies to the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives only; the EIR found that a similar measure was not necessary for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives (i.e., that the current policies offered adequate environmental protection).

Response to Comment 66-51 (GP): Commissioner Machado is referring to the item in the *Summary of Differences Between the Equal-weight General Plan Alternatives* that addresses soils (and the potential effects of grading upon such). Currently, the County primarily regulates grading through its grading ordinance (Chapter 15.14 of the County Code). Additionally, it may regulate grading through discretionary project approvals by applying policies such as those proposed in the General Plan alternatives. The grading policies presented in the General Plan alternatives are intended to be applied in harmony with the grading ordinance. Ideally, upon adoption of a new General Plan, the ordinance will be updated to include the appropriate General Plan policy (or policies).

Response to Comment 66-52 (GP): As noted by Mr. Pesses, the County is currently in the process of establishing a Storm Water Management Program (SWMP), consistent with federal law. That program may provide further guidance on grading standards. Once the County's SWMP is approved by the State of California (the federal government has delegated oversight authority to the State), the grading ordinance may need further amendments to make it consistent with the approved SWMP.

Response to Comment 66-53 (GP): See the Response to Comment 66-52 above. Mass pad grading is typically reviewed in connection with larger discretionary projects. Conditions for grading (e.g., timing, requirements for Best Management Practices, etc.) are assigned at the time of project processing and approval. Because they are discretionary projects, the Planning Commission and/or Board of Supervisors can review any proposed conditions or mitigation that apply to grading activity.

Response to Comment 66-54 (GP): Also refer to Letter 58, submitted by the commenter. Mr. Beauchamp's preference for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-55 (GP): As noted by Ms. Tschudin, none of the General Plan alternatives include a tree ordinance. All four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives include policies addressing oak and heritage/landmark tree protection, but not to the level typically included in an ordinance. The EIR contains mitigation measures that provide even greater protection for oak trees (Mitigation Measures 5.12-1[f], 5.12-1[g], 5.12-1[k], and 5.12-1[l]). None of the proposed policies or mitigation measures would prevent the County from adopting a tree ordinance at some later date. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 66-56 (GP): The work referred to by Agricultural Commissioner Bill Snodgrass was presented to the Planning Commission. The report prepared by the group, "Draft Oak Woodland Assets and Guidelines for El Dorado County" (1998), was used as a reference document by preparers of the draft General Plan and EIR documents.

Response to Comment 66-57 (GP): As noted by Ms. Crespo, the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives contain policy direction calling for a Cultural Resource Preservation Commission but the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives do not. Policy language was left out of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives because of the current status of the Commission (disbanded) and the uncertainty of how it will be "reconstituted". The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may choose to revise this approach as they deliberate the General Plan.

See Response to Comment 51-1. The Board may choose to adopt a plan made up of "pieces" of each of the alternatives, including the various Cultural Resource policies.

Response to Comment 66-58 (GP): As noted by Ms. Crespo, the language in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, which was developed with input from the now-disbanded Cultural Resource Preservation Commission, seeks to clarify the difference between public and private cemeteries by protecting access to those that are public.

Response to Comment 66-59 (GP): See that portion of Response to Comment 66-49 that addresses grant funding and Certified Local Government status.

Response to Comment 66-60 (GP): All four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives include policy direction for the County to establish Historic Design Control Combining Zone Districts (Policies 2.4.1.3, 7.5.2.1, and 7.5.2.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives; Policy CO-9a and Implementation Measures LU-G, CO-A, and CO-N of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative; and Policy CO-9a and Implementation Measures LU-G, CO-A, and CO-O of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative), which would require the County to first identify "historic districts".

Response to Comment 66-61 (GP): As noted in Response to Comment 51-14, the County has incorporated the updated Department of Conservation mapping into this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 66-62 (GP): Portions of the Vandalia Mine, known to the County as Goldfield's Big Canyon Project (APNs 091-010-20; 091-020-12, 13, 14, 15, and 16; 091-090-20; and 091-110-21) are included as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b in the Department of Conservation's *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California* and is also designated with the –MR overlay in each of the alternatives.

Information regarding the "Pacific Mine" (location, Assessor's Parcel Number) was not provided and the County does not have records of a mine by that name. It is therefore, not known if the mine is included in the Department of Conservation's mapping report issued in April of 2003.

Please refer also to Master Responses 8 and 21.

Response to Comment 66-63 (GP): General performance standards for the Important Biological Corridor (IBC) are contained in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Implementation Measure CO-K, page 272). It is acknowledged that the detailed requirements would be developed subsequent to adoption of the General Plan.

Mr. Mercado's concern regarding application of the -IBC overlay is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-64 (GP): Commissioner MacCready's concern regarding lack of a policy directing protection of agricultural water from conversion to residential use in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives is noted for the record. Commissioner MacCready, his fellow commissioners, and Board of Supervisors may consider issues such as this during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-65 (GP): As noted by Mr. Snodgrass at the hearing, grazing is recognized as a different type of agricultural activity. Most notably, grazing can occur on lands where other types of agricultural activity, such as row crop production, cannot occur because of poor soil conditions.

Response to Comment 66-66 (GP/EIR): See Letter 173 for the Agricultural Commission's comments on the draft General Plans and DEIR.

Response to Comment 66-67 (GP): As noted by Mr. Snodgrass at the hearing, administrative relief for the required agricultural setbacks can be recommended by the Agricultural Commission or by the Planning Director under current procedures.

Response to Comment 66-68 (GP): Mr. Snodgrass's concerns and opinions regarding agricultural water are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan. Goal AF-2 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Objective 8.2.1 in the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative would ensure an adequate, long-term water supply to support sustainable agricultural uses. Goal PS-3 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative concerns conservation of the County's existing water supply, with policies dealing with reclaimed water and an implementation measure (PS-D) requiring the County to work with the Water Agency and water service providers to develop standards that identify the types of projects that could utilize reclaimed water. Objective 7.3.5 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative encourage the construction of wastewater disposal systems designed to reclaim and re-use treated wastewater on agricultural crops and other irrigation. The EIR proposes a new policy for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative that would require

the County to work with EID and other water purveyor's concerning the feasibility of using reclaimed water and working with them to coordinate their ongoing programs.

Response to Comment 66-69 (GP): Mr. Snodgrass's concerns and opinions regarding the Right to Farm Ordinance and agricultural tourism are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan. Policy AF-1e of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative provide protection of agricultural lands from incompatible uses through the Right to Farm Ordinance, while Implementation Measure AF-A(3) requires revision of the Right to Farm Ordinance to include the placement of deed restrictions on new parcels created adjacent to agricultural lands acknowledging the existence of adjacent agricultural operations. Policy 8.1.3.3 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative also require the revision to the Right to Farm Ordinance. Goal ED-5 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative encourage economic development through development and support of the arts and tourism industries. Objective 9.3.1 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative relates to protection of existing tourist based assets such as Apple Hill and development of additional tourism businesses and industries.

Response to Comment 66-70 (GP): See Letter 263 for the Farm Bureau's comments. The requirement to have a registered engineer or certified geologist for development on slopes over 30 percent is included in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives only. Mr. Snodgrass's information regarding vineyard development on slopes over 30 percent is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan. Also, please refer to Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(b) which deals with potential erosion impacts associated with development on slopes in excess of 25% unless it can be demonstrated by a California-registered civil engineer or an engineering geologist that hazards to public safety can be reduced to acceptable levels. It is noted that agricultural activities can occur on such slopes, just as other development can occur, but that restrictions would reduce the amount of erosion resulting from such use. Please also refer to Response to Comments 280-107 and 281-219, 403 and 404.

Response to Comment 66-71 (EIR): The concern regarding the Mitigation Measure placing restrictions on tree removal (Mitigation Measures 5.12-1[g] and 5.12-1[i]) is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-72 (GP): As noted by Mr. Snodgrass at the hearing, a number of parties are involved in water acquisition and development. The County does not have direct responsibility, as the Water Agency and water providers are not County agencies. Though the County has been and will remain involved in water acquisition and development issues in the future, it currently does not have the means to actively acquire

and develop new water sources. Policies in the General Plan must reflect this unless the County changes its role in water acquisition and development.

Response to Comment 66-73 (GP/EIR): See Letter 173 for the Agricultural Commission's comments on the draft General Plans and DEIR.

Response to Comment 66-74 (EIR): Ranch marketing is discussed in several locations within Section 5.2 of Volume 1 of the EIR. The Mitigation Measure referred to by Mr. Snodgrass is 5.2-2 on page 5.2-69 of Volume 1 of the EIR. Please refer also to Response to Comment 263-91.

Response to Comment 66-75 (GP/EIR): Mr. Marinaccio's concerns and opinions regarding the desires of the Agricultural Commission are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-76 (GP): Mr. Marinaccio's concerns and opinions regarding protection of agricultural production inside and outside of Agricultural Districts are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-77 (GP): Mr. Marinaccio's opinions regarding use of land for grazing are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-78 (GP): It is assumed that Mr. Marinaccio was referring to the Sacramento Municipal Utility District's (SMUD's) proposed Iowa Hill Pumped Storage Project in Placer County. If that project is approved, SMUD could pump additional water through its Camino Powerhouse (located in El Dorado County) and discharge the water into Slab Creek Reservoir. Currently, SMUD has no plans to supply raw water to El Dorado County using water pumped from the proposed Iowa Hill project.

Response to Comment 66-79 (GP): Information about the Williamson Act Contract Program appears in all of the draft General Plans because the County is an active participant.

Mr. Mercado's concerns and opinions regarding speculative use of Williamson Act Contracts are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-80 (GP): Mr. Mercado's opinions regarding the Environmentally Constrained Alternative definition of agricultural land and the aesthetic benefits of maintaining grazing land are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-81 (GP): As noted by Mr. Snodgrass, there are provisions of the Williamson Act Contract Program that allow for open space uses. This is consistent with direction provided in the California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (commonly referred to as the Williamson Act) as it relates to “recreational and open space uses” (Government Code 51200 et seq.).

Response to Comment 66-82 (GP): The document referred to by Commissioner Machado is intended to be a summary of the differences between the alternatives, not as a summary of the alternatives themselves. All four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives include tourism policies, although those in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives are slightly different than those in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. Commissioner Machado and his fellow commissioners may choose to modify the tourism policies and address the issue of hotel rooms during deliberation of the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-83 (GP): Mr. Smart’s concerns and opinions regarding General Plan parks and recreation policies, new park locations, park management, and types of parks that should be built are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Letter 233.

Response to Comment 66-84 (GP): For a discussion of the County’s role in the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor Joint Powers Authority (SPTC-JPA), particularly in regard to potential rail use, please refer to Master Response 17. Also, please reference Master Response 16 for more discussion on Bikeways, Sidewalks and Pedestrian Access. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter’s position on the SPTC are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

More specifically, this comment asks which County department is responsible for bringing the SPTC on-line. This type of detailed assignment of departments is not in keeping with the purpose of the General Plan. Each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives contains policies in their respective Circulation and Parks and Recreation Elements that promote the coordination and interface of commuter bike paths located primarily in the County rights-of-way, and recreational trails.

However, in light of the repeated interest in the assignment of departmental roles with regard to nonmotorized transportation and the El Dorado Trail within the SPTC, the following discussion and background may prove helpful.

Subsequent to the purchase of the Corridor by the SPTC-JPA in 1996, the Board of Supervisors assigned the management of the Corridor to the Department of General Services with the provision that the Department of Transportation prepare the Master Plan and related EIR for that portion of the Corridor that lies within the County. The EIR

was certified in 1998 and the *Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor Master Plan* was completed and adopted by the Board in February 2003.

The SPTC Master Plan delineates County roles in Chapter 1, page 17. In summary, the General Services Department is responsible for managing real property on behalf of the County including easements and leases on the County segment of the right-of-way. General Services includes within its purview the Airports, Parks, and Grounds Division, which is responsible for developing a system of recreational trails throughout the County. Airports, Parks, and Grounds Division cannot be responsible for bike paths within County road rights-of-way. That belongs to the Department of Transportation.

The Department of Transportation (DOT) is primarily responsible for planning, constructing and maintaining the County's circulation system, as well as development services with the Departments of Building and Planning. New roads and road widening projects are reviewed and conditioned accordingly for bike paths within the County right-of-way as appropriate, to be consistent with General Plan policies. DOT cannot be responsible for recreational off-road trails. That belongs to Airports, Parks, and Grounds Division.

General confusion seems to occur because of the overlap in usage of commuter bike paths and recreational trails. Policies present in both the Circulation and Parks and Recreation Elements of each General Plan alternative that call for agency coordination were designed to address this usage overlap.

In conclusion, the assignment of roles within the SPTC is dependent upon the type of usage proposed. Since the El Dorado Trail purported to be a nonmotorized transportation use, or trail, located off-road and outside the County right-of-way, the responsibility lies primarily within the Department of General Services Airports, Parks, and Grounds Division. Pursuant to General Plan policies, all relative departments would become involved as necessary.

Response to Comment 66-85 (GP): While the Planning Commission Minutes of June 4, 2003 indicate the comment to say the "Parkway" Master Plan should be updated, because of similar comments received, the staff assumes the commenter was referring to the "Bikeway" Master Plan. See Master Response 16.

Response to Comment 66-86 (GP): As noted by Ms. Crespo, the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives do not contain policies that directly address historic trails. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, it was the intent to make the policies general enough that they could be broadly applied. In the case of trails that may have historical significance, they would be addressed in the prescribed *Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan* update.

Response to Comment 66-87 (GP): Policy PR-4d of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" (page 295) and Environmentally Constrained (page 297) Alternatives addresses the development of parks and recreation facilities near prehistoric or historic sites. This could include interpretive centers. Additionally, the Cultural Resources Ordinance prescribed in the Conservation and Open Space Element could address the appropriateness of recreational facility development near prehistoric or historic sites. As it undertakes the task of developing a preferred General Plan alternative, the Planning Commission may consider proposed policies from the various General Plan alternatives (please refer also to Response to Comment 51-1).

Response to Comment 66-88 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives include a goal (PR-5) "to secure an adequate and stable source of funding to support the acquisition and development of parks and recreation facilities countywide". The policies intended to accomplish this goal focus on ways to supplement County funding for parks and recreation facility acquisition/development.

Mr. Mercado's concerns regarding the funding-related policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-89 (GP): As noted in Response to Comment 66-88, the intent of the funding-related policies contained in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives is to provide funding flexibility.

Response to Comment 66-90 (GP): See Letter 123 for written documentation of the parcel-specific request made by Mr. Converse on behalf of the Federated Church. It should be noted that the website database referred to by Mr. Converse states that "The parcel acreage shown in this database may not match the County's Official Records and should be used for reference only". This is due to the fact that acreages on the website are calculated using a Geographic Information System, which the Assessor's office does not use to calculate acreages (the Assessor's Office relies on surveys and Assessor's Parcel Maps for acreages).

Response to Comment 66-91 (GP): All four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives contain policies addressing nonmotorized transportation. The Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor is not specifically called out in these policies because that corridor has its own master plan. This master plan, which was drafted by the El Dorado County Transportation Commission, was adopted by the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors in February 2003. It is anticipated that management of the corridor will follow guidance provided in the master plan.

All four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives contain direction to update the Bikeway Master Plan.

Mr. Smart's concerns and opinions regarding a vision for nonmotorized transportation, the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor, and community walkability are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-92 (GP): See Letter 75 for written documentation of Mr. Steltzmilller's parcel-specific request.

Response to Comment 66-93 (GP): Mr. Steltzmilller's concerns and opinions regarding a preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative and the current lack of a General Plan are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-94 (GP): The new legislation referred to by Commissioner Larsen-Hallock is AB 1426, which is no longer active. Response to Comment 51-26 discusses inclusionary housing.

Response to Comment 66-95 (GP/EIR): Mr. Wright's substantive comments are duplicated in Letter 77. The responses to comments in that letter address Mitigation Measure 5.13(d), mapping of school facilities, potential land use incompatibility, the appropriate yield factor, the Lake Tahoe area, and potential impacts associated with an insufficient number of school facilities (i.e., facilities commensurate with growth allowed under the General Plan alternatives).

The staff communicated directly with the County school districts and Office of Education. Subsequent to Mr. Wright's comments, the team worked with the districts and the Office of Education through Mr. Wright.

Response to Comment 66-96 (GP): As noted in Response to Comment 66-95, the staff has had additional contact with Mr. Wright regarding his comments, including the appropriate yield factor.

Mr. Wright's comments regarding school siting and the potential impacts of smaller projects are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-97 (GP/EIR): Policy PS-9c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives states that the County will encourage the siting of new school facilities in Community Regions and Rural Centers. Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d) states that "schools and other public buildings and facilities shall be directed to Community Regions or Rural Centers." Please refer to Response to Comment 77-3.

Response to Comment 66-98 (GP): The area described by Mr. Marinaccio is included in the Cameron Park Community Region of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and was evaluated accordingly.

Response to Comment 66-99 (GP): See Response to Comment 66-41. By its nature, the *Summary of Differences Between the Equal-weight General Plan Alternatives* identifies some of the issues that arose following adoption of the General Plan in 1996. Such issues may not have been addressed or may have been addressed differently in the General Plan adopted in 1996; by pointing out the differences, the summary would identify these issues. Other issues not addressed in any of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives may already be addressed by the County Code, State regulations, or federal law and do not necessarily need to be addressed in the General Plan.

Response to Comment 66-100 (GP/EIR): See Letters 256 and 257 for written documentation of Mr. Wasserman's comments on behalf of the Measure Y Committee. The responses to comments made in those letters address his comments regarding the ultimate number of lanes on U.S. Highway 50, Metropolitan Transportation Plan assumptions, regional consensus regarding road widening projects in general, and funding obstacles to completing highway widening. Please also refer to Master Responses 13 and 14.

Response to Comment 66-101 (GP): See Letter 33 for written documentation of Mr. Rathbun's parcel-specific request.

LETTER 67: DON HARTLEY, EL DORADO COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS

Response to Comment 67-1 (GP): The four equal-weight General Plan Alternatives were compiled by County staff based on direction from the Board of Supervisors. Public input, comment, and involvement have occurred at every step in the process. Because the 1996 General Plan Alternative is substantially similar to the 1996 General Plan adopted in February 1996, it is accurate to say it has been subjected to more public review than the Environmentally Constrained or Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. The same is true for the No Project Alternative which is comprised of the 1996 General Plan Alternative, as constrained by the Writ of Mandate.

Response to Comment 67-2 (GP): Both have occurred. Property owner involvement will continue through the end of the process, culminating with adoption of a General Plan in June 2004.

Response to Comment 67-3 (GP): The concern is noted. The staff has no way of knowing what advice individual property owners may have received in this regard.

Response to Comment 67-4 (GP): The boundaries for the Community Regions, Rural Centers, and Rural Regions for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives as based on those established through the 1996 process. Additional adjustments were made to differentiate between the alternatives as described in Volume 1 of the EIR commencing on page 3-18, and as depicted in the Land Use Diagrams for each alternative (EIR, Volume 1, pages 3-43, 3-51, and 3-59).

Response to Comment 67-5 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 3. A history of the process of identifying General Plan alternatives is provided in Volume 1 of the EIR commencing on page 3-9. See also Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 67-6 (GP): The concerns of the commenter are noted for the record. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 124-1 and 162-2.

Response to Comment 67-7 (GP): The comment period for the General Plan was extended twice for a total of 98 days or over three months. Please refer also to Master Response 1.

Response to Comment 67-8 (GP): The concerns of the commenter are noted for the record. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 67-9 (GP): The Writ of Mandate and its application are described in Volume 1 of the EIR on page 3-7. Please refer also to Master Response 3.

Response to Comment 67-10 (GP): The Development Agreements are described and their effects characterized on page 3-8 of Volume 1 of the EIR. Master Response 11 addresses questions about incorporation efforts in El Dorado Hills.

Response to Comment 67-11 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 3 and DEIR Appendix G (revised in Appendix C.2 of this Response to Comments document).

Response to Comment 67-12 (GP): The role of the Planning Commission in this process is indeed to recommend one preferred General Plan to the Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 67-13 (GP): The recommendation is noted. Presently the Project Manager anticipates 12 hearings on the General Plan. Six of these would be before the Planning Commission at which time the Commission would be tasked with recommending one preferred General Plan to the Board of Supervisors. The remaining six would be before the Board of Supervisors to deliberate the Planning Commission recommendation and a decision regarding a final General Plan.

The anticipated project schedule is as follows:

- Mid-January 2004 – Release of Responses to Comments/Final EIR
- Late February/Early March – Planning Commission Hearings (six)
- April – Board Hearings (three)
- May – Board Hearings (two)
- June – Adoption

Response to Comment 67-14 (GP): This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 67-15 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 67-1 and 67-2.

Response to Comment 67-16 (GP): The Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives do not prohibit infrastructure improvements. The concerns of the commenter are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 67-17 (GP): The requirements of CEQA are specified in State law. The EIR is being prepared in compliance with those requirements. The EIR provides a fair and objective analysis of the potential for adverse environmental impact as a result of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives specified by the Board of Supervisors. The commenter provides no substantiation for his allegations that the analysis is “slanted”. The staff does not concur and points to the EIR analysis in support of its position.

Response to Comment 67-18 (GP): The comment is on the Board’s actions relevant to the Shingle Springs Rancheria – a project that is not the subject of the General plan EIR.

No response is necessary. Please refer also to Master Response 10 for additional information on this issue as it pertains to the General Plan process.

LETTER 68: KENNETH WILKINSON, KFRD INVESTMENTS, INC.

Response to Comment 68-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the effect of tree canopy protection policies on industrial development, the need for a tree removal permit, and the effect of agricultural activities on oak woodlands are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer to the Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 68-2 (GP): Please refer to the Master Response 12 on Floor Area Ratios.

Response to Comment 68-3 (GP): The comment suggests that application of a design review overlay is redundant and unnecessary. The General Plan alternatives recognize this to some degree, and there are several policies that direct the County to adopt specific standards and guidelines, either as a part of the Zoning Ordinance or as separate documents that would obviate the need for additional review. These particularly apply to multifamily housing development (Policy HO-1p). However, design review provides a tool for ensuring that potentially incompatible uses that may be located adjacent to each other are designed in a way to ensure their compatibility, and to address community aesthetics and design criteria that go beyond the minimum standards that can be established in the Zoning Ordinance. Applicable policies include LU-6e, LU-7d, and LU-7g in the constrained alternatives, and the policies under Objective 2.4.1 in the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

LETTER 69: MARK SANDER

Response to Comment 69-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Industrial land use designation for APN 088-050-59. This letter is part of a “group request” submitted by the commenter and two other property owners (see Letters 60, 61 and 62). The requested land use designation was not included in any of the General Plan alternatives. In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designation is the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel is designated Low Density Residential (LDR) because, for that Alternative, the assignment of residential and nonresidential land use designations was based on the current General Plan designations. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is also designated LDR. That alternative does not allow the assignment of Industrial to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcel is not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the Industrial land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 70: DAVID C. BECKER, EL DORADO POST 119, AMERICAN LEGION

Response to Comment 70-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Industrial land use designation for APN 319-260-52. The 1996 General Plan Alternative and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative include this designation for the parcel. The parcel is identified as Low Density Residential (LDR) on the Environmentally Constrained Alternative Land Use Diagram. That Alternative does not allow the assignment of Industrial to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcel is not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the Industrial land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 70-2 (GP): The commenter's concern regarding the current tree canopy retention requirement is noted for the record. Please refer to Master Response 18, which addresses this issue. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives and the EIR propose new options for addressing this issue.

Response to Comment 70-3 (GP): Footprint, or coverage, standards are outlined in the current General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The General Plan alternatives propose different Floor Area Ratios. However, Zoning Ordinance coverage standards are not currently being updated. Subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan, the County will pursue an update of its Zoning Ordinance. Coverage standards will be reconsidered at that time. Also refer to Master Response 12, which addresses Floor Area Ratios.

LETTER 71: C.R. BOGGS AND CRAIG WEIDMER, C. BOGGS, INC.

Response to Comment 71-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the relationship of zoning and General Plan land use designations.

The subject parcel, APN 051-461-59, is proposed with split land use designations under all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The parcel is designated Multifamily Residential (MFR) and Medium Density Residential (MDR) in the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel is designated MFR and LDR. Based on the contents of the letter, it appears that the commenters wish to have the MFR land use designation applied to the entirety of the property. In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designation is the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. The staff was unaware that the split designation was problematic; therefore, the designation was carried over to the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 72: CLAY DAWSON, WESTERN SLOPE COUNCIL, EL DORADO COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH COMMISSION

Response to Comment 72-1 (GP): The comment regarding housing for mental health clients as a critical issue is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 72-2 (GP): The staff understands the need for housing for mentally ill adults. Current and proposed policies that address community care facilities do not intentionally discriminate against the establishment of such facilities for this population. The County General Plan process cannot address the issue associated with reimbursement to Community Care Facility developers. However, the Housing Element does address the needs of any population in need of temporary or permanent supportive housing.

Response to Comment 72-3 (GP): The draft Housing Element no longer contains the policy referred to by the commenter. The policy language of the draft element is more general to provide for flexibility in application. The implementation measures provide more detail, but still not to the specificity suggested by the commenter.

The commenter's suggestion would be better addressed during the Zoning Ordinance update, scheduled to occur during the first year following General Plan and Housing Element adoption. At that time, the County will consider uses allowed by right within residential zone districts.

Response to Comment 72-4 (GP): See the Response to Comment 72-3 above. Although both comments are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations, the detail suggested by the commenter would be more appropriately placed in the updated Zoning Ordinance.

LETTER 73: AL FRANKLIN, PINE HILL PRESERVE

Response to Comment 73-1 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 20 regarding the Pine Hill Preserve boundaries.

Response to Comment 73-2 (GP): All lands currently in public ownership within the recovery plan area or the County Mitigation Area 0 have been identified with an OS, Open Space designation on the Land Use Diagram for each alternative. As additional lands are acquired for the Pine Hill Preserve system, the County can make periodic updates to the Land Use Diagram to identify those changes.

Response to Comment 73-3 (GP): The Land Use Diagrams for the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are proposed to be updated to reflect recent acquisitions. Please refer also to Master Response 20.

LETTER 74: DEBBIE HARRIS, SWANSBORO LAND & HOMES

Response to Comment 74-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Commercial (C) land use designation for APN 085-722-06. This designation is included in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Under the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, the parcel is designated Medium Density Residential (MDR). In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designation is the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. For the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, because the nonresidential land use designations are based on what was adopted in 1996, the land use designation remains residential under this Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 75: JOHN STELZMILLER, TRANSVEST INC.

Response to Comment 75-1 (GP): Once a new General Plan is adopted, the County will begin the process of updating the Zoning Ordinance. The commenter's request for 10 acre zoning on APNs 093-021-71 and 093-021-72 could be accommodated if the parcels were identified as Rural Residential (or Rural Lands) on the adopted General Plan Land Use Diagram. The 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives designate the referenced parcel as Rural Residential (RR)/Rural Lands (RL). Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated Natural Resource (NR). For this Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Increases in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal.

The County will commence processing development applications after adoption of a new General Plan and after the Superior Court of California lifts the Writ of Mandate. Depending on the nature of the application and the effect of the Writ of Mandate's prohibition on earlier processing, applications will be processed according to the provisions of the new General Plan or the General Plan in effect at the time the application was deemed complete.

LETTER 76: THOMAS P. WINN

Response to Comment 76-1 (GP): The commenter requests a Commercial (C) land use designation for APN 12-780-33 (formerly APN 112-642-08). This request was not included in any of the General Plan alternatives. In all of the Alternatives, approximately three percent of the parcel is identified as commercial and the remaining 97 percent is identified for residential use. Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the residential designation is High Density Residential (HDR). Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the residential designation is Low Density Residential (LDR). Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the residential designation is Multifamily Residential (MFR). In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designation is the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated MFR to provide for more multifamily residential opportunities in the El Dorado Hills Community Region. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 77: WILLIAM M. WRIGHT, LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM M. WRIGHT

Response to Comment 77-1 (EIR): The comment restates Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d). The mitigation measure is intended to promote land use compatibility by encouraging new public facilities to be located within land use designations where the likelihood of land use conflicts is reduced.

Response to Comment 77-2 (GP/EIR): The mitigation measure affects only the siting of new school facilities; therefore, it has no effect on existing school sites. Of the seven proposed school sites in the County, there is one site located outside of Community Region or Rural Center boundaries in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, three in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, and three in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. Exhibit 5.7-3 (page 5-7.35) has been revised to show the proposed school sites as well as the existing schools. The following table shows each of the known future school sites and if they are located in a Community Region, Rural Center, or the Rural Region:

| PROPOSED SCHOOL SITE LOCATIONS | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Proposed School Site | No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives | Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative | Environmentally Constrained Alternative |
| Pleasant Grove Middle Sch. | CR | RR | RR |
| High School #5 | CR | RR | RR |
| High School #6 | RR | RR | RR |
| Silver Dove Elem. (Bass Lk.) | CR | CR | CR |
| Oak Meadow Elem. | CR | CR | CR |
| Valley View Specific Plan Elem. | CR | CR | CR |
| Carson Creek Specific Plan Elem. | CR | CR | CR |

See Response to Comment 77-3 below regarding the likely effect of this policy on future schools.

Response to Comment 77-3 (GP/EIR): The policy associated with this measure directs the location of new schools and other similar facilities into areas where there are higher concentrations of residential development and public services and utilities. As discussed in the EIR at page 5.1-67 in Volume 1, land uses permitted outside Community Regions and Rural Centers (e.g., agriculture, timber, and mining operations) are more likely to create conflicts with school uses. Moreover, isolated schools in rural areas could lead to impacts including more and longer vehicle trips, potential conflicts with agricultural

activities and the resulting Community Regions and/or Rural Centers are located in each of the school districts, so the mitigation measure would not preclude the ability to identify an appropriate school site. Existing facilities would be unaffected by this policy as it only applies to new school development. For new facilities, this policy would serve to discourage siting of school facilities that result in incompatible land uses. However, because school districts are independent of the County, they can still site schools in a manner inconsistent with County policy, if approved by a super majority of the school board.

Response to Comment 77-4 (GP/EIR): The difference between the restrictions on schools and other public facilities is the presence of children and their outdoor activity, and the inherent conflict between that and the dust, sprays, and noise associated with agricultural operations and the noise and greater potential for release of toxic substances at sites designated for industrial or research and development uses. For example, there are limitations on the ability to apply certain agricultural chemicals within one-quarter mile of a school that would restrict or inhibit the agricultural operator's ability to farm (California Food and Agriculture Code Section 11503.5.) Because children are not present at park sites for the same length of time as school sites, the mitigation measure does not extend the compatibility to park lands; however the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may wish to amend the policy to treat schools and active park lands as comparable uses for the purposes of determining land use compatibility. Because fire stations and other public facilities typically do not receive extensive use by children and are used primarily indoors, the likelihood of incompatibility with agricultural, industrial, or research and development uses is much lower. The commenter is correct, however, that libraries have similar features as schools, and therefore, has been included in the policy restricting their location, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 77-5 (GP/EIR): As it relates to school facilities, the County General Plan should identify when and how many new school sites will be needed. It is beyond the scope of the Plan to identify specific sites. As indicated by the vacant lands inventory in the Housing Element there is a considerable amount of vacant land in the Community Regions and Rural Centers. This land and currently underdeveloped land may be considered for potential school sites in the future. Policy 5.8.2.5 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and PS-9c in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, along with the associated implementation measure, directs the County to work cooperatively with the school districts in identifying potential school sites.

Response to Comment 77-6 (EIR): Exhibit 5.7-3 of the DEIR, School Districts and School Locations, identifies existing school sites. The exhibit has been revised to show known proposed school sites (see Appendix C.3 of this Response to Comments document). Schools are allowable in all General Plan land use categories unless restricted via adoption of Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d). As such, they can be developed

throughout the County on sites deemed appropriate by the school districts and (if State funds are involved) by the California Department of Education.

Response to Comment 77-7 (GP): The mitigation measure described in Comment 77-1 is intended to express County policy with regard to the location of school sites. Staff shares the commenter's belief that clear County policy may help avoid land use conflicts in the future. As discussed in Response to Comment 77-5, however, it is not feasible for the General Plan land use analysis to provide parcel-specific designations for all public facilities. To support the objective of clear County policy with respect to school sites, Implementation Measure PS-N has been revised to require the County to work with County school districts to designate zoning categories and standards for development of new school sites.

Response to Comment 77-8 (EIR): As the commenter notes, the DEIR relies on a countywide student generation rate of 0.338 student per household (including Lake Tahoe). This calculation of current student generation was derived from enrollment statistics provided by the County Office of Education and from county population data provided by the U.S. Census Bureau. The data used were countywide, and the generation rate of 0.338 is a countywide approximation; no specific information from Lake Tahoe (or any other school district) was used.

Use of a general countywide figure to estimate student generation is appropriate for this analysis because the draft General Plan EIR is a program-level document that assesses the overall impacts from school facilities of implementing the four General Plan scenarios. As explained in the note to Table 5.7-7, a detailed calculation of student generation in each school district by grade level would suggest a greater level of precision in predicting the future than is reasonable for a program-level analysis such as this General Plan EIR. Provision of school facilities is the responsibility of the individual school districts and is not within the jurisdiction of El Dorado County. Further, school district facility planning is generally done in 5-year increments, so use of school facility plans would not match the 20-plus-year horizon of the General Plan. Each school district will perform a detailed analysis, based on its own student generation rates, when specific plans or individual projects are proposed within its jurisdiction to ensure that adequate facilities are provided for the additional students, as is their authority.

The table provided below shows the student generation rates of school districts that responded to inquiries during preparation of the DEIR. For districts that did not provide generation rates, the California Department of Education's (CDE's) default rate of 0.7 is used. The CDE generation rate is higher than those used by most of the school districts in the County, and using that rate to calculate countywide data would provide an unrealistically high estimate of the number of new students generated under the four General Plan scenarios, based on countywide averages.

| Student Generation Rates of School Districts | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| School District | Total Enrollment (2001-2002) | Generation Rate (students per household) |
| Black Oak Mine Unified | 2,012 | 0.7 |
| Buckeye Union | 4,100 | 0.57 |
| Camino Union | 592 | 0.7 |
| El Dorado Union High School | 6,612 | 0.19 |
| Gold Oak Union | 756 | 0.18 |
| Gold Trail Union | 645 | 0.7 |
| Indian Diggings Elementary | 38 | 0.7 |
| Latrobe Elementary | 192 | 0.7 |
| Mother Lode Union Elementary | 1,663 | 0.214 |
| Pioneer Union Elementary | 589 | 0.32 |
| Placerville Union Elementary | 1,345 | 0.7 |
| Pollock Pines Elementary | 935 | 0.7 |
| Rescue Union Elementary | 3,346 | 0.6 |
| Silver Fork Elementary | 17 | 0.7 |

Under CEQA, the number of students generated and overcrowding created is a social issue. The development of school facilities to accommodate these students and the effects on the environment of constructing and operating the schools is the focus of CEQA. The General Plan EIR assumes development of the County at intensities consistent with the land use plans for each alternative. The development of school facilities is on this same land, thus the actual acreage by market area developed as schools versus other development does not alter the EIR conclusions with respect to conversion of land from undeveloped to developed uses. Thus, while the EIR quantifies acreage of school facility needs, the acreage devoted to schools versus alternative uses of the same land is not the relevant factor in the conclusions.

Rather, the EIR is focused on land use compatibility between developed schools and other development. Because school districts have the jurisdiction and authority to approve the location, construction, and operation of schools and the County does not, this creates the potential for incompatible land uses (from issues such as noise and traffic), as discussed on pages 5.7-45 and 5.7-46 and pages 5.7-49 through 5.7-54 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 77-9 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 77-8.

Response to Comment 77-10 (GP): The General Plan EIR does not analyze impacts to individual school districts, but rather addresses impacts to existing schools, and land use compatibility issues associated with new schools on a countywide basis. Each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives seek to avoid overcrowded schools by designating

broad areas of the County where school sites are appropriate and by requiring new development to offset demands on public school facilities to the maximum extent allowed by law. See Policy PS-9a in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives and Policy 5.8.1.1 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. Please refer also to Response to Comment 77-8.

**LETTER 78: BANKY E. CURTIS, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME,
REGION**

Response to Comment 78-1 (GP/EIR): The commenter requests an extension of the comment periods for the draft General Plan and the DEIR. Please refer also to Master Response 1.

LETTER 79: WILLIAM AND JENNIE CAMICIA

Response to Comment 79-1 (GP): Based on the contents of the letter the commenters appear to be requesting the Rural Residential (RR)/Rural Lands (RL) designation for APN 102-020-06. The request is included in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated Natural Resource (NR). For this Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Increases in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. The commenters' concerns regarding the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Important Biological Corridor proposed as part of that alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

The commenters appear to support the land use designation included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. While the No Project Alternative uses the same Land Use Diagram as the 1996 General Plan Alternative, restrictions associated with the No Project Alternative would prevent any future subdivision. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 80: RICH HOLMES

Response to Comment 80-1 (GP): The commenter is expressing support for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 80-2 (GP): Each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives contains policies in their respective Circulation Element that promote the development of multimodal mass transit options as alternatives to automobile use. Light-rail is among those other potential options. In addition, a joint study is currently underway between the City of Folsom and the El Dorado County Transportation Commission to analyze the feasibility of various multimodal options that could provide a link from Folsom to El Dorado County. This study is planned to be completed by Spring of 2004.

Response to Comment 80-3 (GP): The commenter is expressing views regarding affordable housing. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. The commenter is referred to the “Project Housing Needs” discussion in the Housing Element of all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, which outlines El Dorado County’s allocation of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments’ Regional Housing Needs Plan (page 71 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives; page 73 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative; and page 75 of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative).

LETTER 81: BETTY JEAN MAY

Response to Comment 81-1 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative and her concerns regarding the No Project, Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus", and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 81-2 (GP): Clustering of development is allowed under all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. While the 1996 General Plan Alternative contains much detail on the subject, the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives recommend that the County draft and adopt a Transfer of Development Rights Ordinance. For these two alternatives, detail regarding when, how, and where transfer of development rights would occur would be developed through an ordinance adoption process.

The Zoning Ordinance currently provides specificity on clustering through the Planned Development combining zone district. Any revisions to that combining zone district will be considered at the time the County updates the Zoning Ordinance, scheduled to begin subsequent to General Plan adoption.

Response to Comment 81-3 (GP): The land use designation definitions do not differ greatly between the alternatives. Rather, the land use patterns proposed on each of the Land Use Diagrams could lead to different types of development in different areas. The intent was to develop alternatives that differed from one another, consistent with CEQA and direction from the Board of Supervisors.

The parcels that are the subject of the commenter's request for application of the Low Density Residential-Ecological Preserve designations are evaluated in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

LETTER 82: DAVE CORDER

Response to Comment 82-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between land use designations and zoning.

The commenter requests a Commercial (C) designation for APN 009-720-08. This request is not included in any of the equal-weight Alternatives. The parcel has a split designation of C and Natural Resources (NR) under the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the entire parcel is designated NR. In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designation is the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, no new commercially-designated parcels were identified. Additionally, those Alternatives prohibit the establishment of new commercial land uses in Rural Regions (Policy LU-4f in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Policy LU-4e in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative). Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 83: NANCY AND WALTER EHRLICH

Response to Comment 83-1 (GP): With regard to the differences between zoning and General Plan land use designations, please refer to Master Response 7. With regard to property values and property rights, please refer to Master Response 9. The concerns of the commenter are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 84: RICK WILLIAMS

Response to Comment 84-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please see Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between land use designations and zoning.

The commenter requests the Multifamily Residential (MFR) and use designation for APN 101-210-13. The parcel is included as Commercial in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The staff was not aware that the Commercial designation was problematic; therefore, the designation was carried over to the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 85: JUNE 9, 2003 PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING ORAL COMMENTS

Note: The following responds to comments and questions raised during the Planning Commission Draft Environmental Impact Report comment hearing.

Response to Comment 85-1 (GP): See Letters 18, 19, 31, and 91 for written documentation of Mr. Smith's parcel-specific request.

Response to Comment 85-2 (GP): See Letters 82 and 136 for written documentation of the parcel-specific request for the Fresh Pond site.

Response to Comment 85-3 (GP): The commenter requests land use designations that would allow development of Piedmont Park (APNs 051-550-40, -47, -48, and -51). As noted at the hearing, Mr. Davies' parcel-specific request for the Piedmont Park development could be accommodated if the 1996 General Plan Alternative is adopted. The land use scenario proposed by Mr. Davies is included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the parcels are outside of the Placerville Community Region. These alternatives do not allow the assignment of High Density Residential (HDR) or Medium Density Residential (MDR) to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcels are not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the HDR or MDR land use designations could not have been assigned in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" or Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 85-4 (GP): Mr. Abel requests the Rural Residential (RR) land use designation for APN 096-080-09. The request is included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the parcel is designated Natural Resource (NR). The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. The NR land use designation is not inconsistent with the designations of other similarly-sized parcels in the area. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 85-5 (GP): Ms. Graf's concerns and opinions regarding subdivision and the need for parcel-specific review are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 85-6 (GP): See Letter 83 for written documentation of Mrs. Ehrlich's comments. Her concerns and opinions regarding the need for existing zoning designations to remain in place subsequent to adoption of a General Plan are noted for

the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 85-7 (GP): The Missouri Flat Road/State Route 49 connector road (the commenter's "bypass road") is included on the Circulation Diagrams for each of the four equal-weight alternatives as a "Future Road". This means that the exact alignment of the road has not been fixed and its location on the ground could vary significantly during the development of preliminary alignments and the associated analysis done for those. In this particular case, the Department of Transportation is exploring the options regarding the alignment of this road at this time. However, those alignments have not reached a level beyond being simple proposals of several possible alignments.

Mr. Bahlman's request to have the Commercial designation applied to his property was not included in any of the General Plan alternatives. The property is designated Medium Density Residential (MDR) on each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternative Land Use Diagrams. In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. For the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, no new commercially-designated parcels were identified. Please refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 85-8 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives propose different policies than the previously-adopted General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 8.

There is no evidence that reducing development prevents the establishment of fire safe infrastructure. Elements that make a development, community, or region fire safe can be implemented regardless of the level of development. While it is true that fire safety elements can be incorporated into development plans, development plans are not required for the implementation of fire safe actions.

The General Plan team concurs that much of the information in all of the draft General Plans is very detailed. In an attempt to strike a balance between generalities and too much detail, the staff included some detail in the General Plan drafts that might otherwise be included in an Ordinance or the County Code. For the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, much of the detail has been placed in the Implementation Program rather than in the Policy section. The No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives do not contain implementation programs, so the policies are much more detailed and directive. In all of the drafts, several policies and/or implementation measures direct the County to take more comprehensive action after adoption of the General Plan. These processes would allow for additional public input and "full public disclosure". The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may choose to further alter the proposed General Plan alternative drafts as they conduct their deliberations.

Response to Comment 85-9 (GP): As noted by Project Manager Heidi Tschudin, site specific requests not met through the General Plan process could still be presented as proposed General Plan amendments subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Currently, the application fees are approximately \$3,000.00 for a map or major text amendment and \$1,600.00 for a minor text amendment. This fee does not include the cost of environmental or engineering studies that may be required to support the application or costs associated with completing a comprehensive environmental document (i.e., an Environmental Impact Report). Whether or not these additional studies would be necessary would depend upon the nature of the proposed amendment.

Response to Comment 85-10 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 85-11 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between land use designations and zoning.

State Planning and Zoning Law states that the legislative body of any city or county may adopt ordinances that regulate the size of lots and intensity of land use (Government Code Section 65850[c]). This is typically done as part of a Zoning Ordinance. State Planning and Zoning Law states that a legislative body may divide a county, city, or portions thereof into zones of the number, shape, and area it deems best suited to carry out the purpose of Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 4 of the Government Code (Government Code Section 65851). Planning and Zoning Law does not state that a jurisdiction cannot modify its Zoning Ordinance. In fact, because Zoning Ordinances are intended to implement a jurisdiction's General Plan (Government Code Section 65800), zone designations must therefore be compatible with the adopted General Plan land use designations.

Response to Comment 85-12 (GP/EIR): Mr. Cribbs' concerns and opinions regarding availability of documents, proposed oak tree mitigation measures, deer fencing, and financial impacts of the proposed General Plan are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 85-13 (GP/EIR): The dam failure inundation zone maps included in the draft General Plans are copies of the dam failure inundation zone maps on file with the County and State Offices of Emergency Services. These maps are the basis of dam failure emergency response in the County (coordinated by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Office of Emergency Services). The maps used by El Dorado County were developed consistent with the California Dam Safety Act. There is no evidence that the maps are not accurate.

See Response to Comment 66-63 regarding the Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay. This corridor is proposed for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative only,

although the EIR proposes, as mitigation for environmental effects, that the corridor be included in the No Project, 1996 General Plan, and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Consistent with CEQA, the EIR evaluates the environmental impact of proposed General Plan policies and implementation measures. CEQA states that economic effects of proposed projects are not environmental impacts, and such analysis is not required in an EIR (California Code of Regulations Section 15131). The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may take potential economic effects into consideration as they deliberate the General Plan.

The proposed implementation and mitigation measures that address establishment of the -IBC overlay state that the standards will be developed subsequent to adoption of the General Plan. It is anticipated that, if the Board of Supervisors adopts a plan with the -IBC overlay in place, the standards would be developed over a period of time and with the assistance of responsible agencies and affected landowners. There would be opportunities for public participation. The Board of Supervisors would have the final say on any standards within the -IBC overlay.

Response to Comment 85-14 (GP/EIR): See Letter 173 for the Agricultural Commission's comments on the draft General Plans and DEIR.

Response to Comment 85-15 (GP): The current Ranch Marketing Ordinance (County Code Section 17.14.180) outlines allowed uses, parking requirements, and minimum parcel sizes. Currently, the ordinance allows the following by right: picnic areas; the display and sale of handicrafts and agricultural promotional items; gift display and sales areas (not including handicrafts) of a certain size for the retail sale of agricultural-related promotional items, gift items, and/or prepackaged goods; bake shops; prepared food stands; special events (with limitations depending upon parcel size and available parking); events promoting the agricultural operation on the parcel; the sale of alcoholic beverages made from agricultural products produced on site; agricultural-related museums; and agricultural homestays.

It is anticipated that the Ranch Marketing Ordinance will be updated sometime in 2004. Parcel size requirements may be revised at that time.

Response to Comment 85-16 (EIR): The CEQA Guidelines suggest, but do not require, that an EIR for an unusually complex project should be no more than 300 pages. County staff have endeavored to be as efficient as possible in analyzing impacts and suggesting mitigation, but the analysis and compliance with CEQA mandates, as well as the Writ of Mandate, resulted in the length of the document.

Response to Comment 85-17 (EIR): See Letter 283 for written documentation of Mr. Marinaccio's comments. The EIR was prepared based on the current project descriptions

and consistent with the CEQA Guidelines. Whether or not prior decisionmakers had previously rejected ideas presented in the EIR was not considered.

Response to Comment 85-18 (GP): Mr. Marinaccio's opinion regarding the "sunsetting" of Measure Y is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 85-19 (EIR): The staff concurs that full and complete disclosure of environmental impacts adds to the complexity of the EIR. The "baseline condition" is described throughout the subject chapters of the EIR (entitled "Existing Conditions" in Sections 5.1 through 5.14 of Volumes 1 and 2). Potential environmental effects of the proposed alternatives on the baseline condition are the subject of the impact analyses contained in each of the sections. CEQA requires the County to consider the effects of the proposed alternative in comparison to existing conditions on the ground.

Response to Comment 85-20 (GP): As noted by Mr. Mahach, the County did not finish the update of the Zoning Ordinance following adoption of the General Plan in 1996. The Zoning Ordinance update process was put on hold due to results of the 1999 lawsuit.

Response to Comment 85-21 (GP): Subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan, the County will resume the update of the Zoning Ordinance. The extent to which current zoning will change will depend upon the adopted General Plan and details of the new ordinance. It is speculative to predict the number of parcels that would be subject to changes. Please refer also to Master Response 7.

Response to Comment 85-22 (EIR): Mr. Mahach's concerns and opinions regarding the potential effects of mitigation measures on fire safety are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan. Please also refer to Master Responses 13 and 14.

Response to Comment 85-23 (GP/EIR): Conflict resolution is a fundamental component of the process. It is addressed through the EIR analysis which serves as a disclosure of potential "conflicts" in the form of impact analysis and through the public hearing process which allows the decisionmakers to consider the oral testimony of interested parties.

Response to Comment 85-24 (GP): By their nature, the alternative project descriptions define the overall "objective" of each plan. The No Project Alternative is required by law. The objective of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is to establish a land use pattern that is compatible with a proposed road system. The objective of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is to establish a land use pattern that provides a greater level of environmental protection than the other alternatives. While it was developing the alternatives, the General Plan Team anticipated that the public and

decision making bodies would propose changes intended to further accommodate those objectives.

Response to Comment 85-25 (EIR): As part of the General Plan adoption process, the County will prepare Findings of Fact and Overriding Considerations, as necessary. Because the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors have not selected a preferred alternative or identified policies and mitigation measures it may want to override, it is unrealistic to prepare findings and overriding considerations at this time. See Master Response 6 for more information on this subject.

Response to Comment 85-26 (GP): Please refer to Letter 207 for written documentation of Mr. Oliver's parcel-specific request.

Response to Comment 85-27 (GP): The commenter requests the Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation for APN 067-310-11. This request is included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. The parcel is identified as Rural Lands (RL) in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. The RL land use designation is not inconsistent with the designations of other similarly-sized parcels in the area. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Mr. Farren's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative and his concerns regarding the need for more site-specific review are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 85-28 (GP): Please refer to Letter 207 for written documentation of Mr. Brown's parcel-specific request.

Response to Comment 85-29 (GP): Please refer to Letter 207 for written documentation of Ms. Pimental's parcel-specific request. Ms. Pimental's opposition to the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 85-30 (GP): Mr. Wasserman's opinions regarding the General Plan process and parcel-specific requests are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 85-31 (GP): All hearings are noticed using local newspapers and direct mailings. Mr. Hartley's concern regarding public awareness of the General Plan process is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 85-32 (GP): Mr. Hartley's opinions regarding the public's opinion of Measure Y is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 85-33 (GP): Mr. Hartley's opinions and concerns regarding what the public wants and respecting the desires of property owners are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 85-34 (EIR): As noted by Ms. Tschudin at the hearing, the EIR assumes for the purposes of environmental analysis that the proposed casino will be built (please refer to page 1-3 of Volume 1 of the EIR). Please also refer to Master Response 10. Please refer also to Letter 87 for a copy of the casino-related articles Mr. Hartley distributed at the hearing.

Response to Comment 85-35 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 16. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on sidewalks and pedestrian safety, especially in relationship to parks and schools, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 85-36 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 108-5.

Response to Comment 85-37 (EIR): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 14.

Response to Comment 85-38 (GP): Whether or not U.S. Highway 50 could be eight lanes in El Dorado County would depend on a number of factors, including funding and coordination with the California Department of Transportation and other agencies. Please refer also to Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 85-39 (GP/EIR): As noted by Ms. Tschudin at the hearing, the Planning Commission may reach conclusions of mitigation measure feasibility as it deliberates the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 6 for a discussion of the process to be used by the County in evaluating the feasibility of proposed mitigation measures.

Response to Comment 85-40 (GP/EIR): The Board of Supervisors extended the General Plan and Environmental Impact Report comment periods, resulting in a total of 98 days for the General Plans and 76 days for the DEIR. Please refer also to Master Response 1.

Response to Comment 85-41 (EIR): The El Dorado County Transportation Commission and the City of Folsom are currently working on the U.S. Highway 50 Corridor Light Rail Route Refinement Study to look at and analyze several different alternatives for light rail into the County. This analysis will likely be the follow up document to begin

implementation of policies contained in the General Plan regarding rail operations. Also, please refer to Master Response 17.

Response to Comment 85-42 (GP/EIR): This Response to Comments document includes draft implementation programs for each of the alternatives. While the programs do not assign dollar amounts, they do identify estimated staff hours. This estimate gives a gauge of how costly implementation may be, although other factors such as relationships to other implementation and mitigation measures and requirements of State and federal law must also be considered. The information included in these programs may be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. The final implementation program will be based on Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors deliberations. The final General Plan may not include all of the measures currently proposed in the General Plan drafts and EIR.

Response to Comment 85-43 (GP): The staff recognizes that affordable housing development is directly affected by fee requirements. This subject is addressed in the draft Housing Element. The element includes policies and implementation measures directed at reducing, deferring, or waiving fees for affordable housing projects. While it is true that fee waivers could affect the overall County budget, it is the intent to develop programs that would be self-funding (e.g., the Housing Trust Fund as outlined in Implementation Measure HO-K, or land banking as outlined in Implementation Measure HO-P).

Response to Comment 85-44 (GP/EIR): The Implementation Programs included in this Response to Comments document include direction on the timing of proposed implementation measures. However, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may choose to change the timelines, and thus change priorities. It is anticipated that the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will consider implementation timelines during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 85-45 (GP/EIR): See Response to Comment 85-42.

Response to Comment 85-46 (GP/EIR): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives included Implementation Programs that proposed priorities through timelines. This Response to Comments document includes draft implementation programs for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 85-47 (GP/EIR): As noted by Ms. Tschudin, completing the exercise of more detailed cost analyses is not feasible at this time due to the uncertainty of what the ultimate plan may include. After the Planning Commission makes its initial recommendations for mitigation and policy/implementation measure inclusion and exclusion, it may be feasible for staff to take a closer look at costs associated with implementation.

Response to Comment 85-48 (GP/EIR): The subject referred to by Commissioner Machado, oak tree canopy retention, is addressed in the Conservation and Open Space Elements of each alternative and in Section 5.12 of the EIR. Please refer also to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 85-49 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b) is one of four possible mitigation measures to address potential inconsistencies between the land use plan and the Level of Service (LOS) policies contained in the proposed General Plans (Impact 5.4-1). This inconsistency issue is for the year 2025 time horizon. The roadways that are not projected to meet the LOS policies in the Plans in 2025 assuming planned improvements, are those listed in the mitigation measure. While there are other roads in the County that currently exceed the LOS policies in the General Plan, and there may be additional ones in the future, it is possible to provide improvements, i.e., traffic capacity, to return all of them to an acceptable LOS level prior to the year 2025.

Response to Comment 85-50 (EIR): The intent of Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d) is to make sure that schools are centrally located within Community Regions and Rural Centers and to address potential incompatibilities associated with the siting of schools and other public facilities. The proposed Mitigation Measure does not require the siting of schools in a manner that avoids incompatibilities but rather directs the County to consider siting and potential incompatibilities. At the time schools are proposed, the County can provide recommendations to the school districts. The County may oppose school projects, but, because they are under the jurisdiction of another agency with separate and distinct authority, the County cannot prevent school projects through the project approval process.

All four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives include policy direction for coordination with the school districts in identifying potential new school sites.

Mr. MacCready's concern regarding the inclusion of Agricultural Districts and agriculturally-zoned lands on the list of potentially incompatible uses in Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d) can be discussed during the Planning Commission's General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 85-51 (EIR): As proposed, Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(d) does not specify the party responsible for granting administrative relief from agricultural setbacks. Resolution 176-97 (adopted July 1997) established responsibility for administrative relief. Currently, administrative relief can be approved by the Planning Director or the Agricultural Commission.

Response to Comment 85-52 (GP/EIR): The Environmentally Constrained Alternative treated agricultural lands differently in that it assigned the Agricultural Lands designation as the base land use designation. This is different from the No Project, 1996 General Plan, and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, which assign an Agricultural District overlay, as well as another base land use designation.

As it deliberates the General Plan, the Planning Commission may consider how to best address protection of agricultural lands (through Agricultural Districts, an Agricultural land use designation, or, as suggested by Commissioner MacCready, a combination of both).

Response to Comment 85-53 (GP/EIR): As noted by Commissioner MacCready, well production interference as a result of other nearby wells is difficult to predict. According to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) (Water Facts: Ground Water in Fractured Hard Rock, April 1991), the amount of water passing through fractured rock varies depending upon conditions of fractures (e.g., size), recharge characteristics, and connections between fractures. See also the discussion on pages 5.5-63 and 5.5-64 of EIR Volume 1. Connections could be affected by existing and new wells, although advance knowledge of potential interference is difficult or impossible to determine in advance. In many cases, new wells drilled near existing high-producing wells may be dry because of fracture zone locations. According to the DWR, the best “insurance” to avoid interference between neighboring wells is large lot sizes (minimum of 3-5 acres in most cases). Policies proposed in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives provide protection similar to that recommended by DWR for new groundwater-dependent residential development by specifying that residential density cannot be greater than one dwelling unit per five acres. This does not offer protection for groundwater-dependent development on existing parcels that may be smaller than five acres.

Response to Comment 85-54 (EIR): As currently proposed, the new countywide fee program (new policy proposed under Mitigation Measure 5.7-5) could apply to all areas of the County, including areas already served by districts providing parks and recreation services. Details of the fee program, including the extent to which the fee requirement may apply to areas already served by a recreation provider, would be determined at the time the program is developed.

Response to Comment 85-55 (GP/EIR): See Response to Comment 85-43. The staff recognizes this challenging issue. The Housing Element includes measures that address alternative funding mechanisms for affordable housing.

Response to Comment 85-56 (EIR): The staff concurs with the commenter regarding the feasibility of implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(g) and proposes the addition of “where feasible” to the end of the first sentence. Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for this change.

Response to Comment 85-57 (EIR): As noted in Response to Comment 51-44, the Community Action Plans did not receive greater analysis for consistency with the General Plan because they are documents prepared by private organizations and have not been adopted by the Board of Supervisors or any other County agency, and they therefore have no standing as official policy documents. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may choose to more closely consider and incorporate elements of those Community Action Plans as they deliberate the General Plan.

Response to Comment 85-58 (GP/EIR): The EIR states that land in that portion of Sacramento County abutting El Dorado County is designated primarily for agricultural uses (page 5.1-20 of Volume 1 of the EIR). Land south of the highway is not dismissed as all of Sacramento County's land is south of U.S. Highway 50 (land to the north of the highway is within the City of Folsom). It is true that the City of Folsom has gained approval to expand its sphere of influence (SOI) south of the highway (into land currently under the jurisdiction of Sacramento County). The City of Folsom's recent expansion of its sphere of influence was granted by the Sacramento County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). Because it granted the sphere expansion, it is assumed that the Sacramento County LAFCO did not find any land use inconsistencies between Sacramento County land use and land uses that may be associated with the proposed expansion.

Land uses for those areas of the City of Folsom bordering El Dorado County are specific plan (Empire Ranch) and other residential (ranging from one to 30 dwelling units per acre). According to Section 5.1 of the EIR (Table 5.1-5, page 5.1-30 of Volume 1 of the EIR) , none of the land uses proposed in the City of Folsom are inconsistent with the proposed General Plan alternatives or adopted specific plans.

As noted by Mr. Hartley, the EIR contains a Mitigation Measure for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives that directs the County to coordinate all planning with adjacent jurisdictions (not just transportation corridor planning) (Mitigation Measure 5.1-1).

Response to Comment 85-59 (EIR): The mitigation measure referred to by Mr. Hartley, Mitigation Measure 5.1-2, is intended to facilitate the maintenance of community separation. The mitigation measure proposes a two-step approach. First, areas between Community Regions and Rural Centers would be evaluated to reach conclusions regarding potential obstacles to the maintenance of rural land uses. The second step involves establishing a parcel consolidation and transfer of development rights program. The measure separately describes both the consolidation and transfer steps and does not describe them as one and the same. The measure would allow consolidation of parcels where such consolidation would further the maintenance of rural land uses in areas between Community Regions and Rural Centers (as identified during the first step). As an incentive to consolidate smaller rural parcels, developers may then transfer development rights to other parcels within Community Regions and Rural Centers. In the case of this mitigation measure, consolidation and transfer are complimentary and may be beneficial to property owners.

Response to Comment 85-60 (EIR): The statement on page 5.1-51 of Volume 1 of the EIR regarding a 5-acre minimum parcel size was intended to demonstrate the difficulties of buffering a 5-acre residential parcel from activities that may disturb the occupants. The statement on page 5.1-52 of Volume 1 of the EIR that, in general, a 10-acre parcel provides adequate space and buffering, is not contradictory to the statement on page 5.1-

51 of Volume 1 of the EIR. The paragraph on page 5.1-51 has been revised for clarity. Please refer also to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 85-61 (EIR): The mitigation measure referred to by Mr. Marinaccio, Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(d), is one of four items the decisionmakers have to choose from as mitigation for potential inconsistencies with the level of service policies contained in the General Plan. In this instance, choice of one of the other three options would suffice as reason to not adopt Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(d).

Mr. Marinaccio is correct that staff, under direction of the decisionmakers, will bring forward findings of fact and overriding considerations. See Master Response 6 for more information on this subject.

Response to Comment 85-62 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 174-68.

Response to Comment 85-63 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on the funding of future road improvements and the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Funding of improvements is not an environmental issue under CEQA. However, the Matt Boyer memorandum to the Board of Supervisors regarding these costs (and attached to Letter 257), while not a part of the EIR itself, is a public document and is a part of the General Plan review and analysis process. As such, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will be including that information in their deliberations on the General Plan. Also, please refer to Master Response 14 and the Responses to Letters 256 and 257.

LETTER 86: GARY FORNI, GREEN SPRINGS RANCH BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Response to Comment 86-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on gated subdivisions and the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The inclusion of Policy HS-2e in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives was intended to provide the Board of Supervisors with an additional option to address the emergency egress and ingress issues for residential development. Some of the fire districts in the County have expressed a desire not to have any access gates on new subdivisions within their jurisdictions.

LETTER 87: DON HARTLEY

Response to Comment 87-1 (GP/EIR): The commenter submitted a collection of articles on Indian gaming casinos. Master Response 10 summarizes why the EIR assumes development of the Shingle Spring casino in the cumulative analysis. Please refer also to Response to Comment 85-34.

LETTER 88: WILLIAM G. AND JOY LYNN PIMENTAL

Response to Comment 88-1 (GP): This documentation, distributed by the commenters at the June 9, 2003, hearing, is support for Comment 85-29. This parcel-specific request is part of a “group request”. Please refer to Letter 207 for documentation of this request.

LETTER 89: KENNETH AND HEIDI BROWN

Response to Comment 89-1 (GP): This documentation, distributed by the commenters at the June 9, 2003, hearing, is support for Comment 85-28. This parcel-specific request is part of a “group request”. Please refer to Letter 207 for documentation of this request.

LETTER 90: DANNY E. OLIVER ET AL.

Response to Comment 90-1 (GP): This documentation, distributed by the commenters at the June 9, 2003, hearing, is support for Comment 85-26. This parcel-specific request is part of a “group request”. Please refer to Letter 207 for documentation of this request.

LETTER 91: ADAM C. E. SMITH

Response to Comment 91-1 (GP): This documentation, distributed by the commenter at the June 9, 2003, hearing, is support for Letters 18, 19, and 31 and Comment 85-1. Please refer to Response to Comment 18-1.

LETTER 92: DAVID E. THORBURN

Response to Comment 92-1 (GP/EIR): The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 92-2 (GP): Based on the contents of the letter the commenter appears to be requesting that the Multifamily Residential (MFR) designation be applied to APNs 323-640-01 [formerly 317-170-28] and 323-640-06 [formerly 317-170-38]. The parcels were not included as MFR in any of the General Plan alternatives. Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the parcels are identified as Low Density Residential (LDR). In this Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcels are designated Rural Lands (RL) and LDR, respectively. This Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcels are designated Agriculture (A). This designation was assigned because more than 50 percent of the parcels contain choice soils. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 93: STEPHAN C. VOLKER, LAW OFFICES OF STEPHAN C. VOLKER

Response to Comment 93-1 (GP/EIR): The commenter requests an extension of the comment periods for the draft General Plan and the DEIR. As described in Master Response 1 the comment periods for both documents were extended. It should be noted that there is no record of the commenter's request for a copy of the General Plan. The commenter is on both the postal distribution list as well as the email distribution list and all notices have been sent using one or both methods. Neither County Counsel nor the General Plan Project Manager has any record of such a request.

The only request of which the General Plan team is aware was a voice message from Jan McKinsey of Quality Growth on June 3, 2003 indicating that she was seeking a copy of the DEIR (all three volumes) for the commenter. The Project Manager called Ms. McKinsey back that day and left her a message that a set would be set aside for her to purchase at the County Planning Department.

All four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, as well as the entire DEIR have been available on the County's website for the entire length of the comment period. Additionally, all documents are available for purchase, and for review at various County locations and all County libraries.

LETTER 94: CATHY E. CRESWELL, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Response to Comment 94-1 (GP): The County submitted a draft Housing Element for review by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) consistent with the requirements of State housing law (Government Code Section 65580 et seq.). Letter 94 represents the State's official comments on the County's draft Housing Element.

Response to Comment 94-2 (GP): Pursuant to State law, individuals may submit comments to HCD regarding the draft Housing Element. Please refer also to Letter 130 for the comments of Mr. Tunny and his associate, Mr. Michael Patrick Durkee.

Response to Comment 94-3 (GP): Through revisions to the draft Housing Element, which are included in this Response to Comments document, the staff has endeavored to address these and other stated concerns of HCD. See Responses to Comments 94-7 through 94-32.

Response to Comment 94-4 (GP): As it moves through the General Plan update process, the staff is aware of the need to retain an adequate land inventory to accommodate its housing allocations. Because the inventory included in the draft Housing Element is based on current zoning and that zoning will remain in place subsequent to General Plan adoption until a new Zoning Ordinance is adopted, the inventory will remain accurate. Once the County updates the Zoning Ordinance, it is anticipated that the Housing Element will require revision to maintain consistency with the new ordinance. Such revision would be completed consistent with State law and in cooperation with HCD.

Response to Comment 94-5 (GP): The staff appreciates the assistance of HCD and will continue to work closely with HCD representatives.

Response to Comment 94-6 (GP): Revisions to the draft Housing Element, included in this Response to Comments document, are intended to respond to HCD's comments in a manner that will bring the draft element into compliance with State Housing Law.

All of the references cited by HCD were used in preparing the draft Housing Element.

Response to Comment 94-7 (GP): The "Lower Income Households Overpaying for Housing" discussion in Section 2 of the Housing Element has been revised using the data provided by HCD. (The numbers of owner households overpaying for housing cited in the letter were incorrect; the correct numbers were extracted from the 2000 Census information.)

Response to Comment 94-8 (GP): The "Crowding" discussion in Section 2 of the Housing Element has been revised using the data provided by HCD.

Response to Comment 94-9 (GP): As noted in Response to Comment 94-4, the Zoning Ordinance will be updated upon adoption of a new General Plan. That update will include consideration of the Regional Housing Needs Analysis (RHNA) numbers. It is anticipated that the final Housing Element (adopted by the Board of Supervisors and certified by HCD) may need revision upon adoption of a new Zoning Ordinance.

Response to Comment 94-10 (GP): Table A-3 of Housing Element Attachment A includes a summary of the number of sites having both sewer and water service. This summary was provided to demonstrate that the allocation for very low and lower income households could be accommodated using lands considered higher density and having “full” services (“A” service lands). By not including those areas with “B” service (public potable water supply and septic for wastewater disposal) or “C” service (private water supply and septic for wastewater disposal) in the total, it is assumed that areas not having full services are not as suitable for accommodating the allocation. Because the allocation could be met using “A” lands, a more in-depth analysis of the development capacity of areas without full services was not undertaken.

Response to Comment 94-11 (GP): Because the land inventory contained in the draft Housing Element is based on current zoning, it is assumed that any of the residential development allowed pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance could occur within the next five years. This assumes that the Court-issued Writ of Mandate is lifted subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan and that the development is also consistent with other County standards and requirements.

The “Survey Summary” discussion in Section 4 of the Housing Element has been revised to provide more information on “realistic development”.

Response to Comment 94-12 (GP): The provisions of Measure Y do not affect the capacity of land available to accommodate the RHNA numbers. In some cases, the Measure’s provisions may result in an additional fee requirement or the completion of infrastructure improvements. The “Impact Fees” discussion in Section 3 has been revised to provide more information regarding the potential constraints of Measure Y.

Response to Comment 94-13 (GP): The “Zoning Ordinance Permitting” discussion in Section 3 of the Housing Element has been revised to provide more information on permit processing procedures.

The draft Housing Element contains a number of programs that address, either directly or indirectly, permit processing for multifamily and/or affordable housing. Direct measures include streamlining of processing procedures (Measure HO-N), ongoing review and revision of programs (Measure HO-R), and an amendment to the Planned Development combining zone district to encourage a variety of housing types (HO-T). Indirect measures focus on revisions to development standards (which may facilitate streamlined processing) (Implementation Measures HO-E, HO-G, HO-J, HO-O, HO-U, and HO-V). It

is expected that implementation of these programs will help facilitate development of more such housing.

Response to Comment 94-14 (GP): The “Zoning Ordinance” discussion in Section 3 of the Housing Element has been revised to include information on setback, coverage, height, and parking requirements.

Response to Comment 94-15 (GP): The staff recognizes that impact and development fees may be an issue for some developers. Many of the development fees are not levied by the County and are thus beyond the control of the Board of Supervisors (e.g., Water District fees, Fire District fees, etc.). The “Impact Fee” discussion in Section 3 of the Housing Element has been revised to provide more information about impact fees and how and why they are levied.

Response to Comment 94-16 (GP): The provisions of Measure Y have the potential to affect development in that construction may require additional impact fees for construction of new infrastructure. The “Impact Fee” discussion in Section 3 of the Housing Element has been revised to provide information about the potential effects of the provisions of Measure Y.

Response to Comment 94-17 (GP): The “Seniors” discussion in Section 2 of the Housing Element has been revised to include the information provided by HCD. The Housing Element contains a number of measures to encourage the construction of affordable housing. It is assumed that these measures may be used to facilitate development of housing for El Dorado County’s Seniors.

Response to Comment 94-18 (GP): The “Large Families and Households” discussion in Section 2 of the Housing Element has been revised to include the information provided by HCD and available from the 2000 Census.

Response to Comment 94-19 (GP): There has been considerable effort to quantify the need for emergency shelters and transitional housing in the County. The Housing Element acknowledges that there is a need, and the “Homeless” discussion in Section 2 of the Element has been revised to address a number of groups that may be in need of temporary or transitional housing (in addition to homeless populations). Based on this change, Measure HO-GG has also been revised to facilitate the identification of sites that may be suitable for development of temporary or transitional housing.

Response to Comment 94-20 (GP): The “Assisted Housing Units at Risk of Conversion to Market-Rate Units” discussion in Section 2 of the Housing Element has been revised to show housing developments at risk of conversion (as opposed to individual units at risk).

Because of the costs associated with new housing construction in general, the value of housing rehabilitation over new construction is recognized. The Housing Element contains a number of policies and programs focused on the preservation of affordable

housing (See policies under Goal HO-3 and Implementation Measures HO-Z, HO-AA, HO-BB, and HO-CC).

Response to Comment 94-21 (GP): In the draft Housing Element, the County's quantified objectives are contained in appropriate Implementation Measures throughout the "Implementation Program" portion of Section 6. A new table (Table HO-32) summarizing the quantified objectives has been added to Section 6.

Response to Comment 94-22 (GP): The timeframe associated with Measure HO-U has been revised, consistent with HCD's comment that adoption of design standards should be a higher priority.

Measures HO-E and HO-U have been revised to include direction to cooperate with potential developers of affordable housing in the development of design standards.

Response to Comment 94-23 (GP): Measure HO-X has been revised to state that the County will apply for funds annually.

Response to Comment 94-24 (GP): Measure HO-FF has been revised in a manner that strengthens the County's commitment to addressing homelessness.

Response to Comment 94-25 (GP): The County currently has a referral procedure for suspected housing discrimination. Measure HO-LL has been revised to show this as an "ongoing" activity.

Response to Comment 94-26 (GP): The "Homeless and Other Groups in Need of Temporary and Transitional Affordable Housing" discussion in Section 2 of the Housing Element has been revised to include information on where emergency shelters and transitional housing may be located. Measure HO-GG has also been revised to provide clarity on where such housing may be established.

Response to Comment 94-27 (GP): The "Farmworkers" discussion in Section 2 of the Housing Element has been revised to provide information on where farmworker housing is allowed. The revised draft Housing Element contains a new Implementation Measure, HO-NN, which addresses the siting of farmworker housing.

Response to Comment 94-28 (GP): Measure HO-O has been revised to strengthen the County's commitment to adopting an infill ordinance.

Response to Comment 94-29 (GP): The "Governmental Constraints" discussion in Section 3 of the Housing Element has been revised to include an analysis of the identified Governmental constraints.

Response to Comment 94-30 (GP): The County's transportation capital improvement program (CIP) is designed to address the requirements of Measure Y, specifically

maintaining minimum but adequate levels of service. As outlined in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the transportation CIP will be reviewed every two years (Implementation Measure TC-A in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, page 65). Measure Y contains a requirement that the County enforce the General Plan roadway level of service standards to ensure adequate capacity for new development.

There are few other capital improvement plans under control of the County. The development of community and neighborhood parks is largely the responsibility of independent districts (such as community services districts), though the County has some involvement in park and recreation capital improvements (two of the draft General Plan alternatives include policies directing the County to develop a parks and recreation capital improvement program). Because it is not a water or wastewater service provider, the County has no control over the capital improvement plans of the providers of these services other than to specify land uses over time (which theoretically the providers would use as a gauge to develop their capital improvement programs. Other services, such as electricity and communication, are supplied by non-County providers.

Response to Comment 94-31 (GP): Measure HO-G has been revised to strengthen the County's commitment to revising its development standards. Measure HO-U has been similarly revised.

The term "occupancy characteristics" used in the former version of HO-G was meant to apply to physical characteristics of sites that may affect the ability to develop occupiable spaces, regardless of who the occupant may be. The text has been revised to provide clarity.

Response to Comment 94-32 (GP): A new discussion titled "Consistency with General Plan" has been added to Section 1 of the Housing Element.

LETTER 95: LINDA MATTHEWS

Response to Comment 95-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation for APN 070-072-17. The request is included in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated Low Density Residential (LDR). That alternative does not allow the assignment of MDR to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcel is not within a Community Region of Rural Center, the MDR land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 96: WILLIAM D. WHITE

Response to Comment 96-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between land use designations and zoning.

The commenter requests the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation for APNs 076-230-03 and 076-230-26. This designation is incorporated in the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcels are designated Low Density Residential (LDR) and Rural Lands (RL), respectively. That alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 97: JEFFREY PULVERMAN, CALTRANS DISTRICT 3 SACRAMENTO AREA OFFICE

Response to Comment 97-1 (GP/EIR): The commenter's support of the County's approach in addressing land use, community identity, the regional highway system, highway safety, public transportation, and housing needs is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 97-2 (GP/EIR): The EIR identifies that under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, U.S. Highway 50 will be operating at Level of Service (LOS) F during the peak hours between the west County Line and Cambridge Road.

Response to Comment 97-3 (GP/EIR): The Caltrans concern regarding streamlining the approval process for multifamily and affordable housing is at odds with the position and emphasis of the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). This discrepancy between the two State agencies cannot be resolved by the County. However, it should be noted that CEQA would still apply where appropriate. Should the County ultimately prepare and adopt an ordinance or other regulation that allows for less discretion over multifamily and affordable housing projects, that action would be subject to CEQA analysis and "cumulative" concerns would be examined at that time.

Response to Comment 97-4 (GP/EIR): The staff agrees with the described approach. This General Plan process, including the EIR analysis, undertakes cumulative analysis on a countywide and areawide basis.

Response to Comment 97-5 (GP): All of the elements of the General Plan must be fully integrated. This is required by State law. The Compact Development Alternative (#12) in Chapter 6.0 emphasizes a strong density/transit link.

Response to Comment 97-6 (GP): It is assumed that the commenter meant these interchange spacing standards to apply to freeways, not all divided roads. By definition, an interchange involves freeways, whereas nonfreeways have intersections. The standards cited are consistent with the Caltrans freeway standards.

Table TC-1 (Goal TC-1, Policy TC-1a) of the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives only applies to those roads under County jurisdiction. As such, it does not apply to roads and freeways under State jurisdiction. Therefore, the spacing cited in the table does not apply to U.S. Highway 50, which is the only freeway in the County and is under Caltrans' jurisdiction.

Response to Comment 97-7 (EIR): The commenter suggests that there is a discrepancy between the General Plan EIR and the relevant Caltrans Transportation Concept Reports (TCRs). The General Plan alternatives and the EIR do not contain any such discrepancies. Level of Service (LOS) policy inconsistencies are identified in the EIR (please refer to Impact 5.4-1 for this discussion). The differences between the

General Plan EIR LOS results and those shown in the TCRs are due to a variety of causes. One is the time horizons. The General Plan uses 2025 as its horizon year and the TCRs use 2020, 2018, and 2021. It is unlikely LOS will be the same with different time horizons.

The County is using a traffic forecasting model built specifically for this General Plan update work. The County's forecasting model likely has a more refined level of detail than the model(s) used by Caltrans for the preparation of their Transportation Concept Reports (TCRs). Without knowing the source of the Caltrans modeling, staff cannot be certain, but the number of Traffic Analysis Zones in the County model is higher and has a greater refinement in the boundaries to better match the actual trafficsheds. Additionally, the County's model is using the land use data forecasted for the General Plan effort in 2002, reflecting the revised land use patterns of each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. These forecasts may differ from the land use forecasts used by Caltrans. These differences, combined with a probable difference in the LOS cutoff volumes, most likely account for the different LOS results reported in the EIR and TCRs.

It should also be noted that in all cases, except State Route 49 between State Route 193 and the El Dorado/Placer County line and US Highway 50 within the City of Placerville, the County's LOS F requirement is more restrictive than those shown on the TCRs.

LETTER 98: DIANE DUTRA

Response to Comment 98-1 (GP): The commenter requests either the Low Density Residential (LDR) or High Density Residential (HDR) land use designation and to be within a Community Region for APNs 070-072-56 and 57. The request for the LDR designation is included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. None of the equal-weight Alternatives identify the parcels as HDR. The subject properties were included in the Shingle Springs Community Region under the 1996 General Plan Alternative only (they were not included in the Community Region in either the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" or Environmentally Constrained Alternatives). Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, APN 070-072-56 is designated LDR and APN 070-072-57 is designated Rural Lands (RL). This Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, both parcels are designated LDR. In this Alternative, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers, which were generally more limited in size and extent. Furthermore, the LDR designation is not permitted in Community Regions under this alternative. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 98-2 (EIR): The EIR evaluated the effect of applying the LDR designation to the subject property as part of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 98-3 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 99: EUGENE PORI, EL DORADO TRAILS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Response to Comment 99-1 (GP): Each of the four Alternatives contains policies in their respective Circulation Element and Parks and Recreation Element that promote the development of nonmotorized transportation. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on General Plan treatment of multimodal and nonmotorized transportation options, will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Also, please reference Master Response 16 for a more detailed discussion on Bikeways, Sidewalks and Pedestrian Access.

Response to Comment 99-2 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 66-84 for discussion relevant to the nonmotorized use of the SPTC, or El Dorado Trail as well as a discussion of inter-departmental responsibilities. For a discussion of the County's role in the SPTC specific to rail use, please refer to Master Response 17. Also, please reference Master Response 16 for a more detailed discussion on Bikeways, Sidewalks and Pedestrian Access.

The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on development of the El Dorado Trail corridor (SPTC), will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 99-3 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 16 for a more detailed discussion on Bikeways, Sidewalks, and Pedestrian Access. That response includes discussion of the Bicycle planning documents referenced in the comment.

Response to Comment 99-4 (GP): Each of the four Alternatives contains policies in their respective Circulation Element and Parks and Recreation Element that promote the development of nonmotorized transportation. Please refer also to Master Response 16 for a more detailed discussion on Bikeways, Sidewalks, and Pedestrian Access. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on the General Plan policies on nonmotorized transportation, will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 100: MIKE POTT, EL DORADO COUNTY FIRE PREVENTION OFFICER'S ASSOCIATION

Response to Comment 100-1 (GP): El Dorado County has received a number of comment letters supporting the Fire Safe Council's recommendations. Please refer to the Responses to Comment Letter 265, submitted by Vicky D. Yorty, Coordinator of the El Dorado County Fire Safe Council.

Response to Comment 100-2 through 100-40 (GP): These comments appear to be a version of a draft document that was subsequently submitted by the El Dorado County Fire Safe Council in Comment Letter 265. Please refer to the responses to those comments.

Response to Comment 100-10 (GP): The commenter is recommending language regarding roadway standards for areas with high fire risk. These types of specific standards are at a level significantly more detailed than is appropriate for a General Plan. However, it should be noted that these issues with road standards in high fire risk areas will be dealt with in the form of revisions to the County's Design and Improvements Manual and Standard Plans and enforcement of these revised standards. This is an explicit Implementation Measure in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives – Measure TC-C. It is implied in the policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives – Objective 3.1.2 and Policy 3.1.2.1.

LETTER 101: DAVID L. MAC MILLAN, MAC MILLAN PARTNERS, INC.

Response to Comment 101-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the need for a jobs/housing balance are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Please refer to Master Response 12 on Floor Area Ratios and the responses to Letter 249. The FAR of 0.25 has been in place for all R&D designated land since the adoption of the 1996 General Plan. The 1996 General Plan Alternative contains the same 0.25 FAR requirement. The 0.25 FAR is higher than the average FAR for the existing building inventory in the business park described by the commenter (0.23). The Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives contain a 0.20 FAR requirement and 0.30 FAR requirement, respectively, so that a range of FAR possibilities was examined. Regarding the commenter's assertions relating to entitlements and traffic, please refer to the responses to Letter 249.

LETTER 102: MICHAEL AND PATRICIA TAYLOR

Response to Comment 102-1 (GP/EIR): Apartments may be constructed on lands having the Multifamily Residential land use designation. According to the EIR, the total Multifamily Residential land in the Cameron Park/Shingle Springs/Rescue Market Area is as follows:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| No Project Alternative | 531 acres |
| Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative | 442 acres |
| Environmentally Constrained Alternative | 436 acres |
| 1996 General Plan Alternative | 531 acres |

And in the El Dorado Hills Market Area:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| No Project Alternative | 94 acres |
| Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative | 183 acres |
| Environmentally Constrained Alternative | 107 acres |
| 1996 General Plan Alternative | 94 acres |

The figures for the El Dorado Hill market area have been revised in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives to reflect the adopted Valley View Specific Plan (please see Exhibit 4-1 in Volume of the EIR for a map of the market areas).

The above totals include land that is already developed. According to County Assessor's Office records, approximately 30 percent of the Multifamily Residential lands in the Cameron Park and 10 percent in the El Dorado Hills Market Areas are currently developed. Some of this development is multifamily while other areas are developed at lower densities. Under the No Project Alternative, new development of Multifamily Residential lands could be developed at a maximum of four units/parcel. Under the remaining alternatives, Multifamily Residential lands could be developed at a maximum of 24 units/acre. Multifamily Residential lands throughout the rest of the County are concentrated in the Placerville, Diamond Springs, Pollock Pines, Georgetown, and Cool Market Areas.

Response to Comment 102-2 (GP): As noted above, much of the land currently identified for Multifamily Residential in the Cameron Park/Shingle Springs/Rescue Market Area is currently vacant and could be developed as apartments. This is true under all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, although there would be less development overall through 2025 under the No Project and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative land use scenarios. Whether any new apartments would be established as affordable housing (affordable to very low or lower income families) would depend on site-specific proposals. All apartments do not necessarily need to be affordable to very low or lower income households, although affordable housing is typically multifamily dwellings.

The commenters' concern regarding the construction of more multifamily and/or affordable housing in the Cameron Park area is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

LETTER 103: EILEEN CRIMM, TRAILS NOW

Response to Comment 103-1 (GP): The efforts put forth by Trails Now toward improving nonmotorized transportation within the County are appreciated. Please refer to Master Responses 16 and 17. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on the General Plan policies relating to the nonmotorized trail program, will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 103-2 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 99-2 for a discussion of the transportation corridor and Response to Comment 66-84 for discussion regarding the responsibilities of the Department of Transportation and the General Services Department, Division of Airports, Parks, and Grounds. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on the General Plan policies relating to the nonmotorized trail program, will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 103-3 (GP): Please see Master Response 16 for a more detailed discussion on Bikeways, Sidewalks and Pedestrian Access, which includes discussion of the bicycle planning documents referenced in the comment.

Response to Comment 103-4 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on the General Plan policies relating to the El Dorado Trail, will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 104: SCOTT KRANHOLD, CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD, CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

Response to Comment 104-1 (EIR): The role of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) in review of the EIR is noted.

Response to Comment 104-2 (EIR): The referenced discussion in the EIR refers to the County's process for consideration of projects. The County's determination of whether a project is ministerial and therefore exempt from CEQA does not remove the obligation of a project applicant to comply with applicable laws and regulations, including Section 13260 of the California Water Code, as described in the comment.

Response to Comment 104-3 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 104-2. An applicant is required to comply with all applicable regulations whether imposed at the local (County), regional (RWQCB), or State (CEQA) level.

Response to Comment 104-4 (EIR): The discussion of El Dorado Irrigation District's (EID) wastewater treatment plants was based, in part, on EID's *Wastewater Master Plan Update* (EID 2001b), and this document does not include the Camino Heights wastewater treatment plant. According to EID, the Camino Heights wastewater treatment plant has a capacity of 60,000 gallons per day (gpd) and treats an average of 17,000 gpd (as of 2000), less than one third of its capacity. It serves 107 connections in Camino. The plant includes three oxidation ponds and discharges treated wastewater via spray irrigation. No wastewater is discharged to a water body. EID has no plans to expand or alter this facility (Sullivan, Tim. Senior Engineer, El Dorado Irrigation District, Placerville, CA. July 16, 2003 – personal communication with Gary Jakobs of EDAW regarding the Camino Heights Wastewater Treatment Plant).

Camino is located in Market Area 4 (along with Placerville), as identified in Chapter 4 of Volume 1 of the EIR. This area is projected to grow by 47 percent at buildout under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, which is the most of any alternative. If this rate of growth is applied to generation of wastewater in the Camino Heights plant, it would treat a total of 25,000 gpd, which is less than half the plant's capacity. It can be concluded, then, that none of the alternatives would result in the need to expand the Camino Heights plant, and there would be no associated environmental impacts.

Response to Comment 104-5 (EIR): It is acknowledged that the County would be required to apply for updated Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) if the Union Mine Septage Treatment and Disposal Facility is expanded. The updated WDRs would require the County to treat wastewater to a level that is protective of surface and groundwater, as is required by the RWQCB.

Response to Comment 104-6 (EIR): El Dorado County follows the processes explained in this comment. A Report of Waste Discharge (RWD) from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is required for any subdivision over 100 units relying on a

community leachfield. Further, the County's Private Sewage Disposal Systems Ordinance (Ordinance 4542) was prepared to be in compliance with the Basin Plan Guidelines. The County submitted the ordinance to the RWQCB to seek written confirmation that it does comply, but was informed by RWQCB staff that they do not issue compliance letters in this regard. There is no reason to believe the ordinance is not in compliance with the Basin Plan, and there are no assertions from the RWQCB (or anyone else) that the ordinance is not in compliance (Jon Morgan, Director, El Dorado County Environmental Management Department, July 17, 2003 telephone conversation with Gary Jakobs of EDAW regarding onsite wastewater treatment system regulations).

Response to Comment 104-7 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 104-5. Note that EID would be responsible for seeking updated WDRs from the RWQCB for any expansions to the El Dorado Hills or Deer Creek wastewater treatment plants.

Response to Comment 104-8 (EIR): The comment that industrial facilities would be required to file a RWD is consistent with the discussion in the referenced paragraph on page 5.5-93 of Volume 1 of the EIR. As stated, all industries that discharge wastewater to streams are required to procure a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. An RWD is required to be filed with the RWQCB before the agency will grant an NPDES permit.

Response to Comment 104-9 (EIR): The RWQCB's interpretation of allowable waivers of WDRs is noted. El Dorado County refers higher discharge requests (above 5,000 gpd) to the RWQCB for WDRs (Sanford, Fred. Senior Environmental Specialist, El Dorado County Environmental Management Department, Placerville, CA, October 1, 2003—telephone conversation with Gary Jakobs of EDAW regarding how El Dorado County addresses requests for higher discharge OWTS).

Regarding winery waste, please see the discussion on pages 5.5-103 and 5.5-104 of Volume 1 of the EIR. As of July 11, 2003, a waiver for small food processors, including wineries, had been granted by the RWQCB under certain conditions (wineries crushing under 80 tons of grapes per year or wineries crushing over 80 tons of grapes per year but producing less than 100,000 gallons of wastewater per year as long as wastewater is applied at reasonable agronomic rates, etc.) (California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Region. July 11, 2003, Resolution No. R5-2003-0106, *Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Small Food Processors, Including Wineries, Within the Central Valley Region*). Regarding industrial wastewater, please refer to Response to Comment 104-8.

Response to Comment 104-10 (EIR): Please see Response to Comment 104-6. As described, the County sought concurrence from the RWQCB that Ordinance 4542 would be acceptable and believes it is acceptable because it meets the requirements for being consistent with the Basin Plan. However, because RWQCB staff has not issued a specific statement regarding the acceptability of the ordinance, the text on page 5.5-105

of the DEIR has been revised. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 104-11 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 104-9 regarding waivers of WDRs for small wineries. The RWQCB's timing for the adoption of a regulatory scheme for wineries is noted.

LETTER 105: SANDY HESNARD, CALTRANS DIVISION OF AERONAUTICS

Response to Comment 105-1 (GP): The County acknowledges the review of the draft General Plan and DEIR by staff of the Division of Aeronautics. Each of the airports listed in this comment are shown on the Land Use Diagram and discussed in the Transportation and Circulation Element and the Health, Safety and Noise Element of each alternative. The aviation system is also discussed in the EIR in the Traffic and Circulation section (pages 5.4-11 and 5.4-38 of Volume 1) and the Noise section (see Impact 5.10-4)

Response to Comment 105-2 (GP): Planning staff reviewed the Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUPs) for each of the County's airports during the preparation of the draft General Plan Alternatives. Additionally, staff coordinated with the staffs of the General Services division that oversees operations of the Georgetown and Placerville Airports and staffs of the City of South Lake Tahoe and Cameron Park Airport District. Notification was provided of the availability of the General Plan Alternatives and the DEIR to each of the Airport Land Use Commissions and will be coordinated with appropriate staff.

Response to Comment 105-3 (GP): The comment accurately reflects the content of Policy 6.5.2.3 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

Response to Comment 105-4 (GP): The maps referenced by the commenter are available in the Planning Department office and need not be included in the General Plan. Builders, developers and the public are often referred to the maps when inquiring about properties located within these areas. In addition, the influence areas were taken into consideration when developing the land use designations by the airports.

Response to Comment 105-5 (GP): The County currently works with the staff at SACOG on airport-related issues and airport noise is a frequent topic at the Folsom/El Dorado County Joint Powers Authority meetings. A policy has been included in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives (see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document) to consider amending the current disclosure requirements to include the approach zone for Mather Airport.

Response to Comment 105-6 (GP): The County recognizes the role of the Division of Aeronautics in airport-related noise, safety and compatible land use issues and acknowledges that the *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook* published by the Division of Aeronautics must be utilized as a resource in the preparation of environmental documents for projects within airport comprehensive land use plan boundaries.

Response to Comment 105-7 (GP): The County acknowledges receipt of the information provided by the commenter. No landfills or wastewater treatment facilities are currently located nearby County airports. No surface mining activities are being conducted in proximity of County airports.

Response to Comment 105-8 (GP): With regard to protection of airports from incompatible land use encroachment, Policy TC-7a in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires the County to support federal and State regulations governing both the operations and the land use restrictions related to airports. Policy 3.1.1.1 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative requires the General Plan to be consistent with the Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plans for all airports.

LETTER 106: JOHN J. FLEISCHMANN

Response to Comment 106-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation for APN 070-180-45. This request is included in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. The entire Sierrama Drive area is included as MDR in those alternatives as well. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated Low Density Residential (LDR). That alternative does not allow the assignment of MDR to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcel is not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the MDR land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Other parcels along Sierrama Drive are also designated LDR under this Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 107: JAMES M. EICHER, U.S. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Response to Comment 107-1 (GP): This comment identifies an error in the Land Use Diagram for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. Property recently acquired and managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in the Shingle Springs area for rare plant protection is not shown as Open Space or Natural Resources, nor does it have the Ecological Preserve overlay designation. This is true for several recent acquisitions to the plant preserve. The County requested from BLM staff an updated list of all lands owned by the federal government and managed by BLM. (This request was made of all federal and State agencies.) The Environmentally Constrained Alternative reflected the data received from those agencies in November 2002. However, the 1996 General Plan Alternative Land Use Diagram retained the land use designations of the plan adopted in 1996; therefore, there are inaccuracies with that map because of more recent acquisitions by BLM. The Land Use Diagram for each alternative (See Figure LU-1) has been revised to reflect the most recent data regarding federal ownership of rare plant preserve lands in the County. See Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 107-2 (GP): The commenter indicates that the County has inaccurately characterized BLM managed lands as Open Space, with the specific concern that the Open Space designation is too broad and does not reflect the management goals of the Bureau.

The Open Space designation is broad in its scope, identifying lands used, as the commenter notes, from golf courses to rare plant preserves. The primary intent of the designation is to identify those lands that are not available for residential development and it reflects El Dorado County's desire, to the degree it can control land uses, including those on nonjurisdictional land, that future land uses reflect the designation. In the forecasting studies done to assess the growth implications of each alternative (EPS, March 2002), this designation was applied to lands that would not be developed for a variety of reasons. This includes lands that have been acquired for recreational purposes and for the management of rare plant habitat. BLM was contacted early during the preparation of the draft alternatives and did not provide any comments during that time. The land use designation for most, if not all, lands managed by BLM, was Open Space during the 1996 General Plan process and in the earlier Area Plans. El Dorado County continues to believe this land use designation is appropriate. However, to the extent the County designates nonjurisdictional land, including BLM land, the ultimate use of that land is under control of the BLM or other relevant agency.

Response to Comment 107-3 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 107-2. Note that as a federal agency, BLM has land use control over its publicly owned land, irrespective of County land use designations. Open Space reflects the County's desired uses for these lands. The Open Space designation would be used if BLM were to sell the property to a private party.

Response to Comment 107-4 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 107-2.

Response to Comment 107-5 (GP): The commenter points out that there are differences between developed golf courses with clubhouses and other recreational amenities and the rare plant preserves, both of which are designated Open Space on the Land Use Diagrams for each alternative. Open Space has historically been used for existing golf courses to reflect that they are otherwise unavailable for residential and non-residential development. It is recognized that a golf course provides a different type of open space than that provided by an undeveloped parcel used for passive recreation, such as BLM land adjacent to the South Fork of the American River. However, Policy 7.6.1.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and CO-11b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives identify outdoor recreation as an appropriate land use under the Open Space designation without specifying the specific types of outdoor recreation (e.g., developed versus passive). In the context of Policy 2.2.3.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives as it has previously been applied under the 1996 General Plan, the County has not accepted golf courses as satisfying the 30 percent open space requirement. Should Tourist Recreational be determined to be a more appropriate designation for golf courses such a change could be made as an amendment to the plan at the Board's direction.

Response to Comment 107-6 (GP): The commenter accurately states that the County has no land use authority over federally-owned lands. However, land often changes hands between federal agencies and private parties, so the County applies a land use designation to all parcels, in the event that what is now public land becomes private in the future. It is also helpful to identify those lands with their intended use, so that the full picture of land management activities can be seen by viewing the General Plan Land Use Diagram. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 107-2 and 107-3.

The commenter suggests that a "Non-Jurisdictional Natural Resources Management" designation be developed to represent all federal- and State-owned lands. The No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives have an "NJ" overlay designation, which serves the same purpose (see Policy 2.2.2.5 on pages 29 and 30 for description.) However, the County has found there are practical difficulties with this designation. Primarily, as a land use designation, each time there is a transfer of title between a federal or State agency and a private party, the Land Use Diagram must either be amended or there is an inconsistency between the map and the actual ownership. This is especially difficult in the Lake Tahoe Basin where acquisition of land by the California Tahoe Conservancy is occurring on an ongoing basis.

Response to Comment 107-7 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 107-1.

Response to Comment 107-8 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 20 regarding the Pine Hill Preserve boundaries.

Response to Comment 107-9 (GP): Although the primary purpose of the Natural Resources designation is to identify areas of resource commodities such as timber and mineral resources, the land use designation also serves to identify other natural resource values, such as watershed, wildlife management and recreation (Policy 2.2.1.2, 1996 General Plan Alternative, page 21). Clarifying language has been added to the text of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives to specify that the Natural Resources designation also includes wilderness areas as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 107-10 (GP): Changes in land use designations have not been possible due to the restrictions imposed by the Writ of Mandate. When the Writ of Mandate is lifted, the County will be allowed to consider amendments to the General Plan Land Use Diagrams. Rather than attempt to predict the most appropriate private land use for lands currently managed by the BLM, it is more appropriate to consider those issues at the time the land is transferred to private ownership.

Response to Comment 107-11 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 107-2.

Response to Comment 107-12 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 107-2, 107-5, and 107-9.

Response to Comment 107-13 (GP): The descriptions of the Open Space and Natural Resources land use designations have been clarified to better describe the range of permitted activities on those lands. The designations are broad, and provide a wide range of uses, which are not incompatible with BLM management plans. The Open Space designation would not prohibit the construction of restrooms, parking lots, and other incidental improvements needed to provide public access to open space areas managed by BLM. See also the previous Responses to Comments 107-2 and 107-5.

Response to Comment 107-14 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 107-13.

LETTER 108: K. FREVERT

Response to Comment 108-1 (GP/EIR): The commenter mentions the efforts taken to prepare the plan alternatives and provide opportunities for public comments.

Response to Comment 108-2 (GP): The concerns and opinions regarding who benefits from the plan and the fiscal impacts of implementation expressed in the comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 108-3 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 108-2.

Response to Comment 108-4 (GP): Both the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative provide a set of policies (TC-5a through TC-5c) with various sidewalk requirements and Implementation Measure TC-C contains a directive to “Provide standards for the requirement of sidewalks in new development and capital improvement projects.” The timeframe of this measure is development of standards within two years following General Plan adoption. Currently no mechanism exists to require sidewalks on previously-approved or constructed projects. See also Master Response 16.

Response to Comment 108-5 (GP): All four of the equal-weight alternatives to the General Plan give the primary responsibility to the County for establishing and providing regional parks (Policy 9.1.1.6 in the 1996 General Plan and General Plan Alternative and Policy PR-1a in the Roadway Constrained Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative). Neighborhood and community parks like those the commenter is referring to are generally under the jurisdiction of the local community services districts. Environmental analysis of park facilities (either through subdivision review or through review of projects submitted by districts) is required to consider air quality and noise factors, among other issues. Policy 9.1.1.4 of the 1996 General Plan requires the incorporation of natural resources such as lakes and creeks into regional parks.

However, parkland, particularly active recreation sites that include sports fields, swimming pools, and similar high use features, can serve as a buffer between a freeway and residential use, such as has occurred in Cameron Park. The parks themselves can be noise generators. In regards to exposure to air pollution, while the traffic on the highway contributes to the overall pollution levels in the County, there is not a direct correlation between the proximity to the highway and exposure levels. This differs from carbon monoxide hotspots that are associated with idling vehicles at congested intersections, as described in Section 5.5-11 in the EIR.

Response to Comment 108-6 (GP): The Circulation Diagram (Figure TC-1) for each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives shows all major existing and planned roadway improvements. This includes the connection of Silva Valley Parkway to White Rock Road and a new interchange where those roads will meet U.S. Highway 50.

Response to Comment 108-7 (GP): Please refer to the Response to Comment 77-2.

Response to Comment 108-8 (GP): As stated in Response to Comment 108-5, policies in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives place the primary responsibility of the County to provide regional scale parks. Neighborhood parks are generally created through the Quimby Act requirements for parkland dedication for subdivision projects or by development by community services districts. The responsibility for locating new schools likewise lies with the local school districts. (Please refer to Response to Comment 77-4.)

Response to Comment 108-9 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment regarding the need for more parks are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 108-10 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) proposes that water be included as a part of the consistency review for all projects. The proposed policy requires the project be consistent with all "...ordinances, policies and regulations." *[emphasis added]* Policies PS-1g and PS-2d of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative require a finding that either public water supply or groundwater resources respectively are available prior to approval. Policy 5.2.3.4 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative also requires a finding of adequate groundwater, but there is no similar policy regarding public water. However, Mitigation Measure 5.5-1b would require the County to make specific findings of water availability for each of the alternatives.

Response to Comment 108-11 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding park policies and mitigations are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Regarding schools, the location of new school facilities is the responsibility of local school districts and not the County. School districts are required to comply with CEQA and, therefore, to consider air quality and noise issues. Also please refer to response to Comment 108-5.

Response to Comment 108-12 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding visual impacts are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The County has an adopted Wireless Communications Ordinance. Communications towers are currently subject to a special use permit in most areas of the County (with some exceptions for towers located in commercial and industrial zones). Utility distribution facilities are exempt from local regulations. However, the CPUC, which regulates utility facilities, has stricter requirements for facilities located along a scenic highway.

Response to Comment 108-13 (GP/EIR): Although there are many scenic, back-country roads, such as Deer Valley Road, in El Dorado County, the development of scenic routes identified in the EIR, Exhibit 5.3-1 in Volume 1, was based on the major roadways traversed by many people traveling within and through the County. Deer Valley Road did not meet these standards. Rural roads used by recreational cyclists will maintain their rural character due to the land use designations along these roads and no further mitigation is necessary. Policy LU-6a contained in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives requires the County to identify and protect scenic corridors along rivers and roads. Implementation Measure LU-F requires that the County inventory potential scenic corridors and prepare a scenic corridor ordinance. This process would allow further public input concerning identification of scenic resources and the contents of the ordinance. The Economic Development Element of each alternative identifies steps the County can take to improve its tourism and recreational-based economic benefits.

Response to Comment 108-14 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter’s position on pedestrian access and safety, and the suggestion of additional policy language and an additional implementation measure for the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Also, please see Master Response 16.

Response to Comment 108-15 (GP/EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.5-3(b) adds language to the policies contained in each of the alternatives that specify what should be contained in the County’s lighting standards. The County has adopted a lighting ordinance that already contains these provisions, codified in Section 17.14.170 of the El Dorado County Code. A review of the referenced web site (www.skykeepers.org/califord.htm) shows that El Dorado County’s ordinance covers all four of the identified areas of concern, with light encroachment and glare fully addressed in that organization’s evaluation.

Response to Comment 108-16 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter’s position on her preference for a revised Level of Service (LOS) standard for the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

The four equal-weight General Plan alternatives have different concurrency requirements that link construction of new development to the construction of the road infrastructure to support it. These vary from the least restrictive requirement (the No Project and the 1996 General Plan Alternatives) to a much more restrictive requirement (Policies TC-1i and TC-1j of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative) to provide the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors a range of concepts to handle concurrency. Also, please see Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 108-17 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 108-18 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter’s position on park-and-ride facilities for the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” General Plan Alternatives both contain a Goal (TC-2), and several Policies (TC-2a through TC-2d) and Implementation Measures (TC-H through TC-L) that require the County to work with transit providers to locate and develop park-and-ride facilities. Likewise, the No Project and the 1996 General Plan Alternatives both contain two Goals (3.6 and 3.7), three Objectives (3.6.1, 3.6.2, and 3.7.1) and three Policies (3.6.1.1, 3.6.2.1, and 3.7.1.1) requiring the County to work with transit providers to locate and develop park and ride facilities. It would be expected that those facilities would be located to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of those facilities. Locations adjacent to high volume roadways such as U.S. Highway 50 would be a priority.

Response to Comment 108-19 (EIR): The referenced policy (Mitigation Measure 5.5-1[b]) requires consideration of not just the project under consideration, but all approved projects. The relevant language of the policy is as follows:

“...A water supply is ‘sufficient’ if the total water supplies available during normal, single dry, and multiple dry years within a 20-year projection will meet the highest projected demand associated with the proposed project, in addition to existing and planned future uses within the area served by the water supplier, including, but not limited to, agricultural and industrial uses...”

Response to Comment 108-20 (EIR): The policy addressed in this comment applies to whether groundwater would be sufficient to meet the demands of a particular project that would rely on groundwater. Pages 5.5-62 through 5.5-65 of Volume 1 of the EIR describe the unique groundwater conditions in El Dorado County and why it is infeasible to determine whether the use of groundwater at one location would adversely affect groundwater use at an adjacent site. In summary, groundwater is found in fractured subsurface rock formations—pockets of water—in the County, and it generally cannot be known with currently available information if using groundwater in one location would affect groundwater at another location. A well may draw from a pocket of water on one site with seemingly sufficient capacity for long-term use, then could use the source up over time. Well tests are inconclusive regarding the effects of using one well on neighboring wells within the fractured groundwater zones. Well tests can establish the ability of a well to generally serve a development, but reliability remains an issue. Further, because groundwater is found in fractured zones between rock formations, there are no formal water recharge zones in El Dorado County. Thus, the policy that was developed to determine the sufficiency of groundwater was determined to be the most far-reaching feasible method available. In light of the circumstances regarding groundwater availability, the impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable after application of feasible mitigation. Please refer also to Response to Comment 85-53.

Regarding mitigation of groundwater pollution, Section 5.5.3 of the EIR provides a detailed discussion of the many programs and policies in place at the County that protect against groundwater pollution. The EIR concludes that impacts to groundwater quality would be less than significant. Please see the discussion of Impacts 5.5-5, 5.5-6, and 5.5-8.

Response to Comment 108-21 (EIR): As described on page 5.5-71, Policy PS-2d (Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative) was revised to remove the provision that would require demonstration that draft of groundwater would not adversely affect operation of wells on lands in the vicinity of the proposed project. This provision was removed because it was infeasible, as explained in Response to Comment 108-20. Well tests would still be required, as they are currently required by the County, to demonstrate that a well would produce sufficient water to support the proposed use, and the revised policy requires that evidence is provided to demonstrate that groundwater supplies are sufficient to support the highest demand of the proposed development. It is acknowledged that, because it is infeasible to determine if a new land use with a new well would or could affect an existing well, such affects could occur. For these reasons and others, this impact is concluded to be significant and unavoidable.

Response to Comment 108-22 (EIR): Please see Responses to Comments 108-20 and 108-21. As described, the combination of well test limitations and the nature of groundwater in El Dorado County limit the ability to determine the long-term sustainability of groundwater on a property (during drought or otherwise). That stated, the applicant would still be required, under all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, to demonstrate the groundwater is adequate to meet the highest demand of the proposed project. It is likely that high water users would require back-up systems (e.g., storage, contingency), not only to demonstrate sufficiency of water but, practically, also to ensure that the project is viable. This is one reason why, for instance, golf courses often have lakes; they are often used as irrigation storage.

Response to Comment 108-23 (GP): Existing County regulation in the Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control Ordinance, the County of El Dorado Storm Drainage Manual, and the County of El Dorado Tentative Storm Water Management Plan all have measures addressing storm runoff from project sites. Best Management Practices (BMPs) encourage the use of natural, or vegetative lined drainage channels, and detention/retention basins to mitigate the effects of increased runoff from development, to provide for biological removal of pollutants and to provide opportunities for infiltration and groundwater recharge. The existence of these regulations, coupled with the pertinent proposed policies in the General Plan Alternatives, led to the determination that Impact 5.6-1 was less than significant.

The use of pervious pavements in parking lots to provide for storm water infiltration may be possible in some areas; however, due to the slow infiltration rates in many areas of the

County, this type of design would potentially result in a supersaturated pavement section which would result in a loss of pavement strength, and a premature failure of the parking lot pavement. This potential renders the use of pervious pavements for public roadways impractical from construction cost, long term maintenance and public safety perspectives in some parts of the County.

Response to Comment 108-24 (EIR): Consistent with State mandate, the policy language establishes 50 percent as the minimum rate of diversion to be achieved. The policy will be amended to emphasize the desirability of a higher rate. See Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 108-25 (GP): The commenter suggests that the County adopt standards that would require a maximum level of energy consumption for new home construction. Energy efficiency and localized generation of power would reduce the need for additional transmission lines, thereby reducing the identified impact of potential land use incompatibility with new and expanded energy transmission infrastructure. It is not appropriate to adopt standards in the General Plan.

Response to Comment 108-26 (GP/EIR): The Environmental Management Department already provides public information on its web site and through other means. Numerous free household hazardous waste collection days are sponsored by the Department, and information is available at most public events such as the County Fair and home shows. The web site is www.co.el-dorado.ca.us/emd/solidwaste/household_waste.html.

Response to Comment 108-27 (EIR): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives include a policy that encourages the County to replace fleet vehicles with more fuel-efficient vehicles (Policy HS-8f). Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(c) directs the County to apply the same policy to the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. The measure states:

The County shall investigate the replacement of its fleet vehicles with more fuel-efficient or alternative fuel vehicles (e.g., liquid natural gas, fuel cell vehicles).

Vehicles that are more fuel efficient would include both hybrid vehicles and ultra low emission vehicles (which are typically more fuel efficient than their higher emission counterparts).

Response to Comment 108-28 (EIR): The commenter suggests clarifying the language of Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(g) to articulate what is meant by "common facilities." Staff agrees. The modification is reflected in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 108-29 (GP/EIR): The commenter suggests that a statement regarding the standards for pedestrian and bike paths should be in Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(g). This measure is intended to address air quality impacts by providing

alternatives to the use of motor vehicles for short trips. The quality of the paths is addressed in Policies TC-4a, TC-4b, TC-4f, and TC-4h in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, and Policies 3.11.1.1, 3.11.2.2, and 3.11.2.3 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 108-30 (GP/EIR): The comment suggests that "parks" be added to the list of sensitive air pollution receptors of the recommended new policy in Mitigation Measure 5.11-3. This policy already lists "playgrounds". Adding parks appears redundant.

Response to Comment 108-31 (GP): The Planning Department provides a subscription service for all Planning Commission and Zoning Administrator hearings. There is a nominal fee to cover the costs of mailing. Agendas are also posted on the County's website.

LETTER 109: JOEL M. KOROTKIN

Response to Comment 109-1 (GP): Consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act and as directed by the Board of Supervisors, the County developed four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. Because they represent alternative land use scenarios, the Land Use Diagrams are purposefully different.

The commenter requests the Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation for APN 067-051-02. This request is included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel is designated Natural Resources (NR). That Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated Rural Lands (RL). For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. While there is LDR in the vicinity, the RL designation is not inconsistent with the designations on surrounding land uses.

It appears that, based on the contents of the letter, the commenter supports the land use designation supported by the 1996 General Plan. While the No Project Alternative uses the same Land Use Diagram as the 1996 General Plan Alternative, restrictions associated with the No Project Alternative would prevent any future subdivision, which appears to be the intent of the request. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 110: FREDA D. PECHNER

Response to Comment 110-1 (GP): Subsequent to the production of the General Plan alternative Land Use Diagrams, the State Department of Conservation made an electronic database of its most recent *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California* MRZ-2a and MRZ-2b lands available to the County. That database includes the commenter's client's property, APN 060-480-31. The Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay area has been revised for this Response to Comments document. Accordingly, the commenter's client's parcel is now assigned the -MR overlay. Please also refer to Master Response 21.

LETTER 111: JO ELLEN PARLIN, THE PROUTY RANCH

Response to Comment 111-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation for APN 325-070-11. This request is not included in any of the four equal-weight Alternatives. The parcel is identified as Low Density Residential (LDR) under all the Alternatives. In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Furthermore, the MDR designation is not permitted outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers in this Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the land use designation is consistent with that of other parcels in the area. As with the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the MDR designation is not permitted outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers.

This request is part of a "family request" submitted by the commenter and two others (see Letters 112, 113, and 114). Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 112: DARYL AND THERESA PROUTY, THE PROUTY RANCH

Response to Comment 112-1 (GP): The commenters request the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation for APN 325-080-17. This request is included in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. In the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated Low Density Residential (LDR). This land use designation is consistent with that of other parcels in the area for this Alternative. Furthermore, MDR is not permitted outside of Community Regions or Rural Centers. Because the parcel is not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the MDR land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. This request is part of a "family request" submitted by the commenter and two others (see Letters 111, 113, and 114).

LETTER 113: ISABEL C. PROUTY, THE PROUTY RANCH

Response to Comment 113-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation for APN 325-080-01. The parcel is designated Low Density Residential (LDR) on each of the alternative Land Use Diagrams. In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designation is the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Furthermore, the MDR designation is not permitted outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers in this Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the land use designation is consistent with that of other parcels in the area. As with the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the MDR designation is not permitted outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. This request is part of a "family request" submitted by the commenter and two others (see Letters 111, 112, and 114). Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 114: ISABEL C. PROUTY, THE PROUTY RANCH

Response to Comment 114-1 (GP): The commenter requests Medium Density Residential (MDR) for APN 325-080-16. This request is not included in any of the four equal-weight Alternatives. Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the parcel is designated Low Density Residential (LDR). In this Alternative, the designation is the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel is designated Rural Lands (RL). This Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated Agriculture (A). This designation was assigned because more than 50 percent of the parcel contains choice soils. This request is part of a "family request" submitted by the commenter and two others (see Letters 111, 112, and 113). Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 115: LEAH WARREN

Response to Comment 115-1 (GP): One intention of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is to lower potential development densities in the County's rural areas. By assigning a designation such as Natural Resource instead of Rural Lands (as the Environmentally Constrained Alternative does to the subject parcel), maximum densities would be much lower. The purposes of the Natural Resources designation goes beyond the protection of wildlife values, but can also be used to reduce land use densities to reduce traffic in rural regions and to reduce the cost of providing infrastructure and services to dispersed residential development. Rural residential subdivisions, such as those creating 10-acre parcels, have been found to have an adverse effect on wildlife habitat (Leo Edson, Wildlife Biologist, EDAW, December 2003). The commenter's concerns regarding landowner's rights and property values are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 115-2 (GP): As the commenter notes, the County would develop detailed development standards within the Environmentally Constrained Alternative's proposed Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay subsequent to General Plan adoption. Implementation Measure CO-1 outlines the types of standards that may be considered when details are developed. Because General Plan documents are intended to provide general policies to govern development, the development of specific standards implementing the policy guidance of the Plan were directed to a subsequent process that could accommodate thorough and focused interaction with the public and decisionmakers. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will consider inclusion of an -IBC overlay as they deliberate the General Plan. If they choose to include an -IBC overlay, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may also choose to establish specific standards or to provide specific direction on post-General Plan adoption development of standards.

Response to Comment 115-3 (GP/EIR): Preparing detailed cost analyses of proposed policies and mitigation measures is not feasible at this time due to the uncertainty of what the ultimate plan may include. After the Planning Commission makes its initial recommendations for mitigation and policy/implementation measure inclusion and exclusion, it may be feasible for staff to take a closer look at costs associated with implementation.

This Response to Comments document includes draft implementation programs for each of the alternatives. While the programs do not assign dollar amounts, they do identify estimated staff hours. This estimate gives a gauge of how costly implementation may be, although other factors such as relationships to other implementation and mitigation measures and requirements of State and federal law must also be considered. The information included in these programs may be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. The final implementation program will be based on Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors deliberations.

Response to Comment 115-4 (GP): The commenter's concerns regarding the Environmentally Constrained Alternative Land Use Diagram are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

LETTER 116: LANNY H. FISK, PALEORESOURCE CONSULTANTS

Response to Comment 116-1 (EIR): The analysis in the EIR was based on general research of paleontological resources in El Dorado County. Based on the experience of County staff in preparing environmental documents in the County, paleontological resources had not been identified as significant concerns. Further, no comments were received on the Notice of Preparation of this EIR suggesting paleontological resources presented a substantial environmental concern and required analysis. In response to this comment letter, professional paleontologist Dr. Hugh Wagner was consulted and the responses below reflect his expertise.

Response to Comment 116-2 (EIR): The characterization of El Dorado County's geologic structure on page 5.13-1 of Volume 2 of the EIR has been modified in response to this comment as described below. Please also see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. The geology of El Dorado County is complex. The rocks represented within the County are typical of the central and northern Sierra Nevada. There is a basement complex consisting of pre-Cretaceous age metasedimentary and metaigneous rocks (350-225 Million Years Ago [Ma]) that were present prior to the emplacement of the Sierran Batholith (intrusive igneous rocks dominated by granite, though there several small ultramafic plutons east of Folsom Lake) during late Jurassic through late Cretaceous time (approximately 180-70 Ma). These rocks underlie a majority of the County. Incised channels accumulated sediment in these rocks subsequent to the late Cretaceous, and sedimentary deposits accumulated in these channels apparently during Eocene (55-42 Ma) time. Subsequent volcanism resulted in the deposition of sedimentary, tuffaceous and volcanic lava flow rocks during two different extrusive episodes. The first apparently occurred in early Miocene time (Valley Springs Formation, approximately 21 Ma) and a later episode designated as the Mehrten Formation (andesitic and latite tuffaceous sediments, debris flows and lahars, flows, and some thick sedimentary sequences between 13 and 5 Ma). These volcanic rocks are not just restricted to river channels and can be found on the surface of many topographic highs as well as in the southwestern portion of the County, north of where a single fossil horse tooth may have been collected (apparently at Camanche Reservoir, 20 miles south of El Dorado County, but locational data was not well recorded).

Following Mehrten deposition, Pleistocene-age deposits (1.8 Ma to 10 thousand years ago) have accumulated in valley, river, and cave environments. Holocene-age sediments, referred to as Quaternary alluvium, have accumulated on the surface of valleys and in river and stream channels in sub-Recent time.

Response to Comment 116-3 (EIR): Fossils are generally organized within the following categories: vertebrate (having a spinal column), invertebrate (lacking a spinal column), plants, and microfossils (fossil protists and prokaryotes). The value and importance of different fossil groups varies, depending on the age and depositional environment of the rock unit that contains the fossils, their rarity, the extent to which they have already been identified and documented, and the ability to recover similar materials under more

controlled conditions such as part of a research project. In general, complete and well-preserved vertebrate fossils have been afforded greater protection than invertebrates and microfossils because of their rarity. The following sedimentary rock formations are known to have produced fossils either in El Dorado County or in the same rock formations outside the County:

- 1) Within the basement complex in the western one-third of the County are metasedimentary rocks that may yield Paleozoic and Mesozoic fossils; these formations have apparently yielded some invertebrate fossils. There is no record of any vertebrate fossils from these units in El Dorado County at UCMP (Museum of Paleontology, University of California, Berkeley), the designated State repository.
- 2) The auriferous gravels (those that contain gold) of Eocene age are known to yield fossil plant material, although no definite plant localities in El Dorado County were found in these deposits at UCMP. No fossil vertebrates from this unit were located in the collections at UCMP. Fossil vertebrates are either very rare or absent from this unit.
- 4) The Valley Springs Formation is a dominantly rhyolitic volcanoclastic unit derived from volcanism to the east approximately 21 million years ago. One fossil plant locality was observed in the collections at UCMP from El Dorado County. The locality is unpublished and the specimens were not well preserved. The Valley Springs Formation is not known to be very fossil-rich and only sparse plant and perhaps one vertebrate have been recovered from this unit.
- 5) The Mehrten Formation is an extrusive igneous unit dominated by andesitic debris flows and pyroclastics, though several flow units including the Table Mountain Latite are present that range in age from 13 to 5 Ma. Local thick accumulations of sedimentary rocks are documented in this unit and are discussed by Lindgren (1911) in the Placerville basin north of the City of Placerville. Two plant localities were observed in the collections at UCMP that were apparently from the Mehrten Formation. Neither locality has been published, and one lacked source information. Along the eastern margin of El Dorado County, in the Sierra Nevada mountains, sedimentary deposits of the Mehrten are well exposed. The Mehrten has produced significant remains of fossil vertebrates in the vicinity of the town of Sonora, in Calaveras County, which is similar in location, relative to the basement complex, as is Placerville, where deposits of the Mehrten are well documented.
- 6) Pleistocene channel deposits are known to occur in the river tributaries in El Dorado County and may appear underlying deposits mapped as Quaternary alluvium at shallow depth. One fossil vertebrate locality was found in the collections at UCMP consisting of a single individual partially recovered under 15

feet of gravel resting on bedrock. The specimen from the locality could not be located at the collection.

- 7) Pleistocene cave deposits are well documented from two locations in El Dorado County. Seven fossil vertebrate localities containing important finds of fossil vertebrates (ground sloths, condors, bison, saber-toothed tigers, etc.) of late Pleistocene to Holocene age were located in the UCMP collections. One locality, Hawver Cave, was published by Stock (1918) near the town of Cool. Another productive cave fauna occurs along the Cosumnes River in the southern margins of the County. These cave localities occur in regions underlain by limestones in the western metamorphic belt in the western portion of the County.
- 8) Quaternary alluvium does not appear to be especially common in El Dorado County, primarily due to the relief. Alluvium will occur in stream and river channels and on the surface of valleys and as alluvial fans. No fossil localities were found in deposits mapped as Quaternary alluvium in the UCMP collections. Elsewhere in California, however, important fossils have been recovered in the shallow subsurface in regions mapped as Quaternary alluvium.

Thus, the most sensitive resources are the Pleistocene channel deposits that occur throughout the County and are unmapped, Pleistocene cave locations which are also unmapped, and the Mehrten formation, which has been mapped. Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document has been changed to add three exhibits that depict the Mehrten formation and its relationship to the project alternatives. As shown, there is a greater level of high intensity development in the Mehrten formation under the No Project and 1996 General Plan Land Use Diagrams than under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and the Environmentally Constrained Land Use Diagrams. With implementation of modified mitigation measures (see Response to Comment 116-7), none of these alternatives would result in significant paleontological impacts.

Response to Comment 116-4 (EIR): Regarding the scope of the EIR, please see Response to Comment 116-1. In response to this comment, a record search of the paleontological collections at UCMP and an extrapolation of known fossiliferous nature of the sedimentary rocks underlying El Dorado County were completed and indicate that certain areas of this county have a potential for yielding vertebrate and plant fossils. Utilizing the recommended guidelines established by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (1995), the paleontological potential of rock units within El Dorado County is provided in Exhibit 5.13-1 through 5.13-3 in Appendix C.3 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 116-5 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 116-3.

Response to Comment 116-6 (EIR): The staff recognizes that fossils are nonrenewable resources that need to be considered under CEQA, NEPA, and the Antiquities Act on Federal Land. In addition, as noted by the commenter, the Society of Vertebrate

Paleontology (1995) has established recommended categories of sensitivity for paleontological resources and provided recommended mitigation measures. County staff respect the diverse views of scientists in the field of paleontology, and seek to preserve and protect unique paleontological resources in full compliance with CEQA. Please see Response to Comment 116-7.

Response to Comment 116-7 (EIR): As correctly noted by the commenter, paleontological resources are recognized by CEQA as cultural resources. Each of the General Plan alternatives includes specific policies aimed at protecting the County's cultural resources. For instance, the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives include Goal 7.5.: "Ensure the preservation of the County's cultural resources." Within this goal are a number of policies, including Policy 7.5.1.3, which states in full:

Cultural resource studies shall be conducted prior to the approval of discretionary projects. Studies may include, but are not limited to, record searches through the North Central Information Center at California State University, Sacramento, field surveys, subsurface testing, and/or salvage excavations.

Both the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and the Environmentally Constrained Alternatives similarly have policies aimed at the protection of cultural resources. Goal CO-8 has been established "(T)o protect the County's significant cultural resources for their scientific, education, and community values." Policy CO-8b states in full:

Discretionary projects that result in ground disturbance shall be required to provide onsite monitoring during construction for the presence of cultural resources by a qualified cultural resource specialist.

Policy CO-8d states:

Discretionary projects that may cause a substantial impact to a cultural resource shall be required to avoid or substantially reduce the adverse effect(s).

These policies are cited in the EIR, Volume 2 on pages 5.13-14 through 5.13-22. The EIR added mitigation measures to more specifically protect cultural resources (see Mitigation Measure 5.13-1(c) as it applies to each alternative, pages 5.13-24 and 5.13-27 through 5.13-28 of the EIR), and to extend protection of cultural resources to ministerial development (see Mitigation Measure 5.13-1(b) on page 5.13-23, which applies to all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives).

These policies and mitigation measures fully address impacts to cultural resources. The mitigation measures cited above have been modified in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document and the policies cited above have been modified in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document so they more clearly apply to paleontological resources.

Response to Comment 116-8 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed by the commenter are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 117: GEORGE AND SUE MEGEE

Response to Comment 117-1 (GP): It is recognized that the documents are detailed and comprehensive, and take time to review. Please see Master Response 1.

Response to Comment 117-2 (GP): Goal TC-1, and Policy TC-1i of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives and Goals 3.1 and 3.2 and their associated objectives and policies of the No Project and 1996 Alternative General Plan address the commenter’s concern about the capability of El Dorado Road to accommodate future development.

Goal CO-3 and associated policies of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus”, and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, and Objective 7.3.3 and associated policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives address the issue of wetlands preservation.

Goal CO-8 and associated policies of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus”, and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, and Goal 7.5 and associated objectives and policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives address the issue of historic cemeteries and other cultural resource preservation.

Response to Comment 117-3 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, regarding traffic safety on El Dorado Road, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The issue of traffic safety is addressed in many of the goals and policies of the General Plan alternatives and the implementation measures included in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives. Traffic safety measures will be a relevant factor in revising the standards and design manuals the County uses once the General Plan is in place.

Response to Comment 117-4 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment in support of Alternative #12 are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 117-5 (GP): The recommendation to adopt a plan that lessens impacts from development is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 118: MARY H. NUGENT

Response to Comment 118-1 (GP): The commenter's concerns regarding protection of farmers and ranchers is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. Please also see the Responses to Comment Letter 263, submitted by the El Dorado County Farm Bureau, and Letters 268 and 269, submitted by the Wine Grape Growers Association.

Response to Comment 118-2 (GP): This comment describes the process and frustration that the property owner has in obtaining certificates of compliance for parcels that were created many years ago, and for which historical records are either not available or difficult to find. The General Plan does not affect the process for the issuance of certificates of compliance.

LETTER 119: GENE E. THORNE, GENE E. THORNE & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Response to Comment 119-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Rural Lands (RL) land use designation for APN 087-190-21. This request is included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the parcel is designated Natural Resource (NR). The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. While there is RL in the area, the NR designation is not inconsistent with other parcels in the vicinity.

The commenter points out that the definition of the Natural Resource land use designation does not fit with the manner in which the County applied the designation in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The same is true with the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. The definition of the Natural Resource land use designation under both of these alternatives has been revised to reflect this oversight. Please see Sections 5.2 and 5.3 of Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

**LETTER 120: ERIK VINK, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION,
DIVISION OF LAND RESOURCE PROTECTION**

Response to Comment 120-1 (EIR): The comment accurately reflects the mitigation measure proposed to address potential ranch marketing incompatibilities.

Response to Comment 120-2 (EIR): Policy 8.2.4.2 in the 1996 General Plan Alternative identifies certain uses determined to be compatible with agricultural uses and requiring a special use permit. This policy further requires conformity with the Zoning Ordinance. The policy has been revised to add the requirement for consistency with the provisions of California Government Code Section 51238.1, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. No similar policies are in the Environmentally Constrained or Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives; however, Implementation Measure AF-E directs the County to develop procedures for reviewing and determining such conformity.

LETTER 121: DOUGLAS F. SMITH, CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD, LAHONTAN REGION

Response to Comment 121-1 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment representing the commenter's position on the importance of the relationship between land use and water quality, are noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please see Responses to Comments 121-2 through 121-5.

Response to Comment 121-2 (GP/EIR): The Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives defer to the adopted plan for the Tahoe Basin, TRPA's Tahoe Regional Plan (1984, as amended), and include goals and policies to preserve and protect ground and surface water quality. The No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives contain a separate Tahoe Element with policy language that also defers to or directs the County to work in conjunction with TRPA (Policies 11.1.1.1, 11.1.1.2, and 11.1.11.1) particularly as it applies to management of natural resources.

Response to Comment 121-3 (GP/EIR): The County is in the process of working with the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board to develop a Storm Water Management Plan for the Western portion of the County, per State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 2003 – 0005 – DWQ. And, per correspondence from the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board's Executive Officer, dated October 17, 2002, the County will soon be similarly working with the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board to develop a Storm Water Management Plan for that portion of the County within the Tahoe Basin.

Response to Comment 121-4 (GP/EIR): Storm Water Management Plans are building from the 61 management measures outlined in the State Water Resource Control Board's "Nonpoint Source Program, Strategy and Implementation Plan" (January 2000, as amended), a comprehensive storm water program for implementation by the County. This program will include dozens of Best Management Practices and will address the six minimum pollution control measures outlined in EPA's NPDES rules.

Response to Comment 121-5 (GP/EIR): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative contain a number of goals, policies and implementation measures which would be directed towards accomplishing "Low Impact Development" as discussed by the commenter. These include Goals CO-3, CO-4, Policy LU-3d and Implementation Measures LU-A, CO-B, CO-C, CO-D, CO-I and CO-K (in Environmentally Constrained Alternative only). Table LU-1 establishes density standards and maximum floor area ratios. In the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative, this would be accomplished through Objectives 2.3.1, 7.1.2, 7.3.1, 7.3.2, 7.3.3, 7.3.4, and 7.4.2 and Policy 2.2.2.2. The EIR proposes to modify Policy 7.1.2.2 (included under Objective 7.1.2 cited above) to include ministerial projects and to direct the inclusion of standards in the Zoning Ordinance concerning erosion and

sedimentation and to include the preparation of an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan in the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative.

LETTER 122: DWIGHT E. SANDERS, CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION

Response to Comment 122-1 (EIR): This comment summarizes the jurisdiction of the State Lands Commission. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment 122-2 (EIR): The commenter states that the agency has no comments due to budget constraints. CEQA Guidelines Section 15207 states that when an agency does not make comments, it is to be assumed that the agency has “no comment to make”.

LETTER 123: GEORGE LOWRY, FEDERATED CHURCH

Response to Comment 123-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Multifamily Residential (MFR) land use designation for APN 329-301-19. This designation is included in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. It is within the El Dorado/Diamond Springs Community Region in all of the alternatives. In the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated High Density Residential (HDR). One of the goals of this Alternative was to reduce overall density countywide. Since there were many other MFR parcels within this area, the density was reduced for this parcel. Subsequent to this comment, the parcel changed ownership. Please refer to Letter 224 for the request of the new landowner.

As noted in Response to Comment 66-90, the website database states that acreages contained in the dataset may not match the County's official records.

The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 124: ELNA NORMAN

Response to Comment 124-1 (EIR): The magnitude of the documentation is recognized (please refer to Response to Comment 162-2). The EIR contains a summary in Chapter 2.0 of Volume 1. Also the County's General Plan Project Manager has prepared an overall summary of the General Plan process, alternatives, and impact analysis. That summary is available in hard copy from the Planning Department or online at the following web page:

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

Response to Comment 124-2 (GP): The projected growth for the 1996 General Plan Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are close in total through 2025 but differ in area, type, and density of growth, particularly at buildout. Please refer to the detailed description and comparison of these alternatives in Chapter 3.0 of Volume 1 of the EIR. Please refer also to Comment 97-2 from Caltrans. The Caltrans Transportation Concept Report (TCR) for U.S. Highway 50 indicates the need for an 8-lane facility.

Response to Comment 124-3 (EIR): The comments in support of Comparative Alternatives #9 and #12 are noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 124-4 (EIR): The commenter is encouraged to review Chapter 6.0 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Any of the comparative alternatives (including Alternatives #9 and #12 favored by the commenter) could be adopted by the Board in conjunction with any one or combination of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 124-5 (EIR): The comment in support of "moderate, well-planned growth with protection of our quality of life" is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 125: STERLING RORDEN

Response to Comment 125-1 (GP): The commenter requests application of the Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation and removal from the Agricultural District for APN 060-710-08. The parcel is designated as Rural Residential (RR)/Rural Lands (RL) on all of the alternative Land Use Diagrams and is in an Agricultural District overlay on the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative Land Use Diagrams. Please refer to Response to Comment 200-1 for information about identification of the Agricultural District boundaries.

Regarding the LDR request, under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, land use designations were based on previously-adopted land use designations and Policy LU-1b, which restricts subdivision potential. This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 126: ERIC STRAATSMA

Responses to Comment 126-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment on the effect of the General Plan on seven future generations of county residents are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The General Plan has a horizon year of 2025. The EIR analyzes both 2025 and buildout.

Response to Comment 126-2 (GP): The commenter questions why County building codes would not allow experimental, self-contained housing such as earthship-type housing. The County Building Official has indicated that the County does, in fact, allow experimental housing as long as it meets basic Building Code requirements (Carey 2003). Currently, property owners in the County have constructed straw bale houses, rammed earth houses, foam block houses, concrete domes and a tepee.

LETTER 127: SANDRA WINTERS

Response to Comment 127-1 (GP): Please see Letters 13 and 52, which were signed by the commenter. The responses to these letters address the commenter's remarks regarding the land use designations assigned to her property under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives and the El Dorado Hills Community Region boundary.

As the commenter notes, her property is adjacent to an area that currently supports one-acre parcels. One of the potential applications of the Low Density Residential designation (which is proposed for the commenter's parcel in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives) is to provide a "buffer" between more developed areas and more rural areas. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative the LDR designation is appropriate to serve this purpose. For the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the land use designation is what would be appropriate given Policy LU- 1b, which limits subdivision to no more than four parcels.

LETTER 128: TERRY ROBERTS, GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

Response to Comment 128-1 (EIR): This comment is a standard acknowledgement from the State Clearinghouse noting that the DEIR has been properly received and circulated to the appropriate State agencies. No response is required.

Response to Comment 128-2 (EIR): Please refer to responses to Letter 120.

Response to Comment 128-3 (EIR): Please refer to responses to Letter 105.

Response to Comment 128-4 (EIR): Please refer to responses to Letter 122.

Response to Comment 128-5 (EIR): Please refer to responses to Letter 104.

Response to Comment 128-6 (EIR): Please refer to responses to Letter 78.

LETTER 129: ROBERT SALAZAR, CITY OF PLACERVILLE

Response to Comment 129-1 (GP/EIR): El Dorado County appreciates the opportunity to work cooperatively with the City to solve problems of mutual interest.

Response to Comment 129-2 (GP/EIR): The identified areas of primary concern are addressed in different sections of both the EIR and draft General Plan alternatives. Growth projections surrounding the city and within its sphere of influence, along with the issue of separation of communities, are discussed in the Land Use Elements of each alternative and in Section 5.1 of the EIR. Traffic impacts are addressed in the Transportation and Circulation Elements and Section 5.4. Parks and recreation issues are addressed in a separate element in the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives and are analyzed in Section 5.7 of the EIR, Public Services. Scenic and biological resources are addressed primarily in the Conservation and Open Space Element, with some policies in the Land Use Element relating to scenic resources. The EIR addresses these areas of concern in Section 5.3, Visual Resources, and Section 5.12, Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 129-3 (EIR): The City of Placerville is included in the Placerville/Camino Market Area. The boundaries of that market area are shown on Exhibit 4-1 of Volume 1 of the EIR and were established based largely on SACOG analysis (see page 4-8 of Volume 1 of the EIR and Appendix B of Volume 3 of the EIR). The impacts of the General Plan scenarios that would affect that market area are assumed to have effects on Placerville as well. However, the County has no jurisdiction over development policies or infrastructure planning (e.g., roadways) within the city limits. For this reason, the General Plan EIR addresses impacts in various topic areas according to the degree to which they can be assessed, but (consistent with CEQA) does not speculate on issues and policies under jurisdictional control of the City. However, the General Plan EIR considers the City of Placerville in Section 7.1, Cumulative Impacts. Regarding traffic impacts, please see Response to Comment 129-4.

Response to Comment 129-4 (EIR): The El Dorado County General Plan Travel Demand Forecasting Model utilizes a land use base organized into Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs). These TAZs cover the entire west slope of the County to include the City of Placerville. The land uses for each of the TAZs were forecasted by EPS. Please refer to Appendix B in Volume 3 of the EIR for information regarding their forecasting methodology.

These forecasts, and hence the traffic modeling effort, include all the TAZs within the city limits of the City of Placerville. The land use forecasting within the City was based on the City's adopted General Plan and made use of the same absorption and adjustment factors as used for the forecasts for the TAZs outside of the City. Those forecasts were then compared to other land use forecasts for the area, such as those done for the Justice Center analysis, to confirm their reasonableness. These forecasts were then used as input to the Travel Demand Model.

The EIR analyzed the major roadways within the unincorporated area that provide access into and out of the City of Placerville. The Travel Demand Forecasting Model includes the major roadways in the City. The major roadways that provide access to Placerville and were analyzed in the EIR include.

- U.S. Highway 50
- State Route 49 (north of Placerville)
- Diamond Road (State Route 49 south of Placerville)
- Green Valley Road
- Cold Springs Road
- State Route 193
- Mosquito Road
- Carson Road
- Newtown Road
- Cedar Ravine Road
- Forni Road

Significant impacts were not identified for these roadways at the city/county interface during the p.m. peak hour in the year 2025 under any of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, because they all operate at acceptable Levels of Service (i.e., LOS D or better). The only roadway that did not operate at LOS D or better was U.S. Highway 50, which is projected to operate at LOS F. However, it remains within the maximum volume-to-capacity ratios allowed by Policy 3.5.1.6 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policy TC-1c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives.

Further analysis of roadways within the City of Placerville was not considered necessary because the locations with the greatest contribution of county traffic (i.e., those at the city and county interface) all operate within the LOS thresholds established in the Plan. The detailed LOS results for these roadway segments under the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are contained in Volume 3 of the EIR under Appendices D-3A through D-3D.

The following table was prepared to show the difference in the traffic demand at the city and county interface that was forecasted for all the roads listed above. These are the 2025 forecasted peak hour volumes. All are p.m. peak hour except those noted to be the a.m. peak hour. As can be seen from the table, there are almost no differences in the volumes between the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The differences are all within the acceptable error range for traffic demand forecasts of 22 years out. In effect, this table shows that the difference in the impacts to the City of Placerville between the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives is negligible.

| 2025 Peak Hour Volumes on Roads Adjacent to the City of Placerville | | | | |
|---|------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Road Segment | No Project | Roadway Constrained | Environmentally Constrained | 1996 General Plan |
| U.S. Highway 50 – west of Placerville – am west bound | 2,190 | 2,280 | 2,330 | 2,350 |
| U.S. Highway 50 – west of Placerville – am east bound | 2,650 | 2,830 | 2,980 | 2,940 |
| U.S. Highway 50 – west of Placerville – pm west bound | 2,930 | 3,110 | 3,180 | 3,140 |
| U.S. Highway 50 – west of Placerville – pm east bound | 2,430 | 2,550 | 2,560 | 2,610 |
| U.S. Highway 50 – east of Placerville | 1,460 | 1,470 | 1,620 | 1,610 |
| State Route 49 – north of Placerville | 300 | 300 | 330 | 320 |
| State Route 49 – south of Placerville | 1,230 | 970 | 1,340 | 1,440 |
| Green Valley Road | 610 | 750 | 880 | 770 |
| Cold Springs Road | 630 | 710 | 700 | 700 |
| Highway 193 | 310 | 280 | 330 | 320 |
| Mosquito Road | 290 | 290 | 290 | 290 |
| Carson Road | 250 | 380 | 450 | 370 |
| Newtown Road | 350 | 350 | 350 | 390 |
| Cedar Ravine Road | 320 | 300 | 350 | 330 |
| Forni Road | 210 | 120 | 330 | 470 |

Source: Appendix D of Volume 3, El Dorado County General Plan Environmental Impact Report

This effect demonstrates that for the area surrounding the City of Placerville, the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives all have very similar land use forecasts. The combination of the lower densities (compared to the west end of the County) and the distances from the major employment bases of the El Dorado Hills Business Park, Folsom, and points west of the County Line, are limiting the absorption of new growth in the area. Additionally, several of the roads serving commuter traffic from growing areas pass around the City instead of through it. These include Pleasant Valley Road to Mother Lode Drive south of the City and Lotus Road to Green Valley Road to the northwest. These other routes are included in the County's proposed circulation plan for all the alternatives and also serve to limit the disparity of the impacts of new traffic on the City road system between the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

The County supports the concept of working with the City to develop an integrated transportation plan for the Placerville area. This plan could be used to base traffic impact fees that consider the City's contribution to improvement needs in the County and the County's contribution to improvement needs in the City. This plan could be prepared as an

implementation step of the General Plan in compliance with policies such as 3.2.2.1, 3.3.1.1, 3.3.2.1, and 3.5.1.2 contained in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 129-5 (GP/EIR): Policy 2.2.2.5 describes the purpose of the NJ, Non-Jurisdictional overlay designation in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. In addition, there are specific directions in Subsection A, C, and D regarding cooperation between the cities, specifically the City of Placerville, and the County. No similar policy language is contained in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative or Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. New policies and an implementation measure have been added to these alternatives to address this issue as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 129-6 (EIR): The EIR references recreational facilities in the City of Placerville in Table 5.7-9, Volume 1 of the EIR as part of the existing conditions documentation for El Dorado County. Impact 5.7-5 states that development in El Dorado County and proposed General Plan policies will affect parks and recreational facilities in unincorporated areas of the County. Mitigation Measure 5.7-5 calls for a funding program that would allow for the development of new park facilities in response to the demand for new housing accommodated by the proposed General Plan alternatives. The intent and expectation is that sufficient recreational facilities will be set aside/purchased and developed to meet the needs of future county residents. By providing sufficient facilities, existing recreational facilities in Placerville would not be expected to deteriorate as a result of county resident overuse. It is acknowledged that new residents in the County could potentially also use City facilities, not just new facilities in the County. At the same time, new park facilities being developed in the County as part of the proposed mitigation measure could be used by City residents. On balance, there would be no expected net increase in the use of City park facilities that would require additional or revised mitigation measures as part of the EIR.

Response to Comment 129-7 (GP): Although the intent of Policies LU-2a and LU-2b were to direct orderly growth within the city limits and spheres of influence before extending out into the rural regions of the County, the County agrees that coordination between the jurisdictions is appropriate and desirable and agrees that language similar to that in Policy 2.2.2.5 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative should be included in the other alternatives. Please refer to Response to Comment 129-5.

Response to Comment 129-8 (GP/EIR): The Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay designation contained in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative includes the Weber Creek area south and west of the City of Placerville. If this overlay is included in the final adopted General Plan, the biotic resource protection requested in this comment will be provided. Each of the alternatives shows the Texas Hill Reservoir "take area" on the Land Use Diagram. The "take area" is designated as Open Space (OS). There is some question whether OS is the most appropriate designation for that area, and an alternative would be to provide a base land use designation representing the existing land use

pattern, with a special overlay designation to identify the limitations on development within the take area. Each of the alternatives includes scenic corridor policies to protect the historic and scenic qualities of certain roads, specifically State Route 49 and U.S. Highway 50 (Policies under Objective 2.6.1 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative and those under Goal LU-6 in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives). The latter alternatives also include ridgeline protection policies under the same goal.

LETTER 130: MICHAEL PATRICK DURKEE, ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE & MALLORY LLP

Response to Comment 130-1 (GP): Based on the contents of the letter, it appears that the commenter requests the Multifamily Residential (MFR) land use designation for APN 109-250-12. The parcel is designated as Low Density Residential (LDR) on all of the General Plan alternative Land Use Diagrams. The “existing regulations” referenced by the commenter refers to the current zoning, which is Limited Multifamily Residential-Planned Development (R2-PD). Under all of the Alternatives, the parcel is not within a Community Region or Rural Center. Therefore, the MFR designation could not be assigned. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

According to State Planning and Zoning Law, a jurisdiction’s zoning must be consistent with its General Plan. Subsequent to adoption of the previous (1996) General Plan, the County began the process of updating its Zoning Ordinance so that it would be consistent with the newly-adopted General Plan. Through this process, the Zoning Designation of the subject parcel would have been changed to one that was compatible with the adopted land use designation, LDR. However, the Zoning Ordinance update process was never completed because of the Superior Court’s ruling on the case *El Dorado County Taxpayers for Quality Growth, et al v. El Dorado County Board of Supervisors*. For more information on the relationship of General Plan designations and zoning designations, please refer to Master Response 7.

According to Attachment A of the draft Housing Element, the County currently has enough land identified to accommodate its regional allocation of affordable housing. It is accurate that the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) did not find the draft in compliance with State Housing Law – this is not uncommon for that agency in their review of local Housing Elements. However, HCD did not make any comments suggesting that the County does not have sufficient sites for meeting multifamily housing needs.

Response to Comment 130-2 (GP): The commenter’s statements regarding State Housing Law and the suitability of the parcel for development of multifamily housing is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. The County acknowledges that it did not meet its regional allocations in the previous Housing Element cycle (1996-2001). It is not uncommon for jurisdictions to fall short of the allocation goals. The updated draft Housing Element proposes a number of programs directed at improving the County’s success in meeting its regional allocations.

“Local politics” are not behind the assignment of the LDR designation to the property. As stated above, the LDR designation was adopted in 1996 and is consistently proposed in all of the General Plan alternatives; there is no change proposed in terms of General Plan land use designation. The zoning designation may indeed be changed to ensure that the

County complies with State Planning and Zoning Law. However, that process will not take place until a new General Plan is adopted.

Response to Comment 130-3 (GP): The commenter's request to maintain current density is noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

LETTER 131: BRUCE F. STALLINGS

Response to Comment 131-1 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 3.

LETTER 132: NANCY HALEY, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Response to Comment 132-1 (GP/EIR): It is acknowledged that any project (public or private) that results in the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States must comply with the provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, which is administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Goal CO-3 of the Conservation and Open Space Element contained in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Objective 7.3.3 in the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative provide policies concerning the County’s surface waters. The EIR (Section 5.12) discusses these issues and Impact 5.12-4 analyzes potential impacts to these sensitive habitats.

Response to Comment 132-2 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 132-1. Specifically, Policy CO-3b in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires that new development fully mitigate project impacts on wetlands to achieve “no net loss” consistent with the policies of the State and federal governments. Policy CO-3f of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative states that if avoidance and minimization of impacts of water features is not feasible, the project proponent is required to compensate for the loss at a minimum of 1:1 replacement or 3:1 restoration (2:1 for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative). Policy 7.3.3.2 of the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative requires compensation at a minimum 1:1 ratio. In addition, the EIR proposes several mitigation measures for impacts to sensitive habitats. For the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative, new policies are proposed to develop and implement an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan; adopt a no-net-loss policy and mitigation program and to apply an Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay to lands identified as having high wildlife habitat value. For the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative, addition of the -IBC overlay is also proposed (the Environmentally Constrained Alternative already requires provisions for the -IBC overlay).

LETTER 133: JAMES J. DIDION, J.J.D. PROPERTIES, LTD.

Response to Comment 133-1 (GP): When preparing an EIR on any project, CEQA requires evaluation of a “No Project” alternative as well as a reasonable range of “project” alternatives. The four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are intended to meet this purpose and direction provided under the Writ of Mandate. Please refer to Master Response 8.

The commenter’s support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

The commenter requests the Low Density Residential (LDR) or Rural Residential (RR)/Rural Lands (RL) at a minimum as the land use designations for APNs 042-011-25 and 076-310-49. Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the parcels are designated LDR. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcels are designated Natural Resource (NR). This Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcels are designated Agricultural Lands (A). This designation was assigned because more than 50 percent of the parcels contain choice soils.

LETTER 134: GARY AND NANCY FLETCHER

Response to Comment 134-1 (GP): The commenters' preference to have the Low Density Residential (LDR) designation applied to their property and opposition to the 1996 General Plan Alternative land use designation is noted for the record. Table A-3 of Volume 2 of the EIR has been revised to reflect the commenters' request regarding misrepresentation by another landowner in their neighborhood. The subject property (110-020-35) is evaluated as LDR in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives.

Response to Comment 134-2 (GP): One of the intents of establishing Community Regions is to specify areas where greater residential density is appropriate. Through the definitions of its land use designations, the County has identified Multifamily Residential, High Density Residential, and Medium Density Residential as land uses that are appropriate in Community Regions and Rural Centers (and inappropriate outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers). If the commenters' parcel was included in the El Dorado Hills Community Region, its land use designation would need to be Medium Density Residential at a minimum to comply with County policy. The exception to this in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative involves larger parcels within Community Regions and Rural Centers that are surrounded by smaller parcels; this is based on the restriction of subdivision under this alternative (see pages 20 and 21 of the Draft Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative document). Exceptions also occur in the 1996 General Plan Alternative; these are the result of decisions rendered by the decisionmakers that approved the General Plan in 1996, upon which the 1996 General Plan Alternative is based.

Response to Comment 134-3 (GP): The General Plan land use designations have no direct tie to the Covenants, Codes, and Restrictions (CCRs) that apply in the commenters' neighborhood. The General Plan land use designations do not override CCR guidelines. Regardless of which alternative is selected, the CCRs would remain in effect. Changes to the CCRs that would redefine the minimum parcel size (and thus allow development at a different density) would be the responsibility of the entity or individuals in charge of CCR enforcement.

Response to Comment 134-4 (GP): The Subdivision Map Act (Government Code Section 66410 et seq.) allows for subsequent subdivision of land that has been previously subdivided (Section 66424.1). If a property owner wishes to complete subsequent subdivision, he or she could only do so if it was permitted under the General Plan land use designation and zoning designation. If the General Plan land use designation and/or zoning designation would not accommodate the subdivision, the landowner could seek a General Plan amendment and/or rezone.

Response to Comment 134-5 (GP): The source of the name "Equestrian Village" is unknown to staff. The Assessor's map page for the area (110-020) does not label the area by this name. It is possible that this name has been historically used by some

residents. However, the area in question is not officially known as “Equestrian Village” in available County records.

LETTER 135: (INTENTIONALLY BLANK)

LETTER 136: RICK WILLIAMS AND DAVE CORDER

Response to Comment 136-1 (GP): This parcel-specific request is a reiteration of the request outlined in Letter 82. Please see Response to Comment 82-1.

LETTER 137: JIM AND LINDA GREEN

Response to Comment 137-1 (GP/EIR): Table A-3 of Volume 2 of the EIR has been revised to reflect the commenters' request.

Response to Comment 137-2 (GP): The draft General Plan alternative Land Use Diagrams are intended to provide a range of land use scenarios for the Board's consideration. Similarly, the California Environmental Quality Act requires jurisdictions to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives when completing an Environmental Impact Report for a proposed project (in this case, the proposed project is a new El Dorado County General Plan). One of the key differences in the alternative diagrams is variation in land use patterns, including the Community Region boundaries. These variations are intended to accommodate the goals and policies of the General Plan alternatives, as outlined in the General Plan documents.

As noted in Response to Comment 134-2, the General Plan alternative documents give direction on appropriate land use designations within Community Regions. If the Community Region boundary is placed along Lakehills Drive, the commenters' parcel could not be identified as Medium Density Residential (MDR), consistent with County policy. The commenters' preference to remain outside of the El Dorado Hills Community Region and to have the Low Density Residential designation assigned to their property is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. The commenters' concerns regarding the potential effects of applying the MDR designation are also noted for the record.

Response to Comment 137-3 (GP): The commenter is correct in her statement that limited agricultural use is allowed under the MDR designation. Parcels having the MDR General Plan land use designation could have one of a number of residential zoning designations, based on the current Zoning Ordinance: One-Acre Residential (R1A), Single Family Two-Acre Residential (R2A), Single Family Three-Acre Residential (R3A), and Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE5). Pursuant to the current Zoning Ordinance, a landowner must have a minimum of one acre in order to keep a horse on the property.

The commenters' concern regarding the potential impacts upon rural quality of life are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 137-4 (GP): The commenters' preferences for application of the LDR designation to their parcel and support of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative are noted for the record.

LETTER 138: LEWIS MOELLER

Response to Comment 138-1 (GP): The Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan was not adopted as part of the 1996 General Plan and is not proposed for adoption as a part of any of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment on the need for multipurpose trails for mountain biking are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 138-2 (GP): Currently, only two trails are under the jurisdiction of the County. A portion of the El Dorado Trail, from Parkway Road to Camino Heights is a multipurpose trail for use in bicycling, hiking, and horseback riding. The Rubicon Trail (currently in the master planning stages) is a single purpose trail for use by off-road vehicles. Please also refer to Master Response 17.

Response to Comment 138-3 (GP): Opportunities for public input will be available during the update process of the *Biking Master Plan* and *Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan*. The Trails Advisory Committee is an advisory committee to the Board of Supervisors. The commenter is advised to contact the Board office to inquire about applying for membership to that Committee.

Response to Comment 138-4 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 67-1, 138-1 and 138-3. Goal PR-3 in the Parks and Recreation Element of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Objective 9.1.2 of the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative provide for a multipurpose trail system.

LETTER 139: RON REGAN, DIAMOND SPRINGS OWNERS ASSOCIATION

Response to Comment 139-1 (GP): The commenter's property, APN 054-431-21, is identified as Multifamily Residential (MFR) on all General Plan alternative Land Use Diagrams. A split General Plan land use designation is not proposed. A review of the current zoning map for the parcel indicates that it has split zoning. It is assumed that the split zoning is what the commenter is referring to in his letter.

Once a new General Plan is adopted, the County will pursue an update of its Zoning Ordinance, consistent with State law. At the time the Zoning Ordinance is updated, the County will evaluate the split zoning issue as well as zoning consistency with the adopted General Plan land use designations.

LETTER 140: LEWIS HACKETT

Response to Comment 140-1 (GP): Table A-3 of Volume 2 of the EIR has been revised to reflect the commenter's request regarding misrepresentation by another landowner in his neighborhood.

Response to Comment 140-2 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please see Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between land use designations and zoning.

The General Plan land use designations have no direct tie to the Covenants, Codes, and Restrictions (CCRs) that apply in the commenter's neighborhood. The General Plan land use designations do not override CCR guidelines. Regardless of which alternative is selected, the CCRs would remain in effect. Changes to the CCRs that would redefine the minimum parcel size (and thus allow development at a different density) would be the responsibility of the entity in charge of CCR enforcement.

The commenter's preference for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative or Environmentally Constrained Alternative and to retain a Low Density Residential or Medium Density Residential designation on his property is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

LETTER 141: DON HARTLEY

Response to Comment 141-1(GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 141-2 (GP): The commenter describes his view of the history of the 1996 General Plan, the ensuing lawsuit, and the Writ of Mandate. No response is necessary. Please see Master Response 3.

Response to Comment 141-3 (GP): The commenter reiterates his support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative and the reasons why. Further response is not necessary. This information will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 141-4 (GP): Please see Response to Comment 67-1 and Master Response 8. A history of the process of identifying General Plan alternatives is provided in Volume 1 of the EIR commencing on page 3-9.

Response to Comment 141-5 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative were developed using very different approaches (see Master Response 8). This is reflected in differences in key policy areas and in the Land Use Diagrams for each. In conjunction with the release of the Draft General Plan, the Planning Department also released a document that identifies differences between the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. This chart is available in hard copy from the Planning Department and online at the following website:

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

With respect to the prior County and public work on the 1996 General Plan, this is fully reflected in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. This was among the reasons that very few changes were made to this alternative from what was adopted in 1996.

Response to Comment 141-6 (GP): The four equal-weight General Plan Alternatives were compiled by County staff based on direction from the Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 141-7 (GP): The commenter is correct that among the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives the boundaries for the Community Regions, Rural Centers, and Rural Regions differ. This is explained in detail in Chapter 3.0 of Volume 1 of the EIR. These changes relate to the premise of each individual alternative. The staff has prepared this information at the direction of the Board of Supervisors, for consideration by the public, the Planning Commission, and the Board. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 141-8 (GP): The commenter is correct that among the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives the land use designations on the alternative Land Use Diagrams differ. This is explained in detail in Chapter 3.0 of Volume 1 of the EIR. These changes relate to the premise of each individual alternative. The 98-day public comment period for the General Plan (see Master Response 1) was intended to solicit comments from the public on these and other changes. Similarly the hearings held during the comment period, and the hearings planned in February through June of 2004 (see Response to Comment 67-13, are also for this purpose. Please see Master Response 9 regarding the issue of property values. The staff is preparing this information at the direction of the Board of Supervisors, for consideration by the public, the Planning Commission, and the Board.

Response to Comment 141-9 (GP): The commenter's opinion regarding the Planning Commission and support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 141-10 (GP): The commenter's opinion regarding the General Plan process, and support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 142: KATHLEEN VAN DEN AKKER

Response to Comment 142-1(GP): The parcel referred to by the commenter, APN 110-010-36, is included in all the equal-weight Alternatives as Medium Density Residential (MDR). The owners of the subject parcel have submitted a request to the County to consider changing the General Plan land use designation to Commercial. The commenter's opposition to the application of the Commercial land use designation to this parcel, which is near her home, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

LETTER 143: CHERIE RAFFERTY, EL DORADO COUNTY TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR

Response to Comment 143-1 (GP): The comment suggests incorporating the provisions of AB1207 into the General Plan. Since this is now a statute with which all local jurisdictions must comply, it is unnecessary to have it in the General Plan. However, when the Zoning Ordinance is amended following adoption of the plan, the provisions contained in this legislation must be included.

LETTER 144: FREDA D. PECHNER

Response to Comment 144-1 (GP): This letter is a repeat of Letter 110. Please see the response to that letter.

LETTER 145: DENNIS PETERSON

Response to Comment 145-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between land use designations and zoning.

Based on the contents of the letter, it appears that the commenter wishes to have the Low Density Residential (LDR) designation assigned to APN 096-120-49. This request is included in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated Rural Lands (RL). For this Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. While there is LDR in the vicinity, the RL designation is not inconsistent with the designations on surrounding land uses. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 146: NICK J. AND GRACE P. SCHUBIN

Response to Comment 146-1 (GP): The commenter requests that APN 105-190-33 be removed from the Agricultural District. Under the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, approximately half of the parcel is within an Agricultural District. The Agricultural District boundaries were not changed from what was previously approved by the Agricultural Commission and Board of Supervisors. Please refer to Response to Comment 200-1 for information about identification of the Agricultural District boundaries. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel has a split land use designation of Rural Lands (RL) and Agriculture (A). The original Agricultural District boundaries affected the designations of agricultural lands under this Alternative.

The commenter requests that APN 105-030-04 be included in a Rural Center. Because there is currently not a Rural Center at or near this location, a new Rural Center would need to be created to address this parcel-specific request. Additionally, the parcel would need to be assigned a land use designation that is allowed within Rural Centers (e.g., Medium Density Residential or Commercial, as requested). The commenters also request the assignment of the Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation to APNs 105-190-33, 105-190-35 and 317-020-01. This request was not included in any of the General Plan alternatives. Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the parcels are designated Rural Residential (RR). In this Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcels are designated Natural Resource (NR) [2] and Rural Lands (RL) [1]. This Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcels are designed RL (2) and A/RL split (1). Regarding the A designation, please refer to the first paragraph of this response. Regarding the RL designation, this is consistent with other similarly-sized parcels in the area. For this Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 146-2 (GP): The commenters' preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record.

LETTER 147: NANCY HALEY, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Response to Comment 147-1 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 132-1 and 132-2.

Response to Comment 147-2 (GP): The statutory requirement to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on projects that may affect threatened or endangered species or a species proposed for such designation is acknowledged. Goal CO-5 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires the County to ensure the protection of State and federally recognized special-status species and their habitats.

Response to Comment 147-3 (GP): Policy CO-8a of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires the County to address the inventory, preservation, protection and management of prehistoric and historic resources. This would include a field survey and preparation of a report by a qualified archaeologist and/or historian. The County's *Guide to Preparation of Cultural Resources Reports* requires adherence to the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as well as to CEQA. If the project has federal involvement, the project also would require consultation with the State Office of Historic Preservation and adherence to Section 106 of the NHPA.

LETTER 148: PAUL RAVELING

Response to Comment 148-1 (EIR): The commenter's support for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and reasons for doing so is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 148-2 (GP/EIR): The commenter expresses concern that the No Project Alternative is not a viable alternative because the alternative could be changed by future court order. CEQA requires the County to consider the impacts that would occur if it chose not to approve a project but instead continued to operate under the existing rules and regulations. If the County did not adopt a General Plan at this time, the County's land use decisions would continue to be governed by the Writ of Mandate. The analysis of the No Project Alternative discloses the impacts that would occur if the County did not adopt a Plan but instead continued to operate under the Writ of Mandate.

In addition, the County could, after reviewing the impacts associated with each of the alternatives, choose to adopt the restrictions resulting from the Writ of Mandate as part of its new General Plan. Assuming that the Court would accept this form of a new General Plan, the Court's Writ of Mandate would be lifted. At that point the Court would no longer have jurisdiction based on the Writ of Mandate and future plan amendments would be at the County's discretion. Any subsequent amendments to that Plan would go through the same type of process as future amendments any other alternative that the Board adopts.

Also, please see Master Response 3 regarding the Writ of Mandate.

Response to Comment 148-3 (GP): The commenter's preference for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 148-4 (GP/EIR): Table A-3 of Volume 2 of the EIR has been revised at the request of a number of property owners that have alerted the County that an individual was publicly representing them without their permission. Additionally, the table has been revised to indicate specific requests that have been made by an individual other than the property owner for which the County has no record of similar requests from the property owner. The commenter's opinions and concerns regarding the real estate speculation are noted for the record.

LETTER 149: STEVE YONKERS, EL DORADO COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Response to Comment 149-1 (GP): The commenter's preference for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative policies in the Parks and Recreation Element is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 149-2 (GP): The EIR proposes a new policy under Objective 9.1.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives that would require the County to prepare, implement and regularly update a Parks Master Plan and Parks and Recreation Capital Improvement Program. Another new policy, applicable to all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, would require the County to establish a countywide development fee program applicable to all new development to fund park and recreational improvements to achieve the minimum standards for neighborhood, community and regional parks. The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment on transferring County facilities to community services districts are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 149-3 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 66-84 in answer to this comment. Also, refer to Master Response 16 for a more detailed discussion on Bikeways, Sidewalk and Pedestrian Access, which includes discussion of the bicycle planning documents referenced in the comment. Master Response 17 provides information on the use of the SPTC for potential rail use. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the Parks and Recreation Commission's position on the General Plan policies with regard to the El Dorado Trail, will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 149-4 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 149-3.

Response to Comment 149-5 (GP): This policy was placed in the 1996 General Plan because of the perceived need for active recreational facilities. The wording does not limit future acquisition to recreation-oriented facilities; rather it places the priority on obtaining these types of facilities.

**LETTER 150: PAUL T. CONVERSE, SURVEYORS, ARCHITECTS, GEOLOGISTS,
AND ENGINEERS OF EL DORADO COUNTY**

Response to Comments 150-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment expressing support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 150-2 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 4 regarding the Notice of Preparation.

Response to Comment 150-3 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding excessive detail are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives contain implementation measures that direct the County to adopt specific ordinances and standards as suggested by the commenter.

Response to Comment 150-4 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding vested projects under the No Project Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 150-5 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 9 on the issue of property rights. There have been and will continue to be numerous opportunities for public review of and comment on the various land use proposals being considered by the Board. The process is described in some detail in Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 150-6 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding EID's investment in infrastructure are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 150-7 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 3 on the issue of Writ of Mandate compliance.

Response to Comment 150-8 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 150-1.

Response to Comment 150-9 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 211-3 through 211-6, as well as proposed changes to this mitigation measure in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 150-10 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding lower densities are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 150-11 (GP): It is assumed that the commenter is referring to Policy LU-8b in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives in this comment. This policy directs the County to try to provide affordable housing for targeted income groups throughout the different communities in the County, and not just concentrate affordable housing in one or two locations. Where densities and other restrictions allow under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, programs and actions by the County would consider providing such housing in all of the Community Regions and Rural Centers.

Response to Comment 150-12 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 66-84 for further discussion on the roles of the Department of Transportation versus the Airports, Parks, and Grounds Division of the General Services Department in relation to bicycle paths as well as Master Response 16 for an overall discussion of nonmotorized transportation. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on the development and construction of bicycle paths will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-81.

Response to Comment 150-13 (GP): Although there is some overlap between bikeway and trails planning and the Circulation Element, hiking and equestrian trails are treated as components of the Parks and Recreation Element in each of the alternatives (Objective 9.1.2 of the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative, and Policies PR-3b and PR-4b, and Implementation Measure PR-E of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives).

Please refer to Response to Comment 66-84 for further discussion on the roles of the Department of Transportation versus the Airports, Parks, and Grounds Division of the General Services Department in relation to the overlap that exists between commuter versus recreational nonmotorized transportation. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on the development and construction of bicycle paths will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 150-14 (EIR): The commenter's views are noted for the record. Please refer to Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 150-15 (GP): The commenter's view that the concurrency policies could lead to development of infrastructure in excess of the County's needs will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in deliberating the General Plan as they balance the risk of such potential overdevelopment against the

risk of infrastructure development that is delayed or does not occur, leading to deteriorations in levels of service. Please refer to Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 150-16 (GP): Policy LU-6b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative prohibits the placement of roads and structures along ridgelines. There is no restriction on agricultural activities imposed by this policy. Although in a general sense, the good agricultural soils are concentrated in valley floors, in El Dorado County there are few larger valley floor areas that are considered prime agricultural regions due to the topography of the County. Additionally, orchard and grape crops produce well on slopes, and grapes may be more productive with some "stressing" (i.e. placement in less than ideal soil conditions to produce the best grapes for wine making). The effect of restricting development from ridgelines would be minimal on agriculture in El Dorado County. (Snodgrass, Bill, El Dorado County Agricultural Commission, August 2003, personal communication with Peter Maurer, El Dorado County Planning Department.)

Response to Comment 150-17 (GP): Funds for electric vehicle charging stations come from a variety of sources, the bulk of which are from California Department of Motor Vehicle grants (Otani, Dennis, El Dorado County Environmental Management Department, personal communication with Peter Maurer, El Dorado County Planning Department, September 2003). Although use of charging stations in El Dorado County is limited, they are utilized in the County as one alternative to the internal combustion engine, which is the greatest source of most pollutants in the County. However, due to changes in technology, the text of the policies addressing vehicle alternatives has been amended to broaden the scope and provide support for other options as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 150-18 (GP): The references to transit and its encouragement are not intended to give the impression that transit alone can completely handle current or future mobility and transportation needs. Rather it is a part of a comprehensive and integrated transportation system, which includes but goes beyond just roads; that seeks to maximize mobility of people and goods, while at the same time minimizing the environmental impacts of that system. It also must take into account the resources, most particularly funding availability and sources, needed to construct and operate the system. The EIR notes (for example at page 5.4-25) that it would be unrealistic to expect widespread transit usage in the County given the topography and existing and projected development patterns. Despite these limitations, however, transit currently plays an important role in the County's transportation system and is expected to continue to do so.

Response to Comment 150-19 (GP): The commenter is expressing support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 150-20 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding State-mandated housing requirements are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 150-21 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 211-3, which describes why existing water supplies were considered to be only those that are currently permitted or developed.

Response to Comment 150-22 (GP): Policy PS-2a in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives states, "The County shall actively engage in and support...new surface water supplies..." This would include new storage capacity. Policy 5.2.1.1 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives provides that the El Dorado County Water Agency support a water resources development and management program. Although not specific, water resources development can include the development of new storage capacity.

Response to Comment 150-23 (GP): The text of Policy PS-2a has been amended to more clearly distinguish the role of the County from that of the County Water Agency as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 150-24 (GP): This comment implies that the draft General Plan policies require the water purveyors to supply reclaimed water. Rather, Policy PS-3b directs the County to encourage the use of reclaimed water. Any such use must be in compliance with State water and health codes. Implementation Measure PS-D directs the County to work with the water purveyors to develop standards where the use of reclaimed water may be required.

Response to Comment 150-25 (GP): The intent of Policy 6.2.3.1 (1996 General Plan Alternative) is for an applicant to provide sufficient information so that the responsible fire protection district and the County can make the findings. The text of the policy has been revised to more clearly state this (see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document).

Response to Comment 150-26 (GP): Policy 6.2.3.2 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative does duplicate one provision of Policy 6.2.3.1; however, this policy goes beyond fire access and also discusses emergency egress and circulation as well. Policy 6.2.3.1 has been revised to eliminate the duplication, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 150-27 (GP): The uniform code name has been changed to the California Building Code. All revisions automatically become effective 180 days after adoption of a revision by the State Building Standards Commission (Carey, Bill, EDC Building Official, August 2003, personal communication with Peter Maurer, EDC

Planning Dept). This policy has been deleted (see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document).

Response to Comment 150-28 (GP): Policy 6.6.1.2 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative requires determination of whether a subdivision or parcels are located on a contaminated site listed with the State of California prior to approval of any subdivision of land. Under the analysis of Impact 5.8-4 in the EIR, a mitigation measure is proposed that would revise this policy to expand its scope to include any permit involving ground disturbance and adding language requiring remediation if any contamination is identified. Policy HS-7b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is also revised to include this additional language.

Response to Comment 150-29 (GP): The opinion expressed in the comment regarding transit services are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 150-30 (GP): The "rail corridor" referred to in Policy 6.7.4.3 of the No Project and the 1996 General Plan Alternatives is indeed the former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way running west from the City of Placerville to the west County Line near the City of Folsom. For additional information regarding this corridor, please see Master Response 17.

The only rail corridor in El Dorado County is the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way, for which the County has recently adopted a master plan. The potential use of the corridor at the western edge of the County for transit purposes is still under consideration and review. The County is working with the City of Folsom and Sacramento County to study the options and future alignment of light rail through Folsom, with the possibility of extension into the County.

Response to Comment 150-31 (GP): The commenter summarizes a portion of Policy 6.7.8.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. The rest of that policy states that if research determines or scientific evidence shows that there is a direct impact on vegetation from air pollution, the County should consider amending the General Plan to add new policies to address this issue. Appendix B.1 of this Response to Comment document contains a draft Implementation Plan for the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

Response to Comment 150-32 (GP): Most fire districts have indicated that they prefer not to have gated subdivisions. Although gates are an emergency access issue, the debate over gates also touches on other issues such as circulation, and community character. The policy was placed in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative as a means of bringing the issue up for discussion, and to establish a policy for future action by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 150-33 (GP): The comment suggests that additional language be added to the text of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative discussing seismic and geological hazards. The purpose of the paragraph in question is to provide general background on the hazards associated with the geology of the County. It would seem unnecessary to add language that is more of a policy nature in this part of the document. Slope stability hazards are covered under the term “unstable soils.”

Response to Comments 150-34 (GP): The referenced paragraph in these comments states that there is a fault zone along the western edge of the County and the probability of hazards due to an earthquake is low. Staff reviewed the USGS/CGS Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment Model, 2002 (revised April 2003) available on the California Geological Survey web site. This map shows that most of the County has a Peak Ground Acceleration (Pga) of 10-20 percent. For the western end of the County, from about the town of El Dorado to the Sacramento County line, the Pga is less than ten percent. Only in the very eastern part of the County, near the Nevada state line, does the Pga increase to 30-40 percent (California Department of Conservation Geological Survey. Seismic Shaking Hazards in California. downloaded from Department of Conservation website at www.conserv.ca.gov/CGS/rghm/pshamap/pshamain.html August 2003). The conclusion reached in the General Plan is that the Tahoe Basin is located in an active or potentially active seismic region.

Response to Comment 150-35 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 150-34.

Response to Comment 150-36 (GP): The purpose of the opening paragraph of the geologic hazards discussion in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives is to identify that soil types can lead to certain geological hazards, specifically landslides and erosion. The paragraph has been revised to provide clarity. See Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 150-37 (GP): While the source of the data on landslide potential may be dated, unless new data shows that the original is incorrect, it is no less valid. The remainder of the comment is correct, that landslide potential is a function of the steepness of the slope.

Response to Comment 150-38 (GP): Policy HS-4a of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative has been revised to indicate the County will maintain an inventory of the maps, rather than create the maps where they have already been prepared by other agencies. Please see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 150-39 (GP): The proposed additional phrase is not necessary. The list of items stated in the text that could potentially affect airport operations is inclusive of these items, but not restricted to them.

Response to Comment 150-40 (GP): The proposed revision to Implementation Measure HS-C of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives does not change the intent or action required by this measure. Therefore, no change is proposed.

Response to Comment 150-41 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding green waste and outdoor burning are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 150-42 (GP): The willingness of SAGE to share its information is appreciated.

Response to Comment 150-43 (GP): The text and policies in the Health, Safety, and Noise Element of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives are similar.

Response to Comment 150-44 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 211-3. County staff does not concur with the statement that obtaining new water sources is ministerial. To the contrary, numerous discretionary actions, from local (e.g., EID) to State (e.g., State Water Resources Control Board) to federal (e.g., Federal Energy Regulatory Commission) actions will be required, each of which will have a wide range of discretion that could affect how much and under what conditions new water will be made available.

Response to Comment 150-45 (EIR): Upon review of the suggested clarifications, information pertaining to EDCWA compliance with County Ordinance 4325 has been added to page 5.5-2 of the EIR. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for text changes.

Response to Comment 150-46 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 211-3. Potential water supply projects, including the Public Law 101-514 contract between EDCWA and USBR for Folsom Reservoir water (Fazio water), are not considered part of the existing baseline water supply for the purposes of the EIR.

Response to Comment 150-47 (EIR): The information provided in the comment provides additional details regarding Project 184. These types of details were not included in the environmental setting of the EIR for simplicity of the discussion and because they are not relevant to the discussion of potential environmental impacts (Impact 5.5-2) that would result from implementation of Project 184.

Response to Comment 150-48 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 150-44 and 150-46. EID is pursuing the use of 17,000 acre-feet (af) per year, but discretionary actions by other agencies will still need to take place that could affect this water supply.

Response to Comment 150-49 (EIR): As stated in Response to Comment 211-3, potential impacts are evaluated using a baseline that includes only the existing firm yield supplies. In addition, the changes suggested for Table 5.5-1 by the commenter would not change the significance conclusion of impacts from development of new water supplies (Impact 5.5-2), nor would they change the proposed mitigation.

Response to Comment 150-50 (EIR): Weber Reservoir has been used for irrigation supply, and therefore, is not considered an existing municipal supply source for the purposes of the baseline evaluated in the EIR. While EDCWA has access to up to 5,560 af annually from Crawford Ditch, EDCWA has determined that the firm yield for municipal supplies is projected to be about 200 af.

Response to Comment 150-51 (EIR): The potential impacts of Project 184 were based on the best information that was available at the time the DEIR for the General Plan was prepared and were based on the FERC Draft EIS (see footnote to Table 5.5-9). The Collaborative Agreement is reflected in the range of alternatives considered in the FERC EIS. It is not clear why the final Collaborative Agreement would alter the conclusions in Table 5.5-9.

Response to Comment 150-52 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 211-4 and 211-5 for clarifications that will be made to Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b).

Response to Comment 150-53 (EIR): The information leading to this conclusion is presented on pages 5.8-31 through 34 and is based on research conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency and the experience of the County Sheriff's Office. Wastewater treatment systems throughout the United States commonly show traces of oil waste and other hazardous material indicators. The EIR assumes that flushing some hazardous waste (e.g., oil, cleaning product remnants) down toilets could occur because it is a known problem. This is one reason many counties have instituted free hazardous waste collection services. There is no reason to believe there would not be similar incidents in El Dorado County. This information is also consistent with the extensive experience of the environmental consultant, EDAW, with wastewater treatment systems throughout California.

Response to Comment 150-54 (EIR): The comment is noted. Page 5.8-54 of the EIR is revised in response to this comment (see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document). The additional information provided by the commenter regarding evidence of seiche waves on the Tahoe shoreline is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 150-55 (EIR): The commenter's opinion regarding the placement of the EIR section on naturally occurring asbestos is noted. The environmental effects related to naturally occurring asbestos are primarily a human health and safety issue.

Response to Comment 150-56 (EIR): Background information on naturally occurring asbestos is provided on page 5.8-88 of the EIR. Much of the information included in this comment is already included in the EIR. No modification to the text is necessary.

Response to Comment 150-57 (EIR): County staff concurs that there is merit to the proposed change to Table 5.8-8 of the EIR. In fact, the EIR was not intended to infer this level of precision. Any acreage number provided is an estimate. Table 5.8-8 (page 5.8-91) of the EIR is revised in response to this comment (see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document).

Response to Comment 150-58 (EIR): Page 5.8-92, “Naturally Occurring Asbestos and Dust Protection Ordinance,” of the EIR is revised in response to this comment (see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document).

Response to Comment 150-59 (EIR): Page 5.9-1, “Regional Geology,” paragraph 1, of the EIR is intended to provide background information on the regional geologic setting of the County. The comment that portions of the text are not meaningful is noted, but County staff believes that general descriptive language is appropriate for inclusion in the EIR.

Response to Comment 150-60 (EIR): The background information on the regional geology of El Dorado County (page 5.9-1) in the EIR is based on information obtained from the California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey (CGS), specifically the *Digital Database of the Geologic Map of California and Adjacent Areas*, prepared by C.J. Saucedo, D. R. Bedford, G. L. Raines, R. J. Miller, and C. M. Wentworth (2000). This data source represents large-scale (statewide) mapping and is intended to provide a general overview of the regional geologic conditions in the County, as appropriate for a General Plan EIR. More refined geologic mapping is appropriate during project-specific environmental review.

Response to Comment 150-61 (EIR): This comment addresses several distinct issues related to the seismicity analysis in the EIR. The comment that earthquakes do not cause faults is noted; it was not the intent of this section to imply that this relationship exists. It is understood that the Richter scale is not used in California, which is why information on the Modified Mercalli Scale is also provided on page 5.9-2 of the EIR. In terms of effects of faults from outside the County, Exhibit 5.9-2 (page 5.9-7) includes fault systems located outside the County. It is noted that these faults have the potential to result in ground shaking in the County and have been considered in the impact analysis through the review of the probabilistic ground shaking mapping prepared by the California Department of Conservation, which is addressed in the “Existing Conditions” section of the EIR (page 5.9-5). An expanded discussion of the available ground shaking mapping (i.e., Seismic Shaking Hazard Maps of California, Peak Ground Acceleration, 10 Percent Probability of Being Exceeded in 50 Years, California Division Mines and Geology) is provided in this Response to Comments document (see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document). Based on this mapping, risk from seismic hazards is considered

relatively low throughout the west slope of the County, where most development in the County will take place. The potential for seismic hazards in the Tahoe Basin, which are relatively higher than in west slope of the County, are addressed in Section 5.14 of Volume 2 of the EIR. The use of the probabilistic ground shaking mapping was considered in the analysis of Impact 5.9-1, and the conclusion that seismic impacts are less than significant after proposed mitigation measures remains unchanged.

The EIR does state that the El Dorado County is located in CBC Seismic Zone 3 on page 5.9-30 in Volume 2. It is noted that “California Building Code” is the correct term, as opposed to “California Uniform Building Code.”

The comment also requests that liquefaction and other seismic hazards be addressed at a site-specific level. Site-specific analysis is not appropriate for a General Plan EIR, which provides a programmatic level of analysis. Please refer also to Master Response 2. Site-specific hazards would be considered during the geotechnical engineering and environmental review process for individual projects.

Response to Comment 150-62 (EIR): The concerns and opinions regarding the suggested requirement for further evaluation of buildings that may be constructed over faults not located on Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps is noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. However, because there are no active fault-rupture zones identified in the County, it is not appropriate to apply the same development standards to the faults listed in this comment as faults identified in the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning program. As new studies are conducted and faults added to the Alquist-Priolo program, the County will consider the updated knowledge base when applying development standards related to geologic features.

Response to Comment 150-63 (EIR): Page 5.9-30, “California Uniform Building Code” of the EIR is revised in response to this comment (see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document). These changes do not affect the EIR’s conclusions.

Response to Comment 150-64 (EIR): County staff disagrees that the determination of significance was improperly based on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, as suggested by the commenter. The staff agrees that the 1999 Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Map is also an appropriate reference document, and as listed in the “References” section of the EIR, the staff consulted this document in making its decision. The evaluation of both reference sources indicates that the impact would be less than significant; therefore, no changes to the EIR are warranted.

Response to Comment 150-65 (EIR): It is acknowledged that landslide hazards are present to varying degrees throughout the County. As stated at the top of page 5.9-43 of Volume 2 of the EIR, discretionary projects would be required to undergo a geotechnical study that would identify and mitigate for potential geologic hazards, including landslides. In addition, nondiscretionary projects would be reviewed for landslide hazards as part of

Mitigation Measure 5.9-2(a). The commenter concurs that a geotechnical study would address landslide hazards for development projects and notes that avalanche hazards may need to be addressed in a separate analysis where such an assessment is required by the General Plan.

Response to Comment 150-66 (EIR): It is acknowledged that CBC zoning for most residential construction and nondiscretionary projects would provide adequate design parameters to address geologic hazards. However, the EIR proposes the conservative approach that the all nondiscretionary projects would be subject to a General Plan conformity review process (Mitigation Measure 5.1-3[a]) to ensure that General Plan policies are being adhered to. In addition, Mitigation Measure 5.9-2(b) accounts for site-specific geologic conditions and requires a geotechnical evaluation only in areas determined to be subject to such hazards.

Response to Comment 150-67 (EIR): The comment is noted. The data reported in the EIR related to expansive soils comprise the best available information available for use in the analysis. County staff concurs that the impact will be less than significant.

Response to Comment 150-68 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(b) deals with potential erosion impacts associated specifically with development on steep slopes. Although this requirement differs from current septic system standards that apply to slopes up to 30 percent, they are not in conflict with one another. Slope restrictions on development apply to the slope of the land underlying the proposed structure (i.e., building pad) location, while septic systems could be located in areas with a different slope, albeit on the same property. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-404.

Response to Comment 150-69 (EIR): The comment is noted. Mitigation Measures 5.9-5 and 5.9-6 are designed to protect access to mineral resources and address associated land use compatibility issues. The information provided by the commenter related to potential adverse impacts on aggregate production due to economic considerations will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 151: LEO J. ALBUSCHE

Response to Comment 151-1 (GP): The commenter objects to the proposed land use designation Low Density Residential (LDR) for APN 070-261-82 in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. In this Alternative, new commercially-designated parcels were limited. Additionally, this Alternative prohibits the establishment of new commercial land uses in Rural Regions (Policy LU-4e in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative).

The commenter also objects to the proposed land use designations of APNs 070-250-01 and 070-250-05 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative (LDR). This Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 152: NICK J. SCHUBIN, BAYCO INVESTMENT CO.

Response to Comment 152-1 (GP): The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 152-2 (GP): The commenter requests that APN 101-030-32 have a split designation of Low Density Residential (LDR) and Medium Density Residential (MDR). This request was not included in any of the equal-weight General Plan Alternatives. Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the parcel has a split designation of Natural Resource (NR) and MDR. In this Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel has a split designation of NR/Rural Lands (RL). This Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the entire parcel is designated NR and is not included in the Pollock Pines Rural Center. In general, density in the Rural Regions under this alternative was scaled back, with growth directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. While there is LDR in the vicinity, the NR designation is not inconsistent with the designations on similar surrounding parcels. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 153: BILL BENNETT, COOL-PILOT HILL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Response to Comment 153-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment on the organization of the documents and the history of the Committee are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-2 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 153-3 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5 for a general discussion of how interim performance standards will be applied. With respect to the specific implementation programs noted by the commenter, Measure AF-C requires the County to develop a procedure for evaluating the suitability of land for timber and agricultural production in order to implement Policies AF 1-b (concerning evaluation of agricultural lands) and AF-4a (concerning evaluation of timberlands). Under Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(c) the County would apply the standards of the 1996 General Plan or the existing Zoning Ordinance in conducting a suitability review. The 1996 General Plan Policy 8.1.1.4 provides that the procedures set forth in “The Procedure for Evaluating the Suitability of Land for Agriculture” shall be used for evaluating the suitability of agricultural lands in Agricultural Districts and Williamson Act Contract lands (agricultural preserves) and Policy 8.3.1.2 provides that the procedures “The Procedure for Evaluating the Suitability of Land for Timber Production” shall be used to evaluate timberlands. Accordingly, if the County were to adopt the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” or Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the procedures referenced in the 1996 General Plan would be used.

Implementation Measure AF-F requires a process to identify and mitigate impacts associated with the loss of agricultural land for implementation of Policy AF-1f discouraging the conversion of agricultural lands to nonagricultural uses. Here the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives do not provide a standard. Accordingly, the standards of significance used in the EIR would be applied. With respect to the nature of mitigation to be required for conversions, the EIR proposes mitigation measures for each of the alternatives to require that converted agricultural lands be mitigated by replacement or conservation of an equivalent amount of agricultural land through a mechanism such as a permanent conservation easement (see Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(c)).

Implementation Measure AF-H requires the County to develop a procedure to evaluate the suitability of lands for timber production in connection with the Timberland Protection Zone program, policies affecting nonforestry related development on NR lands, and proposed redesignations of land to or from the NR designation. Pursuant to the proposed mitigation, the County would use the standards in the 1996 General Plan (calling for use of “The Procedure for Evaluating the Suitability of Land for Timber Production”) until new procedures are developed.

Response to Comment 153-4 (GP): The maps referenced by the commenter are available in the Planning Department office and need not be included in the General Plan. Builders, developers and the public are often referred to the maps when inquiring about properties located within these areas. In addition, the influence areas were taken into consideration when developing the land use designations by the airports.

Response to Comment 153-5 (GP): Program 10.1.2.4.3 of the Economic Development Element requires the County to consider both the public and private benefit of new regulations and ordinances. It does not require the County to do a cost benefit analysis.

Response to Comment 153-6 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment concerning Policy 10.1.5.1 in the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The commenter is directed to the Economic Development Element of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative (page 302) and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative (page 304) which state a focus of assisting existing businesses and entrepreneurs to grow and sustain success, rather than concentrating on attracting industry to the County.

Response to Comment 153-7 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative are out of date, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-8 (GP): Policy CO-1d in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative prohibits "disturbance" on slopes 30 percent or greater unless demonstrated that any public safety impacts have been reduced. This would include the location of septic systems. In addition, the EIR proposes Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(b) which limits disturbance of slopes 25 percent or greater outside of Important Biological corridor overlays areas unless it can be demonstrated by a California-registered civil engineer or an engineering geologist that hazards to public safety can be reduced to acceptable levels. It is noted that agricultural activities can occur on such slopes, just as other development can occur, but that restrictions would reduce the amount of erosion resulting from such use.

Response to Comment 153-9 (GP): Although the rainy season varies annually, as noted by the commenter, Policy CO-1c in both the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives specify the timeframes in which grading restrictions would apply.

Response to Comment 153-10 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment recommending the inclusion of Policy CO-1e in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-11 (GP): Implementation Measure CO-A(B) requires the revision of the County Code to include buffer standards for new development adjacent to lands with mining activities. These buffers would be based on an evaluation of noise, aesthetics, drainage, lighting, traffic and other characteristics of mining operations. In addition, the issues covered in Policy 7.2.3.2 in the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative would be addressed in any environmental document prepared for a mining permit.

Response to Comment 153-12 (GP): Objective PS-3 and three accompanying policies in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative propose methods to conserve the County’s existing water supply including water use efficiency programs; reclamation and reuse of wastewater; and use of water-conserving landscaping in all new capital improvement projects. In addition, the EIR proposes two new policies (one for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative, No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative, and one for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative) that require the County to support water conservation and recycling projects. Water quality is addressed in Goal CO-4 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Response to Comment 153-13 (GP): Goal PS-3 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative addresses conservation of the County’s water supply. In addition, PS-C implements Policy PS-3a by requiring the development of a water use efficiency program for existing and new residential, commercial/industrial and agricultural water users.

Response to Comment 153-14 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment on including paragraph 2 under the “Biological Resources” section of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative (describing the Important Biological Corridor overlay) in the final adopted General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-15 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about including Policy CO-6d contained in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative in the final General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-16 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about including the Agricultural Lands and Natural Resources land use designations described in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative in the final adopted General Plan are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-17 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter supports a shorter implementation period for a specific measure. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-18 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter makes a recommendation for a shorter implementation period for a specific measure. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-19 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter makes a recommendation for a shorter implementation period for a specific measure. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-20 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter makes a recommendation for a shorter implementation period for a specific measure. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-21 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter makes a recommendation for a shorter implementation period for a specific measure. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-22 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter makes a recommendation for a shorter implementation period for a specific measure. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-23 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter makes a recommendation for a shorter implementation period for a specific measure. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-24 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter makes a recommendation for a shorter implementation period for a specific measure. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-25 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter makes a recommendation for a shorter implementation period for a specific measure. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-26 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter makes a recommendation for a shorter implementation period for a specific measure. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-27 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about including the tree canopy standards and Policies 7.4.5.1 and 7.4.5.2 from the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative in the final adopted General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-28 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter supports a shorter implementation period for a specific measure. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-29 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter supports a shorter implementation period for a specific measure. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-30 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter supports a shorter implementation period for a specific measure. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 153-31 (GP): Staff reviewed the Land Use Diagrams for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative for these three properties. Cool Corner (southeast corner) is designated Commercial on both alternatives. The former Pilot Hill Ranch planned community is now designated Natural Resources on both alternatives. The former Straza property located south of State Route 49 has been acquired by the Bureau of Land Management. It is designated Open Space on the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The designation of Tourist Recreation on the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is in error and has been changed to Open Space. The Straza property located north of State Route 49 is designated Tourist Recreation and Natural Resources on the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Natural Resources on the Environmentally Constrained Alternative Land Use Diagram.

Response to Comment 153-32 (EIR): The commenter is correct that Policy 3.5.1.6.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policy TC-1c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives allow State Route 49 between State Route 193 and the County Line to operate at LOS F with a maximum volume-to-capacity ratio of 1.51. However, this segment of State Route 49 is not

projected to operate at LOS F under the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives analyzed in the EIR. According to the 2025 LOS analysis results contained in Appendices D-3A through D-3D in Volume 3 of the EIR, this segment of State Route 49 is projected to operate at LOS D under the No Project, 1996 General Plan, and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives and LOS E under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Response to Comment 153-33 (EIR): The relevant segment of State Route 49 was included in the 1996 General Plan which was amended by Measure Y. Measure Y states that no additional segments may be added to this list but did not remove any segments. Therefore, allowing this road to operate at LOS F is not inconsistent with Measure Y.

Response to Comment 153-34 (EIR): The methodology used to calculate LOS is the same for all of the General Plan alternatives in the EIR (refer to pages 5.4-4, 5.4-5, 5.4-6, and pages 5.4-18 through 5.4-21 of Volume 1 of the EIR for more detailed information). The only difference in the alternatives with regard to LOS is the minimum acceptable threshold established in the LOS policy of each alternative. Refer to Policy 3.5.1.1 for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policy TC-1c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives.

Response to Comment 153-35 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 157-6.

LETTER 154: EILEEN CRIMM

Response to Comment 154-1 (GP): Separation of communities is a factor in each of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, but to differing degrees. The choice among alternatives, therefore, dictates how much and where. Objective 2.5.1 and associated policies of the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative addresses separation of communities. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative propose Goal LU-2 and associated policies relating to visual and physical separation of distinct communities. Implementation Measure LU-A directs the County to establish standards for providing visual separation between Community Regions. In addition, the EIR proposes as a mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure 5.1-2), a policy to create distinct community separators through parcel analysis and possible parcel consolidation and transfer of development rights. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative provides the greatest emphasis on separation of communities.

Response to Comment 154-2 (GP): Interconnected systems of natural areas, open space, and trails are a factor in each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, but to differing degrees. The choice among alternatives, therefore, dictates how much and where. Goal LU-e in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative provides for flexibility and balance in design of new development, which could address the issues mentioned by the commenter, including open space and pedestrian and bicycle circulation. The policies under LU-4 address visual integrity and scenic quality. Policy TC-4e requires right-of-way and easement acquisition for bikeways and trails to mitigate the impact of development. Policy CO-3h allows for areas such as riparian corridors to be used for passive recreation and Policy CO-11a allows for open space acquisition. Goal PR-4 and accompanying policies address coordination of parks and trail planning. In the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative, Objective 2.5.1, providing for physical and visual separation of communities, particularly addresses these issues. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative provides the greatest emphasis on this type of green space through the creation of the Important Biological Corridors (-IBC) overlay.

Response to Comment 154-3 (GP): This comment gets to the issue of "concurrency" as it is used in the General Plan. The alternatives differ in their concurrency requirements, and the choice among them reflects a policy preference in this regard. Please see Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 154-4 (GP): The alternatives differ with regard to maintenance of historic character, and the choice among them reflects a policy preference in this regard. Objective 7.5.2 and accompanying policies in the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative address maintaining the visual integrity of the County's historic resources. Policy CO-9a of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires protection of places of historic significance by creation of an Historic Design Control

Combining Zone District. Implementation Measure CO-A provides for establishment of this district. Policy LU-6 and Implementation Measure LU-G concern creation of historic design review districts.

Response to Comment 154-5 (GP): Emphasis on recreational and agricultural industry is a factor in each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, but to differing degrees. The choice among alternatives, therefore, dictates how much and where. Agriculture, as it relates to economic development, is addressed in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative in the Agriculture and Forestry Element in Goals AF-1, AF-2 and AF-4. Tourism issues are covered in Goal LU-6 of the Land Use Element (relating to maintaining the County's visual integrity and scenic quality) and the Parks and Recreation Element (Goal PR-6). In the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative, tourism is addressed in the Parks and Recreation Element under Objective 9.3.5 and in the Economic Development Element under Objective 10.1.6.

Response to Comment 154-6 (GP): The alternatives differ with regard to environmental protections, and the choice among them reflects a policy preference in this regard. The EIR provides a full analysis of this issue and allows for relative comparison of various impact areas among alternatives. Chapter 6.0 of Volume 1 of the EIR provides a discussion of the "environmentally superior" alternative (page 6-36). Among the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, it is defined as the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Among all the alternatives, it is the Compact Development Alternative #12 followed by the Modified El Dorado Hills Development South of U.S. Highway 50 Alternative #9.

Response to Comment 154-7 (GP): The issue of nonmotorized transportation is addressed in many of the goals and policies of the General Plan alternatives (Goal 3.11 and its associated Objectives and Policies in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and Goal TC-4 and its associated Objectives and Policies in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives) and also the implementation measures included in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 16.

Response to Comment 154-8: The commenter recommends all new freeway over-crossings and under-crossings or interchange projects meet the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists to help preserve the rural atmosphere and attract residents to our county. As stated in Response to Comment 154-7, all four General Plan Alternatives address the issue of bikes and pedestrian amenities on road projects. Freeway crossing and interchange projects fall into the category of road projects and must therefore address these issues. The El Dorado Hills/U.S. Highway 50 Interchange EIR identified as mitigation the requirement of bike and pedestrian facilities, which have been included in the final design. The upcoming draft U.S. Highway 50/Missouri Flat Interchange EIR will likely do the same. Please refer to Master Response 16 for further discussion.

LETTER 155: RICK TODD, GEORGETOWN FIRE DISTRICT

Response to Comment 155-1 (GP): Please see responses to Letters 26 (Georgetown Fire District) and 265 (El Dorado County Fire Safe Council).

LETTER 156: SUSAN V. McIVER

Response to Comment 156-1 (EIR): The EIR finds that the projected level of service for the four-lane Saratoga Way in 2025, connected to Iron Point Road is LOS D, which is consistent with proposed level of service policies for each alternative. As noted by the commenter, the EIR identifies the LOS D operations as a significant impact and discusses a range of measures to mitigate those impacts. The EIR explains that a mitigation measure to increase the Countywide LOS standard from E to C was considered but rejected primarily due to the potential physical environmental impacts and feasibility of constructing new roadways and widening existing roadways that would be required to provide LOS C countywide. The commenter's view that the projected level of service is unacceptable is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

The comment references the EIR's discussion of the fact that poor levels of service projected on Latrobe Road and White Rock Road could worsen traffic conditions. The EIR notes this possibility to advise the public and decisionmakers that, depending upon the General Plan alternative and mitigation measures selected by the Board, high levels of congestion on Latrobe and White Rock roads could cause backups on to adjacent roadways, or changes in driver selected routes that would add traffic to roadways that would not otherwise experience that traffic. Although the traffic model used for the General Plan seeks to account for such "cross-over effects" between roadways, it was the EIR traffic consultant's opinion that nuances in driver behavior, the range of options available, and the high levels of congestion projected on the two roads referenced could lead to outcomes that varied from the model's projections. While peak hour congestion levels on Saratoga Way could exceed the projected volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.63 projected for 2025 under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, p.m. peak hour traffic would need to increase by an additional 52 percent before it would be inconsistent with General Plan LOS policies.

The comment also states that Saratoga Way would bring unacceptable levels of traffic into a residential area. An extended Saratoga Way would provide access to residential areas, but Saratoga Way itself would not be classified nor operate as a local residential street. The definition of acceptable levels of traffic in El Dorado County is based on the LOS policies contained in the General Plan. The EIR analysis confirms that acceptable LOS conditions would be provided on Saratoga Way. Further, the local residential street system that would access Saratoga Way is not designed in such a way that it would encourage or allow nonlocal traffic to cut-through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment 156-2 (EIR): The type of traffic modeling associated with a General Plan is a segment analysis. Under this approach, roadway segments are modeled to determine the number of lanes necessary on the various roadways that make up the County's regional circulation system to accommodate the increased traffic projected to occur based upon General Plan allowed growth (please refer to page 5.4-18 of Volume 1 of the EIR for a discussion on analysis methodology). Intersection analysis is

not an appropriate component of General Plan traffic modeling as it is presumed that as road improvements occur, intersection improvements will be constructed consistent with those road improvements to achieve consistent levels of service through those intersections. Therefore, no intersection analysis was performed on El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Saratoga Way as part of the General Plan traffic modeling and the requested information is not available. This intersection will be analyzed as part of subsequent environmental impact analysis when improvements to Saratoga Way are advanced to that stage of development.

Mammouth Way, Arrowhead Drive, and Finders Way are local roads within built-out residential subdivisions, and are not projected to carry regional traffic. The General Plan traffic analysis modeled only the County's regional road system. Because the listed local roads are not regionally significant roadways, projected levels of service were not computed as part of the General Plan Traffic analysis and the requested data is not available. Because the subdivisions served by the roadways are largely built out and because the roadways do not connect with other roads serving undeveloped areas there is little potential for increased levels of traffic on the listed roadways in connection with the extension of Saratoga Way. Some redistribution of local traffic may occur, however, if existing residents use those roads to access Saratoga Way to drive to Folsom instead of using El Dorado Hills Blvd to access U.S. Highway 50 to drive to Folsom. Any such increase in local traffic on those three roadways is not anticipated to exceed General Plan LOS policies or the significance thresholds in the EIR.

Response to Comment 156-3 (EIR): The Circulation Diagram for each of the General Plan alternatives was developed by evaluating the effects of projected land uses potentially allowed by the alternative on the County's existing regional roadway system and identifying improvements to that system necessary to accommodate the projected development levels consistent with the applicable level of service policies in that alternative. This process revealed that even under the No Project Alternative (allowing no further subdivisions other than for projects with vested rights), projected traffic levels would exceed the capacity of an eight-lane U.S. Highway 50 (i.e., three mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction) if parallel capacity was not provided. This finding necessitated development of additional arterial capacity parallel to U.S. Highway 50 for each of the alternatives. Because the City of Folsom has identified a connection of its Iron Point Road with Saratoga Way and because the area between the existing terminus of Saratoga Way and the City of Folsom is undeveloped, the Saratoga Way extension presents a logical and cost-effective means of providing additional capacity. The General Plan alternatives also propose developing parallel capacity through improvements to Green Valley Road and the extension of Sophia Parkway into Empire Ranch in Folsom.

The traffic analysis performed for the EIR explored the potential benefits of a new "south side" road extending westerly from the El Dorado Hills Business Park into Sacramento County to connect with U.S. Highway 50 at the proposed Empire Ranch interchange, or the Scott Road/ East Bidwell interchange (see Appendix D-3E of Volume 3 of the EIR for model results), and concluded that with this new roadway, the problem areas of Latrobe

Road and White Rock Road were alleviated, and these road segments would operate at acceptable levels of service. However, this analysis also found that even with a road south of U.S. Highway 50, the extension of Saratoga Way to Folsom is necessary for U.S. Highway 50 to meet applicable level of service standards under the 2025 planning horizon. Even with the new roadway, p.m. peak hour trips on Saratoga Way would be in the range of 2,200 to 2,250. If Saratoga Way was not extended, many of these trips would be diverted to U.S. Highway 50 and likely create LOS F conditions. The construction of this new roadway on the south side of U.S. Highway 50 is proposed as Mitigation Measure 5.4-1 (a), but because it would require improvements within another jurisdiction (Sacramento County) that has not planned for such a roadway, the ability to construct these improvements cannot be assured. Therefore the impact is deemed to be significant and unavoidable with this proposed mitigation.

While it might be possible to avoid the need to extend Saratoga Way to the City of Folsom by expanding U.S. Highway 50 to 10 lanes or widening White Rock Road, these improvements are not consistent with current plans by Caltrans or Sacramento County and cannot reasonably be expected to occur during the lifetime of the proposed General Plan. Because there is no physical solution to the U.S. Highway 50 capacity problem other than the extension of Saratoga Way and other parallel roadways, the only other alternative would be to revise the level of service policies in the General Plan alternatives to allow U.S. Highway 50 to operate at level of service F during peak hour conditions. This would also likely require allowing Green Valley Road to operate at level of service F. This mitigation measure is identified as 5.4-1(c) in the EIR.

The potential impacts on safety, noise, air quality, traffic circulation, land use planning, and housing associated with the implementation of the General Plan, and the resulting mitigation measures are detailed in Sections 5.8, 5.10, 5.11, 5.4, and 5.1 respectively. Any projects brought forward as part of the implementation of the adopted General Plan will be required to comply with applicable General Plan policies including mitigation measures proposed in the EIR that are adopted as part of the General Plan. "Quality of life" is not a specific category requiring analysis under CEQA, however, by identifying potential impacts, and implementing feasible mitigation measures, the "quality of life" for all residents of El Dorado County is considered.

Response to Comment 156-4 (EIR): The relocation of a two-lane Saratoga Way was a component of the U.S. Highway 50/ El Dorado Hills Blvd interchange project. Realignment of Saratoga Way is necessary to accommodate reconfiguration of the Interchange project. The EIR on the Interchange project examined alternatives for realigning Saratoga Way as part of the Interchange project. The Board of Supervisors approved the tangent alignment alternative for realignment of Saratoga Way and made the determination that a two-lane Saratoga Way would be allowed to have a lower level of service through 2015. Saratoga Way is currently two lanes, and as stated on page 4-9 of the U.S. Highway 50/ El Dorado Hills Boulevard-Latrobe Road Interchange Project Final EIR/EA:

- LOS E for Saratoga Way; *the County's roadway plan assumed four lanes on Saratoga Way based upon the County's General Plan which would result in LOS C on Saratoga Way in 2015. However, because this project assumes two lanes on Saratoga Way in 2015, based on the County Board of Supervisors' direction, LOS E is assumed as the level of service threshold on Saratoga Way. If and when the County Board of Supervisors decides to widen Saratoga Way to four lanes in the future, it would occur as a separate action, unrelated to this project.*

The approved Interchange project included realigning Saratoga Way but did not change it from its two-lane configuration, and acknowledged that the level of service would drop to LOS E by 2015 as a result of that decision, which would still meet the level of service criteria under Policy 3.5.1.1 of the original 1996 General Plan.

The planning horizon for the re-adoption of the General Plan is the year 2025. Under that horizon, the traffic analysis for all of the alternatives indicates that to meet Level Of Service policy requirements, Saratoga Way must connect to Iron Point Road in Folsom, and that it will operate at LOS F in 2025 unless it is widened to four lanes, in which case it will operate at LOS D.

As indicated in Response to Comment 156-1, Saratoga Way is not a neighborhood street; it is a frontage road to U.S. Highway 50, which abuts commercially zoned property. The extension of Saratoga Way is not expected to have any significant effect on traffic in existing residential areas in the vicinity of Saratoga Way. As discussed in Response to Comment 156-3, the traffic analysis performed for the General Plan EIR demonstrates that to mitigate the traffic impacts of the growth contemplated by 2025 under each of the analyzed alternatives it is necessary to connect Saratoga Way to Iron Point Road in Folsom, and to widen it to a four-lane divided roadway. The potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with the General Plan's circulation diagram (including the Saratoga Way extension) are addressed in the EIR.

The current level of service of Saratoga Way was not determined as part of the EIR traffic analysis because it is not currently a major street due to the lack of connection with Iron Point Road. The projected level of service in 2025 with improvements is LOS D, which is consistent with the proposed General Plan policies of all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 156-5 (EIR): Please see Responses to Comments 156-1, 156-2 156-3 and 156-4 for detailed responses to the issues and concerns expressed by the commenter in this comment.

The traffic anticipated under all proposed General Plan alternatives is considered to be significant and unavoidable. This volume of anticipated traffic can be accommodated if the recommended improvements and other mitigation measures are put in place. The General Plan traffic modeling for 2025 shows that under each alternative, with Saratoga Way connected to Iron Point Road, it carries approximately 2,220 to 2,360 peak hour

trips, and operates at LOS D as a four-lane roadway. If it were restricted to only two lanes, this much traffic would cause the road to operate at LOS F, which is inconsistent with General Plan LOS policies. If the roadway were to not connect to Iron Point Road, most of those 2220-2360 peak hour trips would be diverted to U.S. Highway 50, which would cause it to operate at LOS F, which is inconsistent with General Plan LOS policy. The General Plan EIR analyzed a new roadway extending from the El Dorado Hills Business Park into Sacramento County, as additional parallel capacity to U.S. Highway 50, and included this new roadway in proposed Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(a). However, this new roadway would alleviate the projected traffic congestion on White Rock Road, and Latrobe Road resulting from residential and nonresidential growth south of U.S. Highway 50, and does not obviate the need for the Saratoga Way/Iron Point Road connection for the reasons discussed above.

LETTER 157: LARRY RING, SAFEGROW

Response to Comment 157-1 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 153-2.

Response to Comment 157-2 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 157-3 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 153-31.

Response to Comment 157-4 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 153-32.

Response to Comment 157-5 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 153-34.

Response to Comment 157-6 (EIR): The west slope of El Dorado County is within the Mountain Counties Air Basin (MCAB). The MCAB extends into the Sacramento Valley and planning for air quality attainment is coordinated with several other air districts through the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). As described on pages 5.11-14 through 5.11-15 of the EIR, none of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives would be inconsistent with SACOG's planning and projections for attainment of air quality standards. The County, through the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District, provides measures that are applied to projects in order to reduce potential air quality emissions such that the County can support the overall efforts of the various air districts within the area covered by SACOG. Further, the EIR includes several mitigation measures that would reduce potential emission levels even further.

LETTER 158: WILLIAM BLANTON

Response to Comment 158-1 (GP): The correction is noted for the record. Please see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 158-2 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is designed to limit the extent of residential development in the County in order to limit the extent of traffic congestion on a six-lane U.S. Highway 50. As noted by the commenter, this alternative limits all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels. This results in lands with LDR designations inside Community Regions and Rural Centers. This designation was applied to parcels if a designation allowing a greater density than LDR would allow creation of more than four parcels. While this leads to some lands with LDR designations inside Community Regions and Rural Centers, the significant traffic congestion impacts associated with this alternative would be greater if additional parcels were authorized within the Community Regions and Rural Centers. The process used to create the Land Use Diagram for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is described in Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 158-3 (GP): The subject parcel, (APN 076-011-02) is outside of the Camino Community Region in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. Under this alternative, the 14-acre parcel could be subdivided into two parcels (see Government Code Section 66424 for a definition of "subdivision").

The intent of having General Plan alternatives is to have options for consideration by the decisionmakers. Additionally, the California Environmental Quality Act requires evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives when completing an EIR. If the Land Use Diagrams were the same for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, then the alternatives would not differ in that regard. The land use designations shown on the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative Land Use Diagram represent the policy described in Response to Comment 158-2. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 158-4 (GP): The suggested edit to page 8 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative would fundamentally alter the nature of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. Accordingly, the change has not been incorporated into this Response to Comments document.

The definition of Low Density Residential has been edited to provide clarity. Please see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for the change. Note that the definitions of Rural Lands and Natural Resource have been edited in a similar manner. The definition of LDR on page 20 cannot otherwise be eliminated, as suggested by the commenter, unless the land use designation is removed entirely.

The commenter's preference for rejection of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative if it retains the definition of LDR as shown on page 20 of that alternative

document is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

LETTER 159: JOHN E. AND CAROL M. DILLON

Response to Comment 159-1 (GP/EIR): The comment expressing support for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Please refer also to Master Response 13.

LETTER 160: DORIS DYCKHOFF

Response to Comment 160-1 (GP/EIR): The commenter is expressing support for the Comparative Alternative #12, Compact Development. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 160-2 (GP/EIR): The commenter supports adoption of a General Plan that combines specified components of each alternative along with Comparative Alternative #9, Modified El Dorado Hills Development South of U.S. Highway 50. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 160-3 (GP): The concern regarding timelines for implementation of the General Plan and regarding the need for conservative interim standards is noted for the record. Please see Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 160-4 (GP): The concerns of the commenter regarding protection of natural beauty in the County are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 161: JAMES L. DYCKHOFF

Response to Comment 161-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions related to the need for water expressed in the comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The issues of concern to the commenter are discussed in detail in Section 5.5 of the EIR.

LETTER 162: ROSEANNE CHAMBERLAIN, EL DORADO LAFCO

Response to Comment 162-1 (EIR): The commenter's efforts to supply feedback and suggestions for enhancing the General Plan EIR so that LAFCO may utilize this EIR for its purposes in the analysis of future annexation and incorporation applications is appreciated. However, it is not the purpose of the General Plan EIR to provide project specific analysis of any particular potential development application, but rather to understand the program level impacts associated with the long-term growth scenarios provided in each alternative, and to identify potential mitigation of those impacts.

Response to Comment 162-2 (EIR): Section 15141 of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that a DEIR "should normally be less than 300 pages." As a program level EIR for a countywide General Plan to replace a series of Area Plans following an extended public planning process, the DEIR was not prepared under normal circumstances. The length in this case is necessary to provide meaningful information concerning the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, and eight other alternatives are considered. Because the document is a program level EIR, it may not have the parcel-specific information referenced by the commenter. Parcel-specific information will need to be developed and considered by the County or other lead agencies at the time that specific projects are proposed. In order to avoid making the document even longer than it is, an effort was made to include only the information necessary for making decisions regarding General Plan policies.

Response to Comment 162-3 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 4.

Response to Comment 162-4 (EIR): The Board can adopt a General Plan containing land use designations and policies, the impacts of which were analyzed in the EIR. Please refer to Master Response 6.

Response to Comment 162-5 (EIR): The Land Use Diagram for the No Project Alternative is the same as that for the 1996 General Plan Alternative. Development that could occur under the No Project Alternative is described in Chapter 3 of Volume 1 of the EIR, and analyzed throughout the EIR.

Please note that the Court did not invalidate any specific land use designation, as suggested by the commenter, but rather found that the CEQA analysis was inadequate, and therefore set aside the adoption of the plan. Please refer also to Response to Comment 162-1.

Response to Comment 162-6 (EIR): Although a number of projects may be found to be consistent with one or more of the General Plan alternatives, that does not necessarily mean that they are fully entitled or will be constructed. There are any number of reasons that a project may not materialize after project approval, such as lack of financing, requirements for other agency approval (including LAFCO), inability to provide infrastructure, or simply the inability of the project to "pencil out" and be financially

feasible. It is understood that LAFCO will conduct independent reviews of proposed district and municipal boundaries and spheres of influence during the life of the General Plan and that LAFCO's decisions could affect the nature of development that ultimately occurs in the County. It would be speculative to attempt to identify which projects may or may not be ultimately constructed, and which may need further permit approvals from other agencies, and whether responsible agencies may or may not approve development already approved by the County. Accordingly, the EIR reviews the infrastructure and service needs of the totality of the development anticipated during the course of the plan, and at full buildout, which is appropriate for a General Plan program-level EIR.

Response to Comment 162-7 (EIR): The commenter questions the EIR assumption that the development agreements that the County executed in the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan Area are valid. The General Plan team assumed the possibility of development pursuant to the agreements executed by the County and various landowners in the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan Area because there has been no legal challenge to the validity of those contracts, which were executed several years ago.

Response to Comment 162-8 (EIR): Any statements by the County to the Court concerning the ministerial nature of future development projects would have applied only to the scope of the County's remaining jurisdiction over a specific project. Because LAFCO is a State agency operating wholly independently of the County, the status of a project before the County is not relevant to the scope of LAFCO's jurisdiction or authority to exercise discretion. As discussed in response to the preceding comments, as a program EIR, the document made conservative assumptions regarding the level of ultimate buildout under the various plan alternatives.

The comment notes that LAFCO may not approve annexations to service providers found by LAFCO to be unable to provide services such as water. The EIR notes significant constraints in the existing water supplies available to water providers and proposes mitigation to address that issue. (For further discussion of water supply and future potential water supplies, please refer to Section 5.5 of Volume 1 of the EIR, specifically the discussion of "Existing Water Demand and Supply", beginning on page 5.5-21, and Impact 5.5-1, "Increased Water Demand and Likelihood of Surface Water Shortages Resulting from Expected Development", beginning on page 5.5-31.) These existing constraints will likely continue to be taken into account by LAFCO in its annexation decisions. However, the General Plan horizon is 2025 and the EIR identifies numerous sources of water supply that may become available at that time. If additional water supplies become available such that service providers can provide services, LAFCO may allow annexations in the future where it has determined they are not appropriate today. The General Plan, of necessity, must plan for this possibility.

The No Project Alternative is not used as a baseline for evaluating impacts; rather the conditions on the ground at the time the NOP was released were generally used as the baseline, as required by CEQA.

Response to Comment 162-9 (EIR): Section 5.5 of Volume 1 of the EIR contains a thorough analysis of the potential shortfall in water supplies and Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) is designed to ensure that water service will be available without disruption to existing water users. Expired maps no longer are considered “committed “ projects and analysis of individual project impacts is beyond the scope of this EIR.

Response to Comment 162-10 (EIR): An exhibit showing expired maps as suggested in the comment is not necessary and would not provide any meaningful analysis in the EIR regarding the impacts associated with buildout over the anticipated 20-year horizon of the plan. The land use forecasts prepared for the EIR by EPS (March 5, 2002) provided a snapshot of existing commitments (previously approved projects) at the time that analysis commenced.

Response to Comment 162-11 (EIR): The No Project Alternative is not a baseline conditions scenario, but the continuation of working under the status quo of the Writ of Mandate with the 1996 General Plan Land Use Diagram through the expected timeframe of the plan (2025). Please refer also to Response to Comment 162-8. The EIR found that the impact of increased water demand from new development is significant and unavoidable (Impact 5.5-1) under each alternative, including the No Project Alternative. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the effect of over-commitment of water resources are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 162-12 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 162-8 and 162-11 regarding the No Project Alternative baseline conditions. The baseline conditions are generally the existing physical conditions in the County at the time the NOP was issued. The EIR analyzes how each alternative could be expected to affect those physical conditions at 2025 and at buildout. The potential uses permitted under each alternative is what has been analyzed, not the current land use for any given region. It is not the responsibility of the General Plan EIR to fully analyze existing or future LAFCO applications. Each alternative was evaluated against baseline conditions, not against the No Project Alternative.

Response to Comment 162-13 (GP/EIR): Neither “contiguous” or “coterminous” is used in Policy 2.1.1.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and it is unclear how the commenter has interpreted this policy to assume that LAFCO never approves noncontiguous annexations. The policy, instead, provides guidelines for the County in establishing its Community Region boundaries, utilizing a variety of factors. Policy 2.1.1.4, on the other hand, does appear to interchange the word contiguous with coterminous; therefore, the policy has been revised accordingly, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. The commenter has not identified how the use of other terms in these policies are inaccurate, or how this renders the analysis flawed, so no additional response can be provided.

Response to Comment 162-14 (GP): Policy LU-2b of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives makes no assumption regarding LAFCO decisions, but provides guidance for whether certain LAFCO applications can be found to be consistent with the General Plan.

Response to Comment 162-15 (GP/EIR): Although the referenced list of local agencies was not attached as indicated in the comment, staff has viewed the list on LAFCO's website. The discussion in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives have been revised, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document, to refer to this list for a complete accounting for all special districts. They have also been revised to include the McKinney Water District in the discussion of water supply.

Response to Comment 162-16 (EIR): The EIR identifies and evaluates impacts of the General Plan alternatives on a programmatic, countywide basis. Every effort was made to identify and include in the analysis as many service providers as possible. Some providers did not respond to requests for information, and others provided only partial information. Information from the three main water purveyors is included in the water supply analysis to ensure that the analysis is as complete as possible. The purpose of the EIR, however, is to evaluate general impacts on the County as a whole, not on any one service provider. A more detailed analysis of the impacts of individual projects on specific service providers would be evaluated in project-specific environmental documents.

Response to Comment 162-17 (GP/EIR): The boundaries of the Community Regions were established using several criteria, including policies of the individual General Plan drafts, existing spheres of influence for cities and special districts. Future development of those regions is analyzed in both the 2025 horizon and at buildout. Outdated spheres of influence are best addressed by LAFCO rather than through the General Plan process. If the spheres are amended, the General Plan may need to be amended accordingly.

Response to Comment 162-18 (GP/EIR): The staff is unaware of any prime agricultural land not included in its inventories in either the General Plan or the EIR and the commenter does not identify any. These inventories are based on information provided by the State Department of Conservation. Figure AF-1 in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives identifies not only the prime farmland, as defined by the California Department of Conservation, but also farmland defined as unique, of local and statewide importance, and grazing land. Similarly, there are three exhibits in Volume 1 of the EIR: Exhibit 5.2-1, "Important Farmland", which includes each of the categories listed above; Exhibit 5.2-2, "Williamson Act Parcels"; and Exhibit 5.2-4, "Choice soils", which as defined by the County, includes prime and unique farmlands, and farmlands of statewide and local importance. Those lands under current agricultural production have been included in one of the above categories. Where the reference to potential agricultural production on nonchoice soils is made, it is related to potential future conversion to agricultural land that cannot be anticipated at this time.

Response to Comment 162-19 (EIR): The level of detail included in the initial study and findings made by LAFCO for the Silver Springs proposed annexation to EID are appropriate for a project-level EIR, but beyond the scope of the General Plan EIR. This EIR provides sufficient information for LAFCO to make an informed decision regarding cumulative development in the County.

Response to Comment 162-20 (GP/EIR): The discussion of EID's sphere of influence in the EIR (page 5.5-12) was based on information provided by EDCWA. It is noted that LAFCO has not received a formal application for this sphere amendment. The EIR states only that environmental review would be required for this action. The suggestion that the County should facilitate removal of lands from spheres of influence is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 162-21 (GP/EIR): Impacts associated with water service, fire protection, public services, and utilities are each analyzed in at a countywide, program-level basis, in the following sections:

- 5.5 – Water Resources;
- 5.6 – Utilities;
- 5.7 – Public Services (includes fire protection, schools, and parks); and
- 5.8 – Human Health and Safety (fire protection).

While preparing the DEIR, purveyors of public services were consulted to discuss potential impacts on them from adoption of the General Plan. Some responded; others did not. Thus, the EIR identified potential service problem areas based on the best available information. As noted by the commenter, more detailed district-specific reviews are in the process of being performed by LAFCO pursuant to recent amendments to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act.

Response to Comment 162-22 (GP/EIR): Policy 9.1.5.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and PR-4c of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives encourage the formation of recreation districts where none currently exist to provide parks and recreation services. As suggested by the commenter, this language could be modified to include expansion of existing districts to serve the same purpose. However, it is beyond the scope of CEQA to analyze the possible fiscal impacts of either creating new districts or expanding existing districts. This analysis is appropriate at the time that such a proposal is brought forward, either as a development project application or an application before LAFCO. The policies referenced above have been modified as suggested and are contained in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 162-23 (GP/EIR): Section 5.8.5 of Volume 2 of the EIR provides a discussion of the impacts of development and wildland fire hazards.

Beginning on page 5.8-115 is a discussion of the regulatory environment and the interrelationship between local fire protection districts and State and federal agencies. Impact 5.8-10 identifies that the impact of development of each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, both to the 2025 horizon and at buildout will be significant and unavoidable regarding increased potential for fire hazards. Mutual response agreements exist between each of the fire districts and CDF, so that whether a parcel is located within a district or not, the closest responder will fight the fire (Russell, Fred, El Dorado Hills County Water District Fire Department, personal communication with Peter Maurer, El Dorado County Planning Department, December 2003).

Response to Comment 162-24 (GP/EIR): Each of the General Plan alternatives contains policies to ensure that adequate public services are available to new development in the County. Goal PS-1 and Policies PS-1a through 1g address these issues in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives and Goal 5.1 and its corresponding objectives and policies in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives also address these issues. The County’s determinations regarding compliance with these policies will be directly affected by LAFCO actions because of LAFCO’s authority to review the boundaries of public service providers as well as the ability of those service providers to provide services beyond their boundaries. And the information and findings developed by LAFCO in completing the required service reviews referenced in the comment will also be relevant to the determinations to be made by the County in evaluating a project’s compliance with the General Plan’s public service policies. Goal AF-1 and related policies in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives and Goal 8.1 and related objectives and policies in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives provide a direct framework intended to enhance the County’s short- and long-term agricultural future. LAFCO’s willingness to work with the County in implementing those policies is appreciated.

Response to Comment 162-25 (GP): If an incorporation or annexation occurs, the redistribution of housing allocations will occur, as stated in the comment. This will occur regardless of any policy contained in the County General Plan. It is not possible to anticipate if any such actions will occur, and therefore, it would be speculative to try to analyze the impact of such an action. If and when that were to occur, the subsequent update of the County’s and appropriate city’s housing element would need to take into consideration the revised allocations.

Response to Comment 162-26 (GP/EIR): There are a number of policies in each of the alternatives that discuss city-County cooperation. In the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives this is contained within Policy 2.2.2.5, and although it is the description of nonjurisdictional lands, a series of sub-policies within it provide detailed direction to the County with regard to development within a city’s sphere of influence. Comment Letter 129 (City of Placerville) provided recommendations regarding cooperation between the City and the County, and this was incorporated into new policies in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives, as provided in

Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. Please refer also to Response to Comment 129-5.

Response to Comment 162-27 (EIR): The potential environmental consequences resulting from implementation of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives on water and wastewater management services are fully described in Subsections 5.5.1 and 5.5.2 of Volume 1 of the EIR. The environmental impact analyses are based on recent and extensive quantitative analysis of the existing conditions and projected future conditions. Because the analysis addressed full development of the General Plan, the “existing plus project” is also a countywide cumulative analysis. The information for water demand, water supply, and wastewater systems was developed for regional areas within the County; therefore, current site-specific conditions where EID is unable to provide service are not individually identified. However, the impact analyses specifically identify that projected demand for water exceeds the existing supplies and that wastewater treatment plants would likely need to be expanded and forms the basis of Impacts 5.5-1 (water), 5.5-2 (water), and 5.5-4 (wastewater), which are found to be significant and require mitigation. Also, please see Master Response 2 for a discussion of level of detail appropriate for this EIR.

Response to Comment 162-28 (EIR): The analysis of water availability and wastewater is thorough and detailed and discloses existing supplies, potential shortages under each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, and mitigation measures. The commenter is referred to Section 5.5 of EIR Volume 1 for this discussion.

Response to Comment 162-29 (GP/EIR): The Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives already contain policies (PS-1f and PS-1g) that require a concurrency finding at the project approval stage of development for water supply, sewage disposal, and power supply. Similar policies exist in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives (Policy 5.1.2.1 and 5.1.2.2), that generally apply to all public services and utilities. The suggested mitigation measure is unnecessary.

Response to Comment 162-30 (EIR): Taking into account table footnotes, the number of units included in the Development Agreements appear to be consistently reported between these two tables. The only difference is the number reported for the Serrano project. Table 17 (of the EPS report) indicates that there is a projected 3,980 new dwelling units to be built (“existing commitments”) versus the total of 4,481 units shown in Table 5.1-4. The difference of roughly 500 units represents those units that were previously constructed prior to the EPS report. The EPS report (and the traffic and other impact analyses in the EIR) appropriately treated these units as part of the baseline.

Response to Comment 162-31 (GP/EIR): Dam failure inundation is addressed on pages 5.8-38 through 5.8-75 of Volume 2 of the EIR. The County has not prepared a dam failure inundation map for Silver Lake. Because of Silver Lake’s proximity to Caples Lake (for which an inundation map exists) and general location (far from large population centers), the staff did not feel it was necessary to complete additional mapping and

analysis for Silver Lake. The majority of the Caples Lake dam failure inundation zone occurs in areas that are undeveloped or sparsely developed (dominated by U.S. Forest Service land). The Silver Fork of the American River (which flows out of Silver Lake) connects to Caples Creek fairly “high up” in the watershed, in an undeveloped area of the Eldorado National Forest. From his point, floodwater associated with failure of the Silver Lake Dam would follow the same path as floodwater associated with a similar failure of the Caples Lake Dam; this inundation zone is shown on the Caples Lake Dam Failure Inundation Zone map, which is on file in the County Planning Department. The area along the Silver Fork of the American River above the confluence of Caples Creek and the Silver Fork is undeveloped and nonjurisdictional (U.S. Forest Service Land) so mapping of a dam failure inundation zone for that stretch of river for the purposes of land use planning is unnecessary. In the event of a dam failure emergency, the OES would work with Amador and Alpine Counties and the U.S. Forest Service consistent with emergency plans for Caples and Silver Lakes.

Response to Comment 162-32 (EIR): Impacts related to development of the PL 101-514 project (Fazio water) are described on page 5.5-54 and 5.5-55 and individual environmental resource impacts are identified in Table 5.5-10. PCWA’s environmental analysis does not address a proposed project alternative that would include GDPUD. The General Plan EIR itself discloses the potential impacts associated with growth in GDPUD’s service area and Western El Dorado County served by EID. Development of the Fazio water supply project would not induce growth beyond that projected for the General Plan alternatives. As to consideration of Auburn Dam and growth related to Auburn Dam, there is no pending proposal to provide water to El Dorado County and it is therefore not considered in the analysis.

Response to Comment 162-33 (EIR): The EIR addresses the potential impacts of new infrastructure necessary to serve future development associated with the General Plan. It is discussed at a program level rather than at the individual project level. At such time as the service provider or federal agency developing the water storage or conveyance system proposes a project, that agency will be required to analyze the specific impacts of that project on the environment. Impact 5.5-2 specifically identifies this issue as an impact that is significant and unavoidable in each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. This impact specifically describes potential impacts stemming from development of additional water supply infrastructure that would be necessary to accommodate the planned growth under each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The analysis is comprehensive and includes consideration of 23 named projects. Although the specific impacts of a new pumping facility in Folsom Lake are not listed they are included in impacts of diversions from Folsom Lake which are listed in Table 5.5-10. No changes to the EIR or its impacts are required in response to this comment.

Response to Comment 162-34 (EIR): Policy 2.2.5.15 of the General Plan Land Use Element under the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives states, “Any imposition of National Recreational Area or Wild and Scenic River designations on lands within El

Dorado County shall be deemed inconsistent with this General Plan.” In other words, under this alternative and based on this policy, any attempt to overlay the Wild and Scenic River designation on a river that serves as water supply would be opposed by the County.

Response to Comment 162-35 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Master Response 11.

Response to Comment 162-36 (EIR): The commenter is correct that as of the date of publication of the DEIR, USBR held the water rights for water stored in Jenkinson Lake. However, EID has subsequently acquired those rights.

Response to Comment 162-37 (GP/EIR): It is unclear how Policy PR-6c of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, supporting the development of private campgrounds, would cause additional 911 calls any more than any other class of development. However, Section 5.7 of Volume 2 of the EIR discusses at length the impact of future growth in the County on a wide variety of public service providers, including fire protection, law enforcement, and emergency medical service providers, each of whom utilize the 911 system. Impacts 5.7-1 and 5.7-2 indicate that new facilities and services would be necessary to support the anticipated growth and the impact is significant unless mitigated as identified.

Response to Comment 162-38 (EIR): In response to the comment on the NOP, the analyses of impacts in Subsection 5.6, Utilities, and Subsection 5.7 of Volume 1 of the EIR, Public Services, rely on the existing boundaries of the identified service providers and on planned expansion of these areas, where applicable. LAFCO spheres of influence were not used in the evaluation of impacts.

Response to Comment 162-39 (EIR): Section 5.5 of Volume 1 of the EIR, Water Resources, evaluates the impacts of the General Plan scenarios on water resources, including the need for additional sources of water and the likelihood of obtaining the required supply. This section also includes information about the regulatory framework for water procurement and the status of recently approved or proposed water supply projects. Agricultural water demand is discussed in Section 5.5 and also in Section 5.2, Agriculture and Forestry.

While the EIR has utilized information gathered for the Draft Water Resources and Management Plan, prepared for the El Dorado County Water Agency (Eco:Logic, June 2003), it is not feasible in this General Plan EIR to analyze impacts associated with individual water supply and distribution projects that may result from the plan. The EIR discusses in programmatic terms, the various potential water projects, how they may affect the water supply picture for the County during the time horizon of this plan, and the likely impacts associated with the projects. (Please refer to the discussion in Section 5.5, beginning on page 5.5-17.) The use of new water supplies for agricultural purposes is included in this discussion, but it should be pointed out that EID, the primary water purveyor on the west slope, does not differentiate between new water earmarked for

agricultural purposes and domestic and commercial uses. (Please refer to Responses to Comments 210-6 and 210-7.)

Response to Comment 162-40 (EIR): Statutory criteria for the designation of prime agricultural lands are identified in Section 5.2 of Volume 1 of the EIR, Agriculture and Forestry. The analysis in the EIR is based on maps prepared by the Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Agricultural water demand is discussed in this section and in more depth in Section 5.5, Water Resources.

Response to Comment 162-41 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 11.

The following comments refer to a prior draft of the General Plan policies. Some of these policies have since been renumbered in the General Plan alternatives released in April 2003.

Response to Comment 162-42 (GP): The draft policy referenced in this comment letter is no longer a part of either the Environmentally Constrained or Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 162-43 (GP): The draft policy referenced in this comment letter is no longer a part of either the Environmentally Constrained or Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 162-44 (GP): The suggested changes were made and are now incorporated into Policy LU-2b as released in April 2003.

Response to Comment 162-45 (GP): When the term "communities" is used in the General Plan, it is the general definition of the word that is intended. When the identified Community Regions are intended, the term is capitalized.

Response to Comment 162-46 (GP): The opinion expressed in the comment regarding former Policies LU-9a and LU-10b are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 162-47 (GP): The suggested language was incorporated into the final draft of Policy PS-1b in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 162-48 (GP): The commenter's support for these policies regarding adequacy of service and spheres of influence are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 162-49 (GP): The term “service provider” has been used throughout the revised policies contained in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 162-50 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding service availability are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 162-51 (GP): The opinion expressed in the comment regarding evaluating adequacy of service are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 162-52 (GP): What is now Policy HS-8e in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives has been revised to include a wider range of low-emission vehicles. Please refer to the Response to Comment 150-17 (S.A.G.E.) and the revised policy language as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 162-53 (GP): Please refer to the Response to Comment 162-52, above.

Response to Comment 162-54 (GP): Policies relating to safe roadways were relocated and incorporated into the Transportation and Circulation Element of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Capital improvement funds can only be allocated toward County-maintained roads, although unsafe road sections may also be improved by private parties in the process of providing and/or improving access to new development projects.

Response to Comment 162-55 (GP): The policy referenced in this comment was not carried over to the final set of draft policies in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. However, the term “water service provider” is used in other, related policies of those alternatives, primarily in the Public Services and Utilities Element.

Response to Comment 162-56 (GP): The policy referenced in this comment was not carried over into the final set of draft policies in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Policies relating to findings of water availability for discretionary project approval in these alternatives are now PS-1f and PS-1g.

Response to Comment 162-57 (GP): The policy referenced in this comment was not carried over into the final set of draft policies in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 162-58 (GP): The term “provider” has been substituted in most of the revised draft policies in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives where “purveyor” was previously used.

Response to Comment 162-59 (GP): Please refer to the Response to Comment 162-22.

Response to Comment 162-60 (GP): Policy PR-5a was modified to address this comment during the final development of the policies in the draft Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

LETTER 163: HILARY KROGH

Response to Comment 163-1 (EIR): The EIR for the El Dorado County General Plan covers environmental impacts associated with adoption of a countywide general plan, and does not focus on design details specific to a project. Designs have not been formulated for the roadway improvements identified within the EIR and, as a result, design specific data for improvements to the circulation system identified in the EIR will not be developed until specific improvement projects envisioned by the plan are proposed for implementation. Accordingly, specifications for the precise location of the right of way for improvements such as a four-lane divided Saratoga Way have not yet been developed and such design-level details involve a level of specificity that would not be appropriate for a General Plan EIR. No final design drawings have been produced for a four-lane Saratoga Way, so it is not possible to provide the design information requested.

With respect to comments relating to the relocation of Saratoga Way as a component of the U.S. Highway 50/El Dorado Hills Interchange project, it should be noted that the Board of Supervisors adopted Alternative 1 in the interchange EIR/EA, with the tangent alignment for Saratoga Way. Final design level drawings are in process, but have not yet been completed for the realigned two-lane Saratoga Way.

Please refer also to Response to Comment 156-4 for a detailed discussion relative to the operational characteristics of Saratoga Way.

Response to Comment 163-2 (EIR): The commenter's opposition to the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer to Responses to Comments 163-1, and 156-1 through 156-5, for discussion relevant to this comment.

Response to Comment 163-3 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 163-1 and 156-1 through 156-5, for discussion relevant to this comment.

Response to Comment 163-4 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 156-2 through 156-5 for discussion of alternatives analysis in this area. The commenter states that the north/south Saratoga Way realignment negates potential to function as parallel capacity to U.S. Highway 50. The portion that is planned to run north/south is a short segment of the proposed road that ties back into an overall east/west configuration toward Folsom that allows the roadway to provide parallel capacity.

Please refer also to Response to Comment 156-2 for discussion of projected LOS analysis.

Response to Comment 163-5 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 156-3 through 156-5 for discussion relevant to this comment.

Response to Comment 163-6 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 183-6 regarding Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) proposing to lower some level of service

standards. Please note that the allowable level of service for Saratoga Way under all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives is LOS E and that this would not be changed by the proposed mitigation. The projected level of service for the improved Saratoga Way is LOS D, which complies with the LOS policies of each of the alternatives. Other policies within each of those alternatives require that roadway improvements be designed and constructed to “American Association of State Highway and Transportation Official” (AASHTO) and Caltrans standards, which are the recognized State and national standards for roadway design. These policies will assure that roadway improvements are safe and reliable. Also, please refer to Responses to Comments 156-3, 156-4, and 156-5 for additional discussion relevant to this comment.

Response to Comment 163-7 (EIR): The County acknowledges other letters with similar comments, specifically, Letters 156, 168, 183 and 213.

LETTER 164: WILLIAM J. FISHER, PACIFIC STATES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Response to Comment 164-1 (EIR): The commenter presents observations regarding the adequacy of the General Plan EIR. Please see specific responses below.

Response to Comment 164-2 (EIR): An interim measure (Mitigation Measure 5.1-3[c]) is proposed to address environmental impacts that could occur during the period (in some cases, several years) until General Plan policies and programs are implemented. Additionally, even after implementation programs are developed, ministerial projects would not typically be reviewed for conformity or for their potential to cause environmental impacts. Because a substantial level of development could occur ministerially in the County, mitigation was developed. Thus, the General Plan compatibility review required by Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) would apply to all projects (ministerial as well as discretionary) to address all development.

Various options are presented in Volume 1 of the EIR pages 5.1-62 through 5.1-64 for implementation of the review resulting from this mitigation. It is the intent that the process be efficient and not burdensome. Nevertheless, the concerns and opinions expressed by the commenter regarding the prompt and efficient implementation of the General Plan compatibility review are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan and conveyed to the Planning Department for consideration during establishment of the review process.

Response to Comment 164-3 (EIR): Revised Policy 2.6.1.5, discussed in Section 5.3, Visual Resources (EIR Volume 1 page 5.3-25), would not necessarily change ministerial to discretionary projects. The revised policy, which would apply to all ridgeline development, would be incorporated into the General Plan compatibility review required by Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a). The revised policy would not deny development rights to property owners in already developed areas, but would require that all ridgeline development—not just discretionary development or projects in previously undeveloped areas—be designed with consideration given to aesthetic impacts on the surrounding area. Although these mitigation measures will increase the review required for specified types of building and grading permits, the alternate implementation measure directs the County to establish performance standards that would be applied to each application. Chapter 2.0 contains revisions to the policy on page 5.3-25 to incorporate the commenter's suggested clarifications.

Response to Comment 164-4 (EIR): The commenter's concern for an adequate roadway funding system is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 164-5 (EIR): Please see Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 164-6 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 211-3, which describes the basis of water supplies considered to be part of the existing baseline conditions for the EIR. Please refer to Response to Comment 211-4, which describes the purpose and justification for Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b). Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document, which includes changes to this mitigation measure.

Response to Comment 164-7 (EIR): As described in pages 5.7-72 through 5.7-73 of Volume 1 of the EIR, the Quimby Act only applies to acquisition of parkland and does not fund development and maintenance of park facilities. Mitigation Measure 5.7-5 (pages 5.7-80 through 5.7-81) would cover this funding gap. The total fees paid for land and park facilities will not exceed the reasonable cost of providing those facilities.

Response to Comment 164-8(GP/EIR): The referenced mitigation measure would revise proposed General Plan policies to preclude development in high and very high wildland fire hazard areas unless it can be demonstrated that the hazard can be reduced to a moderate or better level as determined by relevant fire protection authorities. The County would not apply this policy in a manner that improperly interfered with lawfully vested rights or otherwise constituted a taking.

Response to Comment 164-9 (EIR): The purpose of an EIR is to identify the significant effects on the environment of a project, alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided. CEQA is not intended to consider balancing preservation of natural resources with property rights, although these issues will need to be considered during project approval (see Master Response 6). The Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors will be able to consider the cost and benefit of the mitigation in deliberations on the General Plan. These comments and comments on cost sharing will be forwarded to the Commission and the Board for consideration.

Response to Comment 164-10 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 164-9 regarding costs/benefits. Please refer also to Master Response 18 regarding additional considerations of oak tree canopy coverage.

Response to Comment 164-11 (EIR): A permit would not be required for tree removal on single-family residential lots that cannot be further subdivided (see page 5.12-62 of Volume 2 of the EIR). Please refer also to Master Response 18.

LETTER 165: WILLIAM J. FISHER, PACIFIC STATES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Response to Comment 165-1 (GP): The information provided by the commenter is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The commenter requests a High Density Residential (HDR) land use designation for a portion of APN 107-146-29, with the balance being designated Open Space (OS). This request was not included in any of the four equal-weight General Plan Alternatives. The staff therefore recommends that is not be considered at this time. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 165-2 (GP): The commenter's opinion on the manner in which the referenced applications should be processed when the writ of mandate is lifted is noted and will be considered when the County resumes processing such applications.

Response to Comments 165-3 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's concurrence with the five Community Regions listed in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-4 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's concurrence with the Rural Centers identified in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-5 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about preference for land use designations which allow continued quality suburban development in Community Regions; allow some development in Rural Regions consistent with infrastructure; and provide the most flexibility for modern planning techniques, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-6 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 165-5.

Response to Comment 165-7 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 165-5.

Response to Comment 165-8 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating a preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as first choice and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative as second choice in terms of allowing reasonable suburban type communities, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-9 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative policies dealing with ridgeline development, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-10 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment recommending the City of Folsom's approach to affordable housing are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-11 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment endorsing Policy HO-6 and Implementation Measures HO-U and HO-O are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please also refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 165-12 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments contained in Letter 94 (State Department of Housing and Community Development) and Letter 252 (Building Industry Association).

Response to Comment 165-13 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on issues related to the future width of U.S. Highway 50 and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Also, please refer to Master Response 14.

Response to 165-14 (GP): The commenter's concerns and opinions regarding Measure Y are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. The implications of Measure Y are analyzed in Section 5.4 (Traffic and Circulation) of Volume 1 of the EIR. Please also see Master Response 15. Please note that Measure Y applied only to new development and did not purport to limit the source of funds that may be used for projects remedying existing deficiencies.

Response to Comment 165-15 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 165-16 (GP): The staff concurs and believes that the Goal allows that discretion.

Response to Comment 165-17 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about long range planning for public services and utilities are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-18 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment on the preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative policies on concurrency are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-19 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment on concurrency relating to water supplies are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please also refer to Responses to Comments 211-4 and 211-5.

Response to Comment 165-20 (GP): Policy PS-2c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative discourages extension of public water service into the Rural Regions.

Response to Comment 165-21 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 2-4.

Response to Comment 165-22 (GP): A "Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance" was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on September 23, 2003. This ordinance would require project proponents (with structures exceeding 5,000 square feet) to recycle a minimum of fifty percent by weight of the total debris generated by the project.

Response to Comment 165-23 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as it relates to emergency and law enforcement, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Concerning Policy PS-7c, the policy does state that "the requirements may be met by submittal of a will-serve letter."

Response to Comment 165-24 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the 1996 General Plan Alternative is the most comprehensive concerning schools, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-25 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment recommending addition of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative policies, along with the 1996 General Plan Alternative policies on utilities are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-26 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment supporting the existing and proposed policies on emergency preparedness, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-27 (GP): The commenter's opinion regarding the manner in which new General Plan policies should be applied to projects that submitted applications prior to February 1999 is noted and will be considered when the County processes such applications.

Response to Comment 165-28 (GP): Please see Response to Comment 165-27.

Response to Comment 165-29 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment expressing preference for the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative policies on streams, lakes, ponds and wetlands, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-30 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating a preference for the existing standards allowing oak canopy replacement and noting that canopy retention should only be used in limited circumstances, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please also refer to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 165-31 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that Policy CO-8b is overly broad and should apply only to projects that are likely to contain cultural resources, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The commenter is also referred to the discussion of cultural resources in Section 5.13 of Volume 2 of the EIR, wherein this policy is determined to be necessary to effectively reduce impacts to cultural resources.

Response to Comment 165-32 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about adopting policies to preserve, protect and expand agricultural uses, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-33 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about adopting and funding policies necessary to preserve, protect and expand economic development in the County, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-34 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment concerning the types, density and location of land uses and maintaining the County's rural character are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-35 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about working with owners with development agreements about amendments to satisfy the County's fair share of affordable housing are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Response to Comment 251-11.

Response to Comment 165-36 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on issues related to Measure Y and the desire to adopt "a new traffic congestion and road improvement ordinance", are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Also, please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 165-37 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on issues related to the future width of U.S. Highway 50 and the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Also, please refer to Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 165-38 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 165-37.

Response to Comment 165-39 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment on the timing for public utilities and commitments by service providers, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The commenter is referred to the policies under Goals PS-1, PS-2 and PS-4 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Goals 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 in the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative and the analysis of these issues in Section 5.5 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 165-40 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment concerning working with EID to get firm water commitments are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. In addition, Policy PS-2a of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives and Policy 5.2.1.1 of the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternatives require the County to actively engage in, and support, the efforts of all public water providers to retain existing and acquire new surface water supplies.

Response to Comment 165-41 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment concerning balancing protection of cultural resources with property rights, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Also note that the County is required to identify and protect cultural resources pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Historic Preservation Act.

Response to Comment 165-42 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about policies to address asbestos-related issues are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The commenter should also refer to pages 4.8-88 through 5.8-106 of Volume 2 of the EIR, which analyzes the potential impacts of naturally occurring asbestos in the County and provides recommend mitigation measures.

Response to Comment 165-43 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 165-30 and Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 165-44 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about balancing environmental policy and property rights as they relate to Community Regions, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 165-45 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 165-10 and 11.

LETTER 166: (INTENTIONALLY BLANK)

LETTER 167: CINDY ROUNTREE

Response to Comment 167-1 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 160-1.

Response to Comment 167-2 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 160-2.

Response to Comment 167-3 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 160-3.

Response to Comment 167-4 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 160-4.

LETTER 168: BRIAN AND JILL BRINK

Response to Comment 168-1 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 156-1 through 156-5 for discussion relevant to this comment.

Response to Comment 168-2 (EIR): The traffic analysis performed for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives determined that to accommodate the projected growth at 2025, and to meet the level of service policies of each of those alternatives it will be necessary to connect Saratoga Way to Iron Point Road in the City of Folsom, and to widen it to a four-lane divided roadway. Please refer to Exhibits 3-5, 3-7, 3-9, and 3-10 and Tables 3-9, 3-11, and 3-12, as well as Appendix D in Volume 3 of the EIR. Also, please refer to Responses to Comments 156-3, 156-4, and 156-5 for discussion relevant to this comment.

Response to Comment 168-3 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment representing the commenter's position on honest and thoughtful planning for Park Village, and avoidance of significant impacts to the residents of Park Village, are noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 168-4 (GP): The commenter's statement that Letter 183 is an accurate expression of the commenter's concerns is acknowledged.

LETTER 169: BILL HOLMES, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION, AMADOR/EL DORADO UNIT

Response to Comment 169-1 (GP): Please refer to the responses to Comment Letter 265.

Response to Comment 169-2 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment relating to fire safety are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer to responses to Letter 265.

LETTER 170: ALLEN G. NEL

Response to Comment 170-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation for APN 109-340-39. This request is included in the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel is designated Rural Lands (RL). This Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 171: DOUGLAS R. ROECA

Response to Comment 171 (GP/EIR): Table A-3 of the EIR has been revised to reflect this request and similar requests of some of the property owners listed in the commenter's letter.

LETTER 172: KYLE SMITH, DORADO LAND & DEVELOPMENT

Response to Comment 172-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment expressing support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please also see Master Response 3.

Response to Comment 172-2 (EIR): The EIR acknowledges that limiting U.S. Highway 50 to six lanes would cause LOS F conditions, which could be severe enough to affect adjacent roadways (refer to Impact 5.4-1 of the EIR). The commenter is correct that Caltrans has identified the need for eight lanes on U.S. Highway 50 west of Placerville. The ultimate improvement concept for U.S. Highway 50 is three mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane from Folsom to just west of Placerville according to the *State Route 50 Transportation Concept Report* (Caltrans, 1998). Caltrans verified this recommendation in their June 11, 2003 comment letter on this EIR (see responses to Letter 97).

Response to Comment 172-3 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative land use designations were applied just as the commenter suggests. Each parcel with the ability to further subdivide was categorized by size so that the land use designation would preclude more than four parcels being created. For example, a 10-acre parcel is designated LDR, permitting the creation of only two parcels, rather than MDR, which could permit the creation of up to ten parcels. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the resultant land use pattern associated with the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 172-4 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please note that the employment forecast for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative at 2025 is comparable to that of the 1996 General Plan Alternative. (See EIR Volume 1 page 4.1-9.)

Response to Comment 172-5 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding population growth and development restrictions are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Chapter 4 of Volume 1 of the EIR and Chapter IV, Land Use Demand, of the "El Dorado County Land Use Forecasts for Draft General Plan" (EPS, March 2002) describes the method of forecasting population growth and the regional context that affect such growth in El Dorado County.

Response to Comment 172-6 (EIR): Page 5.4-26 of Volume 1 of the EIR describes the potential differences of the General Plan alternatives to absorb regional population growth. Although a similar level of future demand may exist for residential development in El Dorado County, the alternatives do not have the same capacity or ability to

accommodate this demand. The No Project and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives are not projected to have sufficient capacity to accommodate the 2025 residential demand for El Dorado County. Please refer to the March 2002 EPS report, available in Volume 3 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 172-7 (EIR): The minimum number of lanes on County roadways and State Highways recommended in the Circulation Elements of each General Plan alternative are based on an analysis of the future 2025 operating conditions on these roadways considering their existing capacity, physical constraints, projected traffic volume growth, and LOS policy thresholds. The following table lists the number of lanes proposed for each roadway segment referenced by the commenter together with a list of the commenter’s suggestion of the number of lanes that should be included in the Circulation Diagram. Where the number of lanes differs from that recommended by the commenter, it is because the traffic projections for 2025 do not justify the number of lanes recommended.

| Road Segment | Number of Lanes Proposed | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| | Commenter’s Suggestion | No Project | Roadway Constrained | Environmentally Constrained | 1996 Plan |
| Green Valley Rd. – County Line to Silva Valley Pkwy. | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Green Valley Rd. – Silva Valley Pkwy. to Deer Valley Rd. | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 6 |
| Green Valley Rd. – Deer Valley Road to Cameron Park Dr. | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cameron Park Dr. – U.S. Highway 50 to Oxford Rd. | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Cameron Park Dr. – Oxford Rd. to Green Valley Rd. | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Bass Lake Rd. – U.S. Highway 50 to Old Bass Lake Rd. | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Bass Lake Rd. – Old Bass Lake Rd. to Green Valley Rd. | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Serrano Parkway – Silva Valley Pkwy. to Bass Lake Rd. | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| White Rock Rd. – County Line to Latrobe Rd. | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| White Rock Rd. – Latrobe Rd. to U.S. Highway 50 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |

| | Number of Lanes Proposed | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| U.S. Highway 50 – County Line to Cambridge Rd. | 8 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 8 |
| U.S. Highway 50 – Cambridge Rd. to Cameron Park Dr. | 8 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 |
| U.S. Highway 50 – Cameron Park Dr. to Ponderosa Rd. | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |

Response to Comment 172-8 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter’s position on the integration of nonmotorized transportation systems into road projects, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

The issue of nonmotorized transportation is discussed in many of the goals and policies of the General Plan alternatives (Goal 3.11 and its associated Objectives and Policies in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and Goal TC-4 and its associated Policies in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives) and also the implementation measures included in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives. Nonmotorized requirements and measures will be included in the revised standards and design manuals the County uses once the General Plan is in place. Also, please see Master Response 16.

Response to Comment 172-9 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding planting of native trees are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Policy CO-6c of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives generally directs the County to preserve its native oak resources, and Implementation Measure CO-J requires the adoption of an Oak Woodland Management Plan. This measure has been revised to include the planting of native trees in new development as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 172-10 (GP): The commenter questions whether the Zoning Ordinance is the correct tool for applying parking lot shading standards. Parking standards are currently in the Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 17.18) and shading standards would be added to that section. All building permits must be found to conform to the Zoning Ordinance; therefore, such standards are appropriately placed in the Zoning Ordinance. Parking lot shading and street tree provisions of the specificity recommended in this comment are more appropriate in the implementing ordinance. The present street tree provisions in Chapter 12.12 of the County Code provide standards for street trees,

but do not require such planting. A proposed street tree ordinance was presented to the Planning Commission I 1998 which was referred to the Planning Department staff for incorporation into the update of the Zoning Ordinance.

Response to Comment 172-11 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding Policy C0-1c of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 172-12 (GP): Mixed uses are permitted in each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives to different degrees. Please refer to Policy 2.2.1.2, Commercial, in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and Policies LU-3h, LU-3i, and LU-3n in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 172-13 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding reservation of commercial and industrial lands are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer to Table 3-4 on page 3-27 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 172-14 (GP): The commenter requests the Commercial (C) land use designation for APN 083-456-01. This request is included in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated Multifamily Residential (MFR). In this Alternative, the parcel is designated MFR to provide for more multifamily residential opportunities in the Cameron Park Community Region. Please refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 172-15 (GP): The commenter requests a split designation of Commercial (C), Multifamily Residential (MFR) and High Density Residential (HDR) for APN 083-350-43. These designations are included in the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. (It appears that the commenter refers to the Environmentally Constrained Alternative Land Use Diagram as the map with which he disagrees with when it is the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative Land Use Diagram that shows the land use in a manner he does not prefer.) Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel has a split designation of C, MFR and Low Density Residential (LDR). This Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that alternative. Please refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 173: BILL SNODGRASS, EL DORADO COUNTY AGRICULTURAL COMMISSION

Response to Comment 173-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding agricultural land are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-2 (GP): Please refer to the Responses to Comments 173-11 through 173-49 below.

Response to Comment 173-3 (GP): The comment describes policies in two of the alternatives. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding retaining the Agricultural overlay districts are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-4 (GP): The support of the Agricultural Commission for the "A" Agricultural land use designation is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-5 (GP/EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(e), requiring the provision of an agricultural setback, would establish a new policy to be added to each of the alternatives. The commenter's support of that measure is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-6 (GP): Policy 8.1.3.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives provides the 10-acre minimum parcel size agricultural buffer referred to in this comment. While not specifically identifying the minimum parcel size, Policy AF-1d and Implementation Measure AF-A in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives direct the County to include "...suitable densities of and setbacks on lands adjacent to agriculturally-zoned lands to protect current and future agricultural production..." A new policy has been added, comparable to Policy 8.1.3.1, to the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 173-7 (GP): Policy AF-3a, supporting agricultural housing, is contained in both the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Policy 8.2.3.1 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives also address agricultural housing. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-8 (GP): Goal AF-2 and Policy AF-2a in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives also address the issue of agricultural water. Please refer also to EID's comments 210-6 and 210-7 regarding the differentiation between water for agriculture and water for other uses.

Response to Comment 173-9 (GP): Several policies in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives encourage or permit "agricultural support services", including ranch marketing activities. These are Policies 2.2.2.2(c) and 2.2.5.10 in the Land Use Element, and Policies 8.2.4.2 and 8.2.4.3 in the Agriculture and Forestry Element. The description of the Agricultural Overlay designation in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative on page 23 encourages the expansion of agricultural associated activities and Policy LU-4h permits agricultural support services in the Rural Regions. An identical policy (LU-4g) is in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. However, there are no specific policies encouraging ranch marketing activities in the latter alternatives. A policy has been added to each, together with a modification to Implementation Measure AF-A, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 173-10 (GP): Implementation Measure AF-A in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives also requires the County to amend the Right to Farm ordinance to require the placement of a deed restriction on new parcels created adjacent to agricultural lands.

Response to Comment 173-11 (GP): Comment 173-11 recommends the adoption of Goal AF-1 from the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative with certain modifications. Staff does not find that the proposed modification adds any substance to the stated goal of protecting agricultural land. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-12 (GP): This comment recommends adoption of Policy AF-1a of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and suggests adding a minimum parcel size of 20 acres to the majority of parcels in the Agricultural District overlay designation. There are several areas of the County within the existing Agricultural District that contain numerous parcels smaller than 20 acres and which can be farmed. The requirement that the parcel be "suitable for agriculture" is sufficient to achieve the relevant policy objective. Staff finds the proposed text change to be too limiting in protecting existing productive agricultural land.

Response to Comment 173-13 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy 8.1.1.5 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding parcels of 20 acres or more with choice soils. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-14 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy AF-1a of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative regarding the assignment of land to the Agricultural land use designation. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-15 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy AF-1b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative regarding a procedure for evaluating the suitability for land for agriculture. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-16 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy AF-1c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative regarding programs for long term conservation of agricultural land. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-17 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy AF-1d of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative regarding protecting agricultural lands. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-18 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy 8.1.3.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and suggests deleting the qualifying term for lands under a Williamson Act Contract. Staff agrees with the recommendation and has proposed a revision to the language (see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document). Please refer also to Response to Comment 173-6.

Response to Comment 173-19 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy 8.1.3.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and suggests (1) striking the qualifying provision that the setbacks only apply in the Agricultural Districts, (2) adding the Agricultural Commission as an entity able to grant administrative relief, and (3) requiring larger setbacks when deemed necessary. The comparable policy adopted in 1996 has been implemented by an ordinance which provides to some degree, the revisions suggested (Section 17.06.150 of the El Dorado County Code). Rather than modify the policy to match the ordinance provisions, staff has revised the proposed policy to incorporate suggestion (1). Suggestion (2) can be considered as part of the General Plan implementation program. Suggestion (3) is already included in the policy which requires a "minimum" 200 foot setback and the proposed policy has been revised to specifically authorize larger setbacks where needed. Please see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 173-20 (GP): This comment recommends adoption of Policy 8.1.3.4 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding a threshold of significance for the loss of agricultural land. It also suggests adding text requiring the replacement or conservation of agricultural land consistent with Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(c). The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-21 (GP): This comment recommends adoption of Policy 8.1.3.5 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding Agricultural Commission review of discretionary development and suggests deletion of the exception for lands with urban land use designations. The change would require review of all discretionary development applications for urban development on lands that have been designated for such development by the General Plan. Because the general determination of the type of use will have been made by the Land Use Diagram, such review may not be necessary. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-22 (GP): This comment recommends adoption of Policy 8.1.4.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding Agricultural Commission review of discretionary development and proposed public facilities in Agricultural Districts and suggests expanding the review to apply to development and public facilities proposed on any agriculturally-zoned lands. This would allow for Agricultural Commission review of projects located outside the Agricultural Districts.

Response to Comment 173-23 (GP): This comment recommends adoption of Policy AF-1e of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives and suggests adding a deed restriction provision to the Right to Farm ordinance. One revision is a simple clarification that seems appropriate, and is reflected in the revised policies as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. The deed restriction provision is contained in Implementation Measure AF-A in both alternatives. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-24 (GP): This comment recommends adoption of Policy 8.2.1.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding the extension of water for irrigation purposes and suggests adding support for use of reclaimed water for agricultural use. Modifications to this policy have been made consistent with the comment have been added as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 173-25 (GP): This comment recommends adoption of Policy 8.2.1.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives while deleting that portion

that would allocate water savings to employment based uses. To the extent that the County policy could be implemented this would have the effect of encouraging agricultural over other nonresidential uses in the County. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please also see Response to Comment 173-8.

Response to Comment 173-26 (GP): This comment recommends adoption of Policy 8.2.1.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding long term water supplies while adding text regarding the potential future needs of agriculture in the County.

The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-27 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy 8.2.2.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding by right uses of agricultural land. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-28 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy 8.2.4.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding visitor serving/agri-tourism uses but deletes golf courses from that list. Because golf courses are not an accessory use compatible with agricultural uses this recommendation has been included as part of Mitigation Measure 5.2-2.

Response to Comment 173-29 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy AF-1f of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative regarding a conversion of agricultural land. The comment also recommends text proposing policy language stating that the County will allow and support agri-tourism programs. Please see Response to Comment 173-9.

Response to Comment 173-30 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy AF-1g of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(f) to protect grazing uses from adjoining residential uses. The recommendation is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-31 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy AF-3a of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative regarding agricultural employee housing. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-32 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Goal AF-4 of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives regarding forest resources and recommends additional language. The EIR finds for each alternative that the policies and land use designations pertaining to forested areas of the County are sufficient to protect forest lands from significant intrusions of incompatible uses. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-33 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy AF-4a of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative regarding protecting timberlands. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-34 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy 8.3.1.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding assessment of lands for timber production. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-35 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy 8.3.2.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding protection of TPZ zoned land. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-36 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy 8.3.2.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding minimum parcel size for timberland. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-37 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy 8.3.3.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding multiple use of forest lands. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-38 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy 8.3.3.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding application of the Natural Resources designation. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-39 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy 8.4.1.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding minimum parcel sizes adjacent to Natural Resources designated and TPZ zoned land. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-40 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy 8.4.1.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding the requirement of a 200-foot timber setback. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-41 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy 8.4.2.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding Agricultural Commission review of development proposals in timberland. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-42 (GP): This comment recommends the adoption of Policy AF-4b of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives regarding designation of timberlands as Natural Resources. The recommended text expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-43 (GP): This comment recommends substituting new text for Policy 8.3.1.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and adding it to each alternative relating to an evaluation of forest land. This is similar to Policy AF-1a in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives as it relates to agricultural land. The proposed text has been included in the revised policies for the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 173-44 (EIR): This comment reiterates the recommended policies identified in previous comments to address Impact 5.2-1. Please refer to Responses to Comments 173-18, 173-19, 173-21, 173-20, 173-23 through 173-27, and 173-31.

Recommendation #1 proposes adding two additional policy changes to Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(a). The change to Policy 8.1.3.1 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives provides a useful clarification but would not offset any impacts and is therefore not proposed as a mitigation measure. The change to Policy 8.1.3.5 would provide an opportunity for Agricultural Commission review of proposed uses of all parcels 10 acres or larger with existing or potential agricultural uses even where those parcels

have been designated for nonagricultural uses on the Land Use Diagram. While this would provide an opportunity for review, the effectiveness of that review would not be likely to mitigate any impact on agriculture because the underlying urban or nonagricultural land use designation adopted by the General Plan Land Use Diagram would allow the nonagricultural use. Accordingly, no change to the proposed mitigation measure has been made.

Recommendation #2 proposes language that is substantially similar to the mitigation measure as proposed. No change is necessary.

Recommendation #3 proposes a number of additional policy changes. The proposed change to Policy AF-1e would add to the policy text that is contained in Implementation Measure AF-A in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. Therefore no mitigation is needed for those alternatives. The proposed deed restriction requirement in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives is not needed as Policy 8.1.3.3 as proposed would require a deed restriction acknowledging the presence of agricultural uses on adjoining parcels.

The proposed adoption of Policy 8.2.2.1 specifying uses permitted by right on agricultural lands would serve to streamline development of such uses but would not serve to mitigate the impact of incompatible uses being developed on or adjacent to agricultural lands. Accordingly this mitigation measure is not proposed.

The proposed adoption of Policy 8.1.4.1 regarding Agricultural Commission review of discretionary development applications is included in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives (see Implementation Measure AF-E in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives). The proposed revision to Policy 8.1.4.1 would specify that review should be required for all agriculturally zoned lands. This could help avoid incompatible uses and is therefore proposed as part of Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(d) for all project alternatives.

The proposed adoption of policies and policy revisions regarding agricultural water supplies (Objective 8.2.1 and Policies 8.2.1.1, 8.2.1.2, and 8.2.1.3) would not supplement policies in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives calling on the County to develop long term water supplies to support implementation of the General Plan (see Goal PS-2 in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives and Policy 5.2.1.1 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives). They would not provide any substantive protection to water supplies for agricultural use and are therefore not proposed as mitigation. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will consider the proposals as a policy matter as part of their deliberation on the General Plan.

The proposed policies regarding housing for agricultural employees are included in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives and are therefore not required as mitigation.

Recommendation #4 proposes adoption of Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(e). No change is necessary. This recommendation also proposes adopting a revised version of Policy 8.1.3.2 regarding setbacks from agricultural uses. This would have the same effect as the mitigation proposed in Measure 5.2-1(d). No change is necessary.

Recommendation #5 supports adoption of a fencing requirement as proposed by Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(f) and comments that impacts to wildlife may not be substantial because fences would be short. While it is possible that individual fences may be short, there remains a possibility that the cumulative effect of a number of fences adjoining a single agricultural operation would have an effect on wildlife.

Response to Comment 173-45 (EIR): The staff does not concur that this regulatory definition should be added into the General Plan: it more appropriately belongs in the Ordinance. The EIR accurately quotes Policy 2.2.5.10 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 173-46 (EIR): The statement in the EIR that no minimum parcel size is required for visitor-serving (ranch marketing) uses is incorrect. Page 5.2-65 of the EIR has been corrected to delete this statement. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 173-47 (EIR): This comment proposes several policies in response to Impact 5.2-2. The first policy, regarding conditions under which ranch marketing activities may be permitted, is similar to Mitigation Measure 5.2-2 in the EIR, but would delete from that measure the requirement for a compatibility review. This would reduce the effectiveness of the mitigation proposed. No change has been made to that Mitigation Measure. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will consider the proposals as a policy matter as part of their deliberation on the General Plan.

The proposed deletion of golf courses from the list of visitor serving uses permitted on agricultural lands would help avoid development of incompatible uses on or adjacent to agricultural lands. Accordingly this revision is proposed for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

The proposed new policy to allow and support agri-tourism programs would not mitigate any impacts identified in the EIR and is therefore not proposed as mitigation. Please see Response to Comment 173-9.

Response to Comment 173-48 (EIR): This comment reiterates previously-recommended policies to address Impact 5.2-3. Recommendation #7 supports implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.2-3 without change. The recommendation also proposes amending Policy AF-1a in the Roadway Constrained Alternative to require that a majority of lands in Agricultural Districts have a minimum parcel size of 20 acres. As discussed in Response to Comment 173-12, this could lessen the level of protection

afforded to agricultural lands and is therefore not proposed as mitigation. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative proposes a new Agricultural designation that would have a 20-acre parcel size.

This commenter also proposes adopting Policy 8.1.1.5 from the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives regarding zoning for agricultural lands. The EIR concludes that adequate mitigation for Impact 5.2-3 can be provided by including all lands suitable for agricultural production in an agricultural district. This will allow for compatibility review and other procedures to safeguard agricultural uses.

Recommendation #8 proposes adopting Policy AF-1a from the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. This policy is included in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The other alternatives do not include the "Agricultural" land use designation but instead use an Agricultural overlay district. The EIR notes that the Agricultural designation in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative provides a higher degree of protection for agricultural lands. Mitigation proposed for the other alternatives, however, was found to reduce the impacts associated with those alternatives to a less-than-significant level; therefore no additional mitigation is required. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will consider the proposals as a policy matter as part of their deliberation on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 173-49 (EIR): This comment reiterates the recommended policies identified in previous comments to address Impact 5.2-4. The EIR indicates that there is no significant impact associated with Impact 5.2-4 and that no mitigation is required. Because no impacts have been identified, the proposed measures are not necessary as mitigation. As discussed in Responses to Comments 173-32 through 173-43, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will consider the proposals as a policy matter as part of their deliberation on the General Plan.

LETTER 174: EL DORADO HILLS AREA PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Response to Comment 174-1 (GP): The role of APAC and its vision for El Dorado Hills is acknowledged.

Response to Comment 174-2 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 11.

Response to Comment 174-3 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative, with the addition of the Circulation Element from the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Note that the Circulation Element from the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative would seek to maintain U.S. Highway 50 at no more than six lanes. This would not be adequate to accommodate the traffic expected as a result of the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

Response to Comment 174-4 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's position on directing the majority of growth to Community Regions, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-5 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the El Dorado Hills Business Park should not be reduced in size to allow for housing, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The only alternative which proposes this reduction is Alternative #9 (Modified El Dorado Hills Development South of U.S.50), analyzed in Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 174-6 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about retaining the El Dorado Hills Community Region boundaries as they are shown on the 1996 General Plan Alternative Land Use Diagram, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-7 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about managing unique resources (such as oak woodlands) on an individual community basis, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-8 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about structuring the goal statements in the 1996 General Plan Alternative like those in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-9 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about the County supplementing funding for pre-development infrastructure, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-10 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment requesting that residential densities in El Dorado Hills be changed back to three dwelling units per acre, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-11 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 174-6.

Response to Comment 174-12 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about placing the Community Region boundary along Salmon Falls Road immediately north of Green Valley Road, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-13 (GP): Policy 2.2.5.8 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative lists a number of uses that may be included in this proposed zoning district and does not preclude the types of uses suggested by the commenter. The actual uses to be allowed would be developed along with creation of the zone district.

Response to Comment 174-14 (EIR): The commenter disagrees with the LOS policy thresholds contained in the General Plan alternatives under the presumption that LOS E as a threshold will allow roads to quickly degenerate to LOS F. Although LOS E is established as the minimum LOS threshold, many of the roadways in El Dorado Hills are projected to operate better than LOS E during the p.m. peak hour under 2025 conditions with the Circulation Element improvements in place. Therefore, a degradation to LOS F is not likely. For example, El Dorado Hills Boulevard is projected to operate at LOS C from Olson Lane to Green Valley Road during the p.m. peak hour in 2025 under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, which allows a minimum LOS E. Refer to Appendices D-3A through D-3E in Volume 3 of the EIR for specific LOS results for other roadways and alternatives.

Additional assurances that LOS F conditions do not occur can be provided by adopting Implementation Measure TC-F of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative as part of the final General Plan. This measure requires the County to monitor the peak hour LOS on County roads and to take actions to ensure that the minimum LOS thresholds are not exceeded. This measure should be coordinated with actions contained in Mitigation Measure 5.4-3, so that funding requirements to provide acceptable transportation infrastructure are addressed.

Refer to Master Response 13 for additional information.

Response to Comment 174-15 (GP): There are two issues with the commenter's proposed modification to the Level of Service (LOS) requirements contained in this policy.

The roads would generally need to be wider to provide for a better LOS given the projected traffic demands. An example would be the need for a ten-lane U.S. Highway 50 at the County Line in several of the alternatives. Those wider roads would have increased environmental impacts such as impervious area, biological and cultural impacts. Additionally, there would be significant increases in the costs of construction and right-of-way for the improvements. Levels of Service standards reflect a balancing of circulation needs with environmental and quality of life impacts.

Some roads, such as Latrobe Road south of U.S. Highway 50 to the El Dorado Hills Business Park, will not meet the LOS standards under any of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, even with projected improvements in place (see Impact 5.4-1 in the EIR). Similarly with U.S. Highway 50 under the LOS required for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. Revising the LOS standard to something more restrictive will only make these impacts more difficult to resolve.

While some specific roads, as noted above, do not even meet the LOS E requirement, most roadways would not be affected by such a change in the policy. Most of the roads (with the proposed improvements in place) in the El Dorado Hills area are forecasted to operate at LOS C and D in 2025 in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. These roads would not be affected by the suggested change in the LOS policy. This is a function of the fact that roads are built in discrete units, i.e., a pair of lanes, as opposed to incrementally, i.e., fractions of lanes. Appendix D of Volume 3 of the EIR provides more specific information regarding the LOS forecasted for various roads.

However, the suggested change could affect the timing requirements for those improvements. With the change in policy, roads would reach the LOS standard earlier in their life and thereby require improvements earlier to maintain the LOS at the new standard. This may exceed the ability of the various funding sources for the improvements to meet the needs of those improvement costs causing difficulties in meeting the LOS standards.

Also, please see Response to Comment 174-14 and 281-90.

The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenters' position on their preference for a revised Level of Service (LOS) standard in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative of the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-16 (GP): Please see Responses to Comments 174-14, 174-15, and 281-90.

Response to Comment 174-17 (GP): The two percent increase shown in the definition of “Worsen” in Policy TC-1d of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative (the commenter has listed it as TC-1e) was chosen to provide a range of alternative definitions. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative uses one percent in its definition of “Worsen”. By using these two different thresholds, the environmental review is able to explore the impacts of two unique alternatives in the definition. The Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors will be able to review this information and then determine the appropriate threshold in the definition.

Also, it should be noted that this definition is really a “level of significant impact” and timing of improvements issue, not an absolute restriction on development. The setting of a percentage to clarify when an impact can be considered significant is critical to determining what additional analysis a project might need to do and what road improvements may need to be constructed. Since a project can meet the requirements of the policy by constructing road improvements to insure their traffic impacts do not exceed the requirements of the policy, it is necessary to have a way to determine what those improvements might need to be.

There is also a danger in setting to fine a line for this definition. Traffic impact modeling and forecasting is not a perfect science. There is a certain amount of acceptable deviation in the land use forecasting, trip generation and trip distribution. Additionally, roadway capacity is also not an exact number, but is rather subject to the comfort levels of the drivers using the road, which in turn varies with such things as the type of traffic, the width and alignment of the road, etc. The closer to zero the definition gets the more likely it is a project with effectively no impact will get penalized as if it does have a significant impact.

The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter’s position on their preference for a revised definition of “Worsen” in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative of the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-18 (GP): The commenter requests a change to Policy 3.1.2.2 to increase the length of off ramps to 1,000 feet and to require signal coordination with corresponding intersection. This policy is consistent with Caltrans design standards (refer to Section 504.3(3) of the Highway Design manual, Caltrans, November 1, 2001). A longer separation is not prevented as the policy is intended to reflect the Caltrans minimum design standards. Additionally, these issues are both dependent upon existing road system limitations and other issues specific to a proposed location.

Response to Comment 174-19 (GP): The update of the traffic impact fees is included in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus”

Alternatives as an implementation measure (TC-B) and implied in the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 174-20 (GP): Policy 3.2.1.3 must be read in light of Policy 3.2.1.4, which requires project denial where there is not mitigation. See also Policy 3.2.1.1.

Response to Comment 174-21 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 174-14 and 174-15.

Response to Comment 174-22 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 174-14 and 174-15.

Response to Comment 174-23 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 174-14 and 174-15.

Response to Comment 174-24 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 174-14 and 174-15.

Response to Comment 174-25 (GP): Both the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives contain additional policies encouraging transit (Goals TC-2, TC-4, TC-5, and TC-6) though they do not include a specific percentage increase as recommended by the commenter. There is no evidence that a one percent increase would result in demonstrable improvements in environmental conditions, accordingly no change is recommended.

Response to Comment 174-26 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains the designation proposed by the commenter.

Response to Comment 174-27 (GP): Policy HO-3i of the Housing Element requires the County to pursue the preservation of units that are approaching the end of the timeframe for the subsidized housing program. In addition, Implementation Measures HO-BB and HO-CC in the Housing Element address housing at risk for market-rate conversion. The commenter is correct in the statement that the County Board of Supervisors serves as the Public Housing Authority Board of Commissioners.

Response to Comment 174-28 (GP): Conversion of agricultural land to high-density housing would be in conflict with Goal AF-1 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Goal 8.1 of the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative. Additionally, this suggestion would be in conflict with the stated goal of directing higher density development in areas with adequate infrastructure in place.

Response to Comment 174-29 (GP): As noted by the commenter, Policy HO-1e directs higher density into both Community Regions and Rural Centers. A number of Community

Regions are proposed in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative (7), Environmentally Constrained Alternative (5), and No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative (13). Rural Centers have been identified in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives: Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative (27), Environmentally Constrained Alternative (19) and No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative (25). These designations would provide opportunities for construction of affordable units throughout the County, in areas where infrastructure would be more readily available.

Response to Comment 174-30 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment concerning solar access orientation and subdivision design, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-31 (GP): The commenter is referred to Table 4.5 of Volume 1 of the EIR which gives buildout projections by alternative for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The referenced tables from the Housing Element are based on existing zoning as required to satisfy State housing law. It should be noted that a significant portion of the housing proposed in El Dorado Hills is “existing commitments” that have already been approved and are vested.

Response to Comment 174-32 (GP): Policy PS-1f of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative require a will-serve letter prior to approval of any discretionary development that relies on a public water source. Policy 5.1.2.1 of the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative requires that a determination be made by the approving authority concerning the adequacy of public services to serve discretionary development. In addition, the EIR proposes a new policy concerning availability of water for discretionary development (see Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b)).

Response to Comment 174-33 (GP): Data used to produce the maps for the GIS layers were derived from the best available sources (e.g., soils information from the Natural Resources Conservation Service; watershed information from the State Department of Fish and Game; mineral resources data from the California -Department of Conservation; and slope information from USGS maps).

Response to Comment 174-34 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment expressing a preference for Policy CO-1c in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative (precluding grading during the rainy season), are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-35 (GP): Areas known to contain naturally occurring asbestos are identified on a map produced by the California Geological Survey in May of 2000, “Asbestos Map of Western El Dorado County. This map accompanies Open File

Report 2002-02, "Areas More Likely to Contain Natural Occurrences of Asbestos in Western El Dorado County, CA." These resources are available on the County Environmental Management Department website.

Response to Comment 174-36 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment supporting inclusion of the agricultural land use designation in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-37 (GP): The commenter recommends the addition of "water use guidelines" to Policy 7.3.1.2. Preparation of such guidelines would be more appropriately done by water purveyors. The County's involvement in these programs would be at the subdivision review stage or in the case of commercial and industrial development, when plans are reviewed for these projects.

Response to Comment 174-38 (GP): The Conservation and Open Space Element in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative (under Goal CO-4) and the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative (under Objective 7.3.1) recognize preservation and protection of the County's water resources.

Response to comment 174-39 (GP): It is unclear what benefit such swales would provide since they would be within landscaped meadows diked by 6-inch curbs and thus would provide no sedimentation or erosion control. Current Best Management Practices already utilize such swales where runoff occurs.

Response to comment 174-40 (GP): In the changing regulatory environment with respect to NPDES, and evolving "Best Management Practices", specificity of design element requirements are a component of Implementation Measure CO-D of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and the Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. However, the concerns and opinions expressed in the comment are noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-41 (GP): The commenter's suggested text change for Policy 7.4.4.2 in the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative (changing "encourage" protection to "require" protection) would substantially alter the policy. This suggestion is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please also refer to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 174-42 (GP): Implementation Measure CO-J of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires the development and adoption of an Oak Woodland Management Plan which would contain, among other items, canopy protection standards; replanting and

replacement standards; and mitigation plans for discretionary projects. In addition, the EIR, under analysis of Impact 5.12-1 (Loss and Fragmentation of Wildlife Habitat), proposes Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(e) for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives which requires the County to adopt a no-net-loss policy and mitigation program for important habitat (see pages 5.12-32 through 5.12-60).

Response to Comment 174-43 (GP): The approach used in the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, which has been carried over to the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative, is to require oak tree preservation on discretionary projects only. However, the EIR has proposed Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a), which would require a General Plan conformance review for all projects involving a structure greater than 120 square feet. This review would need to consider all ordinances, policies and regulations of the County. If adopted by the Board of Supervisors, this process would include review of all building permit applications for conformance with policies on biological resources. Please also refer to Master Response 18 and the revisions to Mitigation Measures 5.12-1(f) and (g) in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 174-44 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 174-37.

Response to Comment 174-45 (GP): The commenter requests that the word "children's" be removed from Policy 9.1.1.2 and that "picnic tables" be changed to "picnic facilities." These changes would clarify that neighborhood parks are not only for children and expand the types of facilities to be included. Please refer to Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for these changes.

Response to Comment 174-46 (GP): The commenter questions the use of 44 acres as the upward limit for community parks. The range of 10-44 acres for community parks is an established national standard used by the California Parks and Recreation Society. Policy 9.1.1.3 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative provides a basic description of the features associated with community parks and is not meant to be inclusive of all features possible in that type of facility.

Response to Comment 174-47 (GP): Concerning the commenter's question on stating where regional parks might be located, the required size of a regional park would necessarily limit where they would be located. Also the policy states that parks will incorporate natural resources such as lakes and creeks. Please also refer to the last sentence of Response to Comment 174-46.

Response to Comment 174-48 (GP): It was the intent with Policy 9.1.1.5 to require that parkland dedicated under the Quimby Act be suitable for active recreation uses. If the 1996 General Plan Alternative is adopted by the Board of Supervisors, they may choose to modify this policy. During preparation of a Parks Master Plan, as required by Implementation Measure PR-A, this issue could be considered.

Response to Comment 174-49 (GP): The Capital Improvement Plan should be updated after park needs are identified in an updated Parks Master Plan. If the No Project Alternative or 1996 General Plan Alternative are adopted by the Board of Supervisors, the policy reference to the preparer of the old master plan will be eliminated (see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document). Implementation Measure PR-A in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative also requires preparation of a Recreation Capital Improvement Program.

Response to Comment 174-50 (GP): As the commenter states, there appears to be a conflict between the last sentence of Policy 9.1.2.5 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative and Policy 9.1.1.5, as trails would normally be considered a passive recreational use. However, where trails have been identified in the Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan on a proposed project, it would be appropriate to request their dedication as part of the Quimby Act requirements.

Response to Comment 174-51 (GP): Concerning Policy 9.1.2.8 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the commenter requests that "bicycle" be added to this policy. Addition of "bicycle" would reasonably expand the scope of this policy. Please refer to Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for a revision to this policy.

Response to Comment 174-52 (GP): Policy 9.1.3.4 would apply to the regional park system. As stated in Policy 9.1.1.6, the County's stated responsibility is for the provision of regional parks. Other parks providers would have the responsibility of ensuring the ADA compliance of their facilities.

Response to Comment 174-53 (GP): Policy 9.2.2.2 reiterates the County policy to have development provide for local rather than regional recreational needs. Note also that Policies 9.2.2.1 and 9.2.2.4 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative grant review authority to the Parks and Recreation Commission and require the County to work with local districts to determine specific parks needs.

Response to Comment 174-54 (GP): Policy 9.2.2.3 is referring to the acquisition of land, while Policy 9.1.1.7 refers to the development of park facilities.

Response to Comment 174-55 (GP): The intent of Policy 9.2.2.7 is to encourage the Bureau of Land Management to sell its lands to private parties. The County would not manage these lands.

Response to Comment 174-56 (GP): The commenter is correct in pointing out that the objectives under Goal 9.3, Recreation and Tourism, do not contain any policies. If the Board of Supervisors adopts the No Project Alternative or the 1996 General Plan Alternative as the General Plan, policies should be drafted for these three objectives.

Response to Comment 174-57 (GP): Objective 9.3.5, concerning “Historical Events,” cites major events such as the Pony Express reenactment, agricultural festivities and historical fairs. This language does not preclude any other type of history-related activity.

Response to Comment 174-58 (GP): Section 16.12.090 of the County Code (Major Land Division Ordinance) requires the dedication of land or payment of fees for recreational purposes. This requirement does not extend to actual development of park facilities.

Response to Comment 174-59 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter supports a shorter implementation period for a specific measure. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-60 (GP): The commenter notes that the Economic Development Element does not address the specific needs of El Dorado Hills and other Community Regions. Implementation Measure ED-A requires the establishment of an economic advisory body to develop and implement an Economic Policy Framework. This process would evaluate the economic development needs in all areas of the County.

Response to Comment 174-61 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 11.

Response to Comment 174-62 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about El Dorado Hills being a major economic engine for the County and the gateway to Sacramento, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-63 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about the Economic Element not presenting a vision for the next twenty years are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-64 (GP): EPS forecasts projected nonresidential development that would occur through 2025 and buildout based on residential projections for each alternative. Nonresidential capacity significantly exceeds those projections for each alternative. See Table 4.6 of Volume 1 of the EIR. See bullet 2 on page 4-20 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 174-65 (GP): Agriculture, as it relates to economic development, is addressed in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative in the Agriculture and Forestry Element in Goals AF-1, AF-2 and AF-4. Tourism issues are covered in Goal LU-6 of the Land Use Element (relating to maintaining the County’s visual integrity and scenic quality) and the Parks and Recreation Element (Goal PR-6). In the No Project Alternative and the 1996

General Plan Alternative, tourism is addressed in the Parks and Recreation Element under Objective 9.3.5 and in the Economic Development Element under Objective 10.1.6.

Response to Comment 174-66 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Master Response 11.

Response to Comment 174-67 (GP): The areas referred to by the commenter, El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park and Diamond Springs/El Dorado, have been identified as Community Regions in four Alternatives. Community Regions were identified based on such factors as the extent of existing development, availability of infrastructure and location of transportation corridors. Goal LU-2 contained in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative provides policies to maintain the visual and physical separation of communities.

Response to Comment 174-68 (EIR): As noted by the commenter, the number of lanes on U.S. Highway 50 and other key roadways is an area of continuing controversy. The commenter also raises several Issues that are outside of the County's jurisdiction and therefore outside of the County's direct control. These include land use decisions in the City of Folsom and the County of Sacramento; improvements to U.S. Highway 50, both within the County and external to the County; and funding of improvements outside of the County.

El Dorado County will continue to work with the regional agencies to insure a coordinated transportation system. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative contain specific language to ensure the County does this coordination (e.g., Policies TC-1l and TC-1m, Implementation Measure TC-D). The No Project and the 1996 General Plan Alternatives do not contain such specific language, but it is recognized that to accomplish the goals in those alternatives, significant coordination with other agencies will be required.

Response to Comment 174-69 (GP): Implementation Measure CO-J in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires the County to develop and adopt an Oak Woodland Management Plan. In addition, the EIR proposes a mitigation measure for the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative for the development of an oak tree preservation ordinance. Please refer also to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 174-70 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment that the land in the El Dorado Hills Business Park should be kept for job growth rather than for schools and other uses, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-71 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 174-28.

Response to Comment 174-72 (GP): Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(c) proposes revisions to Policy 2.6.1.5 in the 1996 General Plan Alternative and the commenter proposes that the revisions be further revised to give the County sole authority to decide ridgeline development. As proposed for revision by the mitigation measure, the policy would give the County sole authority to determine whether and to what extent setbacks, screening, or other methods in order to avoid visual breaks to the skyline. Therefore no change is necessary. Note that Policy LU-6b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative restrict the placement of roads or structures on or along ridgelines "if that development would break the skyline or be visible from publicly accessed lands..."

Response to Comment 174-73 (GP): Proposed Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b) states that the growth control measure would apply to all new discretionary and ministerial development. It would, therefore, apply to residential and nonresidential development.

Response to Comment 174-74 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on his preference for a revised Level of Service (LOS) standard for the No Project and the 1996 General Plan Alternatives, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The EIR considers potential increases in peak hour traffic in its discussion of Impact 5.4-2. The EIR explains that the County considered but rejected a mitigation measure that would have set LOS C as the minimum acceptable threshold and modified the Circulation Element accordingly. This mitigation strategy would have led to numerous adverse effects on the environment.

Response to Comment 174-75 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 211-4 and 211-5, which describe the basis of Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b). Please see changes to Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. The mitigation measure requires water supply planning information to be based on a 20 year projection which is consistent with the trio of State laws described in the EIR that pertain to water supply planning (SB 610, SB 910, SB 221). Ministerial approvals are included because under each alternative several thousand homes could be constructed in the County under ministerial approvals, so a mechanism is proposed to consider and mitigate for the potential related impacts. Also, please see Responses to Comments 174-14, 174-15, 174-16 and 281-90.

Response to Comment 174-76 (EIR): The commenter is referred to Table 5.5-1 in the EIR and the recent EDCWA Draft Water Resources Development and Management Plan (June 2003, URL:www.co.el-dorado.ca.us/water/water_resources_plan.html) that was released for public review after the EIR was published. The water demand planning studies were based on existing, 2025, and buildout scenarios; intermediate calculations for years 5, 10, and 20 don't exist. Existing and future west slope groundwater demands in both references are represented as "Other County Areas." EDCWA's report further identifies groundwater demand for GDPUD, GFCSD, and three sub-areas of EID's service area. The delineation of these areas ultimately depends on the available water

supplies and other factors and is considered speculative at this time. Further, this information would not alter the discussion of impacts, impact significance conclusions, or mitigation measures identified.

Response to Comment 174-77 (EIR): The commenter refers to Mitigation Measure 5.5-8(a). In addition to a visual inspection, the mitigation requires owners of septic systems to repair any noted problems. Charges to homeowners with septic systems have not been determined, but would likely be negligible, if there is any charge at all, for inspections. The reason ports/risers are now being required in septic systems in the County is that it allows for quick and easy inspection to determine if the systems are functioning properly.

Response to Comment 174-78 (EIR): Folsom Lake is operated by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and is located in Sacramento, Placer, and El Dorado counties. Thus, any attempts to control noise levels on that lake would require coordination with all of these agencies. Mitigation Measure 5.10-3 provides for a policy for the County to coordinate with other agencies to reduce noise levels from sources outside the County's jurisdiction. This policy would facilitate any discussions to control noise on Folsom Lake. The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment, requesting a mechanism to control noise from boats on Folsom Lake, will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 174-79 (EIR): **Response to Comment 174-79 (EIR):** The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on eliminating exemptions for single-family residential lots from the proposed canopy retention and replacement standards, and inclusion of policies relating to oak tree trimming, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission.

LETTER 175: RALPH F. GERKEN

Response to Comment 175-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation for APN 102-200-25. This designation is included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. While the No Project Alternative uses the same Land Use Diagram as the 1996 General Plan Alternative, restrictions associated with the No Project Alternative would prevent any future subdivision, which appears to be the intent of the request. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the parcel is designated Rural Lands (RL). The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. While there is LDR in the vicinity, the RL designation is not inconsistent with the designations on surrounding land uses. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 176: RALPH GERKEN, ELLEN LEAL, AND CHARLOTTE-SHAFFER-GAUMER

Response to Comment 176-1 (GP): The land use designations assigned to each of the alternative Land Use Diagrams are based on historical land use designations (not necessarily zoning) and policy direction contained in each alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

The subject parcels have not been identified as open space. The Rural Lands (RL)/Rural Residential (RR) land use designations assigned under the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives would allow the commenter to subdivide and construct housing on the parcels. Restrictions on subdivision contained in the No Project and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives do not prevent the commenters from using their land, but do restrict subdividing in the future. Please also refer to Master Responses 8 and 9.

Response to Comment 176-2 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 8 for a description of the development of the Land Use Diagrams. As the commenter notes, the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives designate the subject parcels as Rural Residential/Rural Lands. Most of the parcels of similar size to the commenters' are designated RR/RL or open space. State law requires the evaluation of a range of alternatives when completing an Environmental Impact Report. The amount of detail allows for an equal-weight evaluation of the four primary General Plan alternatives, as well as a comparative evaluation of the other eight CEQA alternatives.

Response to Comment 176-3 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that alternative. Land use designations were established using the 1996 General Plan Land Use Diagram as a base. Using the assigned land use designations on that map, a computer model was used to look for parcels of a size and land use designation that could be subdivided in the event subdivisions could be processed. Those parcels that were identified as suitable for subdivision were then reassigned a land use designation that would accommodate a subdivision of no more than four parcels. For parcels that would be unable to be subdivided under the 1996 General Plan, a land use designation consistent with parcel size was assigned. Please also refer to Master Response 8. Properties surrounding the commenters' parcels may have different designations based on this fundamental constituent of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative.

The commenter indicates that the definition of the Natural Resources land use designation in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives does not accurately describe how that designation has been applied. The definition has been revised in those Alternatives. See Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 176-4 (GP): The commenters' request to have the Low Density Residential (LDR) designation applied to their parcels was not included in any of the General Plan alternatives. In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. Please refer to Responses to Comments 176-2 and 176-3 for information on how the land use designations were developed for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives.

LETTER 177: RICH AND SANDRA HOLMES

Response to Comment 177-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions favoring the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative expressed in the comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 177-2 (EIR): The effects of the draft General Plan alternatives on air quality and traffic are discussed in Sections 5.11 and 5.4, respectively, in the EIR.

Response to Comment 177-3 (GP/EIR): The EIR based its analysis of impacts on population projections made by EPS in its land use forecasts (EPS, 2002). These forecasts project between 3,134 and 5,776 new households could be created in the Cameron Park/Shingle Springs/Rescue Market Area by the year 2025, depending on the alternative. The concerns regarding Green Valley Road, land acquisitions, historical interest and scenic beauty expressed in the comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 178: MATHILDE HOLTROP

Response to Comment 178-1 (GP/EIR): The commenter expresses concern over growth in the County under three of the equal-weight alternatives. The commenter also expresses support for Comparative Alternatives #9 and #12, and support for moderate growth that protects rural lands, wildlife habitat, air quality, and water quality. The statement that the plan alternatives would triple the County's population in 22 years is inconsistent with the information in the EIR. The EIR states that population on the West Slope of El Dorado County could increase from a current level of approximately 121,000 persons to as much as 202,000 in 2025 or 318,000 at buildout under the highest growth alternative (see Table 3-2).

LETTER 179: PATRICK L. ENRIGHT, KRONICK MOSKOVITZ TIEDEMANN & GIRARD

Letters 39, 52, and 212 address the same issues as those raised in this comment letter. Please refer to those letters for additional information.

Response to Comment 179-1 (GP): The commenter's concerns regarding the placement of the El Dorado Hills Community Region boundary and the potential land use designations of his client's parcel under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives are noted for the record. Based on the contents of the letter, it appears that when the commenter refers to the "El Dorado Hills Community Plan Area" and "Specific Plan", he means the El Dorado Hills Community Region. Note that the County does not have individual community plans for its community regions and there is no adopted Specific Plan for the subject area. The County uses the term Community Region to identify distinct areas within the context of the General Plan.

The General Plan alternatives present options for the decisionmakers to consider. This is consistent with direction provided by the Board of Supervisors, California Environmental Quality Act, and Judge Bond in the text of the Writ of Mandate. The differences in land uses and Community Region and Rural Center boundaries are intentional. For example, under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, Policy LU-1b dictates the subdivision restriction that is an integral part of the Alternative. Land use designations were established based on this policy. In the area of commenter's client's parcels, land uses are identified as Low Density Residential and Rural Lands, designations that are not appropriate in Community Regions. Accordingly, the Community Region boundary was placed in a location consistent with that Alternative's land use pattern. It was anticipated that various residents and landowners in the County would prefer one or some alternative proposals over others. The commenter's opposition to the land use patterns presented in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives is noted. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

The General Plan process has no relationship to or effect upon the Covenants, Codes, and Restrictions (CCRs) in effect in the commenter's client's neighborhood. CCRs can be changed by those parties to whom they apply. The County did not create and does not enforce the CCRs referenced by the commenter. If the decisionmakers choose a Land Use Diagram that requires a minimum parcel size that is larger than allowed by the CCRs, a landowner may apply for a General Plan amendment to formally request a land use designation change.

While the commenter's client's property may meet the criteria normally applied to lands contained within Community Regions, other General Plan objectives may also factor in to the placement of Community Region boundaries (such as the example provided above). Please refer to Master Response 8 for a description of the development of the Land Use Diagrams, including designation of Community Region boundaries.

The commenter notes that the No Project Alternative is not an option for the decisionmakers to consider because it would result in the County not having a General Plan. The County is required, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, to evaluate a No Project Alternative. As proposed, the No Project Alternative includes a policy document, a Land Use Diagram that would provide guidance for the distribution of residential and nonresidential uses, and a circulation plan. If the Board of Supervisors chooses to adopt the No Project Alternative, these pieces of the alternative would become the General Plan. It could be regularly updated, consistent with State law.

The commenter mistakenly states that, under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, if his client's parcel remains in the Community Region, his client would be permitted to subdivide his parcel to more than four new parcels. Policy LU-1b would still apply to his client's parcel (i.e., even if the parcel was in the Community Region, the owner still could not subdivide it into more than four parcels).

The commenter's opinions regarding inconsistencies associated with the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and that the 1996 General Plan Alternative is the only alternative that is integrated and internally consistent are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 179-2 (GP): As the commenter notes, Policy LU-1b is a defining policy of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. Exceptions to this policy cannot be granted to any one property owner. The EIR recognizes that the effect of this policy could be dispersed residential development. However, the policy does not contradict the goal to concentrate higher density development in Community Regions or Rural Centers as there are numerous parcels within those areas that will allow for higher density development, even with the four-parcel limit on subdivision.

Policy LU-2d provides guidance for the use of low-density areas (e.g., Low Density Residential, Rural Lands, Natural Resources) to provide Community Region separation. There are no policies that address providing separation within Community Regions. The commenter's opinion that his client's property could serve as a transition between higher density and lower density land uses if it were identified as Medium Density Residential is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 179-3 (GP): It is recognized that the subject parcel may have access to infrastructure that is normally present within Community Regions and Rural Centers. However, the presence of infrastructure alone does not define Community Region and Rural Center boundaries (see Policy LU-4d of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative). As noted in Response to Comment 179-1, other factors, such as policies proposed in the General Plan, also influence Community Region and Rural Center boundaries.

The proposed boundaries of the El Dorado Hills Community Region in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives have no

relationship to the Community Service District boundaries or services that may be provided by Community Service Districts or to the future incorporation of El Dorado Hills.

Response to Comment 179-4 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 179-1. The commenter's opinions that the El Dorado Hills Community Region boundary proposed in these options are contrary to the stated goals of those plans and General Plan law are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 179-5 (GP): As the commenter suggests, the General Plan adoption process involves a number of parties. The Planning Commission will first hold a series of General Plan hearings so that it may make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding a "preferred" General Plan alternative. The Board will then hold a series of hearings in which it will deliberate the General Plan alternatives and adopt a final General Plan. The Planning Department and other County staff members provide support to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors throughout the process. The commenter's request that the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors reject the El Dorado Hills Community Region boundary proposed in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives is noted for the record and will be considered by those decisionmakers as they deliberate the General Plan.

LETTER 180: W. WYATT OGILVY, OGILVY CONSULTING

Response to Comment 180-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Rural Residential (RR) land use designation for APN 071-032-33 and Low Density Residential (LDR) for APN 071-132-45. This combination was not included in any of the General Plan Alternatives. In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. The commenter's concerns and opinions regarding discriminatory land use designations and development trends along the State Route 193 road corridor will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 181: RANDALL M. FACCINTO, STOEL RIVES LLP

Response to Comment 181-1 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the effect of floor area ratio restrictions in the El Dorado Hills Business Park are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The current FAR of 0.25 has been in effect since 1996. Please refer also to Master Response 12 and Response to Comment 101-1.

LETTER 182: CECIL L. WETSEL, JR., WETSEL-OVIATT LUMBER COMPANY

Response to Comment 182-1 (GP/EIR): Table A-3 in Volume 2 of the EIR lists parcel-specific requests (including those referred to by the commenter) that were considered. All of the parcels listed in the commenter's previous request were not included in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative because they were not consistent with the overall goals and objectives of those plans.

Response to Comment 182-2 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment objecting to policies in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 182-3 (GP): The County lacks the authority to approve Timber Harvest Plans under the Forest Practice Act. Please see Response to Comment 281-49. The text of the EIR on pages 5.2-84 and 5.2-85 of Volume 2 has been revised to clarify the scope of the County's authority. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. County review of timber harvest plans is not proposed in any of the General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 182-4 (GP): The comments reference Policy LU-6b in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, which limits ridgeline development. The commenter's opposition to this policy is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 182-5 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment opposing the establishment of the Important Biological Corridor overlay are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The Board of Supervisors is the land use authority for all lands under the County's jurisdiction. As such, it is the appropriate agency for establishing this overlay in the County.

Response to Comment 182-6 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment opposing the extension of the Natural Resources 160-acre minimum parcel size down to the 2,500 foot elevation, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 182-7 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating support of the draft Forestry Policies recommended by the Agricultural Commission, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please also refer to Responses to Comment Letter 173 (Agricultural Commission).

Response to Comment 182-8 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative impose excessive obstacles to the creation of a General Plan acceptable by the Court and County citizens is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 183: RONALD A. ZUMBRUN, CARE

Response to Comment 183-1 (EIR): The commenter's opinion regarding the adequacy of the EIR is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 183-2 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 156-3 through 156-5 for a discussion of this issue. On all alternatives Saratoga Way is extended to Iron Point Road in Folsom because it is a necessary improvement to accommodate projected traffic increases associated with each of the General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 183-3 (EIR): Saratoga Way is projected to operate at a level of service that is consistent with the LOS policies of each of the draft General Plan alternatives. The commenter's view that this LOS is unacceptable is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations concerning the General Plan. The extension of Iron Point Road to the County line was included within the Folsom General Plan, and is a specific requirement of the Empire Ranch development project within the City. The extension of this roadway is currently under construction and is projected to be complete in 2004. Please refer to Responses to Comments 156-1, 156-2, 156-3, and 156-4 for further discussion on these issues.

Response to Comment 183-4 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comments 156-1 and 156-4 for a discussion of the issues raised in this comment.

Response to Comment 183-5 (EIR): Please refer to response to Comment Letter 156 for a discussion of the issues raised in this comment.

Response to Comment 183-6 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) recommends deleting a clause within Policy 3.5.1.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives that states that in addition to an overall standard of LOS E countywide, ". . . all road segments projected in the roadway plan at the year 2015 to be operating at LOS A, B, or C shall not be allowed to fall below LOS C, and all road segments at LOS D shall not be allowed to fall below LOS D." This policy was interpreted in the EIR to set a LOS standard higher than LOS E for certain roadways and Impact 5.4-1 found that segments of El Dorado Hills Boulevard, White Rock Road, and Latrobe Road violated this higher standard. To eliminate this inconsistency the EIR proposed deleting the language for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives (there is no comparable language in the Roadway Constrained and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives). Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) also proposed adding roadway segments on White Rock Road, Latrobe Road, and (for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative) U.S. Highway 50 to the list of roadways allowed to operate at LOS F. As it does for the segments included on the list in the General Plan alternatives, the amended list would set a LOS standard based on a specified volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio for each segment. The mitigation measure has been clarified in Chapter 2.0 of

this Response to Comments document to specify the ratio based on the ratio projected for 2025 as calculated from the roadway capacity analysis results contained in Appendix D-3 in Volume 3 of the EIR.

The EIR explains that Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) would not improve traffic flow and that the impacts of the projected traffic levels would remain. Other measures that could improve traffic flow were presented as options but their feasibility could not be assured. The effect of Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) would be to allow traffic levels to reach projected levels.

The direct impacts of the General Plan alternatives on traffic (including allowing traffic to operate at levels of service below the standard set in the proposed General Plan alternatives) are considered in Impact 5.4-2. The indirect effects of traffic levels to land use/housing, noise, air quality, health and safety, and visual resources/aesthetics are addressed in corresponding sections of the EIR. Please refer to Sections 5.1, 5.10, 5.11, 5.8, and 5.3 respectively for discussions on each of those issues. Mitigation Measure 5.4-2 for each of the General Plan alternatives includes Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) as an option to mitigate traffic operating at levels of service below C. That mitigation measure would not mitigate the impact identified in Impact 5.4-2 and has been removed from the list of options proposed in Mitigation Measure 5.4-2 (see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document).

With respect to the projected levels of service on Saratoga Way, please see Response to Comment 156-4. Under the EIR/EA for the El Dorado Hills Blvd interchange a two-lane Saratoga Way through 2015 would be allowed to fall to LOS E. Therefore, the discussion above with respect to Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) would not be applicable to Saratoga Way. The traffic analysis for all General Plan alternatives indicates that, with improvements to four lanes, Saratoga Way will operate at LOS D in 2025, which is consistent with the level of service policies of all alternatives. Please see Response to Comment 156-4 for a more detailed discussion on this issue.

Response to Comment 183-7 (EIR): The Silva Valley interchange is an identified component of the El Dorado Hills/Salmon Falls Road Impact Fee Program (RIF). As part of the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (Serrano) Development Agreement, a separate trust account was established, and 30 percent of all RIF fees collected in the El Dorado Hills/Salmon Falls area are deposited in that account to fund those interchange improvements. A Caltrans Project Report was completed for that interchange, and a project level EIR has been certified as well. The interchange project is listed on the Current SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan as project ELD15610, and is listed in the “El Dorado County Department of Transportation Draft Interim Capital Improvement Program, November 2002”. This interchange is a necessary component of the Circulation Element of each of the General Plan alternatives, and a funding program is in place to assure its construction. There is no proposal to amend the Circulation diagram in any of the alternatives to remove the project from the list of anticipated projects. It is beyond the reasonable scope of the General Plan EIR to perform “what if” scenarios

to examine the possible impacts of omitting one or more of the over 40 improvements proposed as part proposed circulation diagrams under the various General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 183-8 (EIR): The commenter's view that the burden of impacts rests on El Dorado Hills homeowners is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. As a general rule, the greatest transportation impacts, and the greatest need for infrastructure to mitigate those impacts generally occur in those areas with the highest concentration of development. The El Dorado Hills Market Area has projected the most residential and nonresidential development of any of the General Plan market areas (please refer to Appendix B-1 in Volume 3 of the EIR). Much of the development occurring today and its associated infrastructure is a fulfilling of the plans put in place almost 40 years ago when El Dorado Hills was originally conceived as a planned community. The majority of the future growth projected for the El Dorado Hills area under each of the General Plan alternatives is associated with existing Development Agreement based entitlements, most of which were contemplated under those early community plans. The General Plan alternatives identify the infrastructure necessary to accommodate the existing development plus entitled land use development from these previous plans within an updated policy context that has changed over time due to a variety of influences including, but not limited to, Measure Y, legal challenges, updated traffic analysis methodology, and better land use forecasting capabilities. The EIR contains feasible mitigation measures so as not to impose an unfair burden on the residents and beneficiaries of that planned community.

LETTER 184: JAY DENNIS

Response to Comment 184-1 (GP): Compared to the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the Community Region boundary has been moved westward to Lakehills Drive in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. This was based largely on a change in land use designations under those alternatives. The change resulted in reduced land use densities, as compared to the 1996 General Plan Alternative. As a result, the level of traffic on Lakehills Drive would be lower under the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

LETTER 185: ROY RUTZ, GEORGETOWN DIVIDE RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Response to Comment 185-1 (GP): This comment expresses support of the El Dorado County Fire Safe Council's recommendations. Please refer to the responses to Comment Letter 265.

LETTER 186: ELNA NORMAN

Response to Comment 186-1 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 160-1.

Response to Comment 186-2 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 160-2.

Response to Comment 186-3 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 160-3.

Response to Comment 186-4 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 160-4.

LETTER 187: JOHN BERRY, USDA FOREST SERVICE, ELDORADO NATIONAL FOREST

Response to Comment 187-1 (GP): The commenter recommends an expansion of the scope of Goal HS-2 in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives relating to wildfire safety. He correctly points out that the issue of safety from wildfire is a combination of hazards and risk. The goal has been revised to include "risk", as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. A similar revision has been made to Goal 6.2 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

This comment also suggests that a countywide hazard and risk assessment be undertaken. Wildfire hazard and risk assessment would be conducted under the development of a wildfire safety plan, pursuant to Implementation Measure HS-B in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Please refer to the responses to Comment Letter 265, El Dorado County Fire Safe Council, for specific recommendations and policy revisions related to the details of fire safe planning and assessment.

Response to Comment 187-2 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 187-1 and the Responses to Comment Letter 265.

Response to Comment 187-3 (GP): This comment refers to the need for specific standards for fuel reduction in greenbelt areas and new development adjacent to forested areas. A new implementation measure has been added to the Health, Safety, and Noise Element of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 187-4 (GP): Policies to address this issue are included in the Health and Safety Element of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Please see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for a new policy that would provide similar language in the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

Response to Comment 187-5 (EIR): The potential impacts resulting from development of future water supply projects and the important role that USFS would have in the planning and environmental analysis of such projects is identified in the EIR. In particular, the current involvement of the USFS with Project 184 is described on page 5.5-34; the general coordination with USFS for future water supply projects is identified in Table 5.5-11. While the land ownership of the source watersheds is important, further identification of the USFS or other agencies involved was not deemed particularly relevant nor would it provide additional information useful for the impact assessment.

Response to Comment 187-6 (EIR): The staff concurs with this comment. Under Impact 5.5-2, the potential firm yield is not specified for the potential water supply projects identified in the comment and the lack of information on or the uncertainty with respect to firm yield of

any of the identified potential water supply projects is stated in the second paragraph on page 5.5-51.

Response to Comment 187-7 (EIR): The regulation of septic systems is described in the EIR on pages 5.5-77 and 5.5-78 of Volume 1, and the potential impact on groundwater quality from development of additional septic systems under each of the General Plan alternatives is described under Impact 5.5-7. The impact is concluded to be significant and mitigation is provided to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level (see page 5.5-127 of the EIR). In addition to the existing County ordinance that governs septic systems, these measures are expected to be protective of groundwater quality.

Response to Comment 187-8 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 229-4.

Response to Comment 187-9 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 229-5.

Response to Comment 187-10 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding plan assumptions related to water supply are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Note that the EIR in Section 5.5 identifies insufficient water supplies as a potentially significant impact and proposes various mitigation measures to address the issue.

Response to Comment 187-11 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 187-5 through 187-9.

Response to Comment 187-12 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the emphasis on directing growth to areas with adequate infrastructure in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and that this type of residential development will aid in reducing hazardous fuels, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 187-13 (GP): The commenter's support for clustered development policies in the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The commenter's support for a policy to address fuel management in a more comprehensive manner is noted and discussed in Response to Comment 187-4.

Note that subsequent to the approval and construction of residential uses in the County's rural areas such as those referenced by the commenter, landowners are required to maintain defensible space that is incorporated as part of the development (e.g., a landowner could not expand a residential building into a fire safe setback). Landowners are also required to maintain access provisions as approved in the original development plan. Setback and

access standards are articulated in the Fire Safe Regulations. Local Fire Protection Agencies also consider proposed standards at the time of project review.

The County Office of Emergency Services (OES), a division of the Sheriff's Department, maintains evacuation information. In the event of a fire emergency, the OES would work with fire response personnel to evacuate threatened areas.

Also, please refer to the Responses to Comments made in Letter 265 (Vicky Yorty, El Dorado County Fire Safe Council).

Response to Comment 187-14 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 229-14.

Response to Comment 187-15 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 229-14.

Response to Comment 187-16 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the Agricultural District overlay and discouraging incompatible uses as contained in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 187-17 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 229-19.

Response to Comment 187-18 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the recognition of wildlife habitat does not appear to be included in either the No Project Alternative or the 1996 General Plan Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The EIR in Section 5.12 of Volume 1 proposes a number of mitigation measures to limit impacts to wildlife habitat.

Response to Comment 187-19 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on specific road maintenance issues and the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. This is also an issue best dealt with outside of the General Plan, as the General Plan does not directly discuss specific road maintenance issues.

Response to Comment 187-20 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 187-19.

Response to Comment 187-21 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the open space policies of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the need to maintain the County's character, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 187-22 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 229-31.

Response to Comment 187-23 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the recognition of the importance of parks and recreation to the quality of life and stating that the National Forest cannot provide for all types of recreational experiences, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 187-24 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 229-33.

Response to Comment 187-25 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 229-31.

Response to Comment 187-26 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 187-23.

Response to Comment 187-27 (GP): The EIR proposes numerous mitigation measures to address wildlife needs. Please see Section 5.12 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 187-28 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the recognition of agriculture and forestry in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 187-29 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 229-37.

Response to Comment 187-30 (GP): The commenter notes that the Brockliss Bridge is not a 2-lane motorized route, and that the bridge no longer exists, but does not reference where this is raised within the General Plan. Peavine Road has been included on various maps as connecting to U.S. Highway 50 over the American River. The Brockliss Bridge is not shown on these maps; however the commenter is correct that the bridge no longer exists and therefore removes this connection to U.S. Highway 50. Please note that Peavine Road was not used in any of the population forecasts or LOS calculations, so the removal of this bridge will not change conclusions that have been made for the General Plan update.

LETTER 188: KEITH WAGNER, LAW OFFICE OF J. WILLIAM YEATES

Response to Comment 188-1 (GP): These comments are made on behalf of the Measure Y Committee. The General Plan team understands that these comments do not supersede or replace other comments made by the Measure Y Committee or its members. The commenter's views on the County's obligations pursuant to Measure Y are noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the Plan.

Response to Comment 188-2 (GP/EIR): The General Plan Team was not advised that either (1) Measure Y is of no force and effect or (2) Measure Y's policies are suspended. The Board of Supervisors directed the General Plan Team to include the policies of Measure Y in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives analyzed in the EIR. Some commenters have advanced legal arguments that Measure Y is of no force and effect. The County has not made a determination as to the legal effect of Measure Y. This is discussed in more detail in Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 188-3(GP/EIR): The commenter's view on the legal status of Measure Y is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. Please see Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 188-4(GP/EIR): This comment leads into the commenter's subsequent remarks. No response is required.

Response to Comment 188-5(GP/EIR): The staff concurs that Measure Y amended the 1996 General Plan to include the policy language quoted in the first paragraph of this comment and that Measure Y contained the text described in the second paragraph of the comment. All four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives include the policy language referenced in this comment.

Response to Comment 188-6(GP/EIR): This comment summarizes the Writ of Mandate directing the County to vacate its approval of the 1996 General Plan and establishing criteria to govern land use approvals pending adoption of a new General Plan. No response is required. The requirements of the Writ of Mandate are discussed in Master Response 3.

Response to Comment 188-7(GP/EIR): This comment summarizes litigation challenging the validity of Measure Y. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment 188-8(GP/EIR): The commenter is correct that the policy revisions proposed in Mitigation Measures 5.4-1(c) and 5.4-3(a) would be inconsistent with the policy language adopted in Measure Y. This is discussed in Master Response 15. As noted there, the referenced mitigation measures were among several proposed by the EIR for consideration by the County. The EIR did not adopt the policy language or

amend the County's General Plan. The General Plan can be adopted and amended only by the Board of Supervisors or the voters. If Measure Y is legally binding and the Board of Supervisors determines that Mitigation Measures 5.4-1(c) and 5.4-3(a) are an appropriate policy response to Impacts 5.4-1 and 5.4-3, then the Board would be required to put the proposed policy changes to a vote of the people. As discussed in Master Response 15, however, there are alternative mitigation measures available that would not require changing the referenced policies.

The last paragraph of this comment notes that under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative the effect of Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) would be to allow U.S. Highway 50 to operate at LOS F from Cambridge Road to the west County line and states that this would undercut the purpose of that alternative. A key purpose of that alternative is to maintain U.S. Highway 50 at six lanes. According to the analysis prepared for the EIR, LOS F is a necessary result of this limitation even where growth is limited by allowing no subdivisions greater than four parcels. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may consider further restrictions on land use to allow improved levels of service during their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 188-9(GP/EIR): The commenter's opinion regarding the effect of applicable law is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 188-10(GP/EIR): The commenter's opinion regarding the effect of applicable law is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 188-11(GP/EIR): During the *Concerned Citizens of El Dorado* case referenced by the commenter, the County informed the Court that Judge Bond's Writ of Mandate contains the policies adopted by Measure Y and that those policies must be applied where they are applicable to projects that may be processed under the Writ of Mandate.

Response to Comment 188-12(GP/EIR): The commenter's opinion regarding the effect of Judge Haugner's ruling is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 188-13(GP/EIR): The commenter's opinion regarding the effect of Judge Haugner's ruling is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 188-14(GP/EIR): The commenter's opinion regarding the effect of Judge Haugner's ruling is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 188-15(GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 188-8.

Response to Comment 188-16(GP/EIR): Please refer to Master Response 15.

LETTER 189: CAMINO COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Response to Comment189-1 (GP): The comment suggests that the core of Camino be designated Commercial in order to implement the Community Action Plan developed in 1991. These properties are not owned by the commenter, however the suggestion expressed in the comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 190: LEWIS AND LOUISE HACKETT

Response to Comment 190-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please see Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between land use designations and zoning.

The commenters' preference for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative or Environmentally Constrained Alternative and to retain a Low Density Residential designation for the area in which they live is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

LETTER 191: RON AND TERRY HIGGINS ET AL.

Response to Comment 191-1 (GP): The commenters' concerns and opinions regarding the El Dorado Hills Community Region boundary and preference for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

LETTER 192: SAL G. OROSCO

Response to Comment 192-1 (GP): The nature of the General Plan Alternatives prepared as part of the General Plan update process has been public knowledge since release of the California Environmental Quality Act Notice of Preparation in July of 2001. The details associated with each alternative were developed over time based on input from the decisionmakers, agency representatives, and the public. The commenter's opinions regarding a "spinning" of the facts and influence by a small special group and his support for the comments of two community members and the 1996 General Plan Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 192-2 (GP): The commenter's attachment reiterates a parcel-specific request received in August of 2002. That request is included in Table A-3 in Appendix A of Volume 2 of the EIR. The commenter's request, to have Commercial designation applied to his property (APN 067-260-15), is evaluated in all of the General Plan Alternatives.

LETTER 193: (INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

LETTER 194: DAVID C. SEDERQUIST

Response to Comment 194-1 (GP): The specific change, if any, the commenter is seeking is unclear. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding groundwater availability are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 194-2 (GP): The staff agrees that this analysis should be performed by qualified individuals.

Response to Comment 194-3 (GP): Policy 5.3.1.4 would not preclude the use of open space within projects for disposal fields. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding wastewater disposal or replacement areas utilizing open space areas are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 194-4 (GP): The County agrees that the availability of water at a point in time can be determined, but long-term availability of that water and how it may or may not affect neighboring properties is not predictable in a fractured rock aquifer. The text in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives has been revised to correct the statement, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 194-5 (GP): The commenter is correct in that the underlying rock type is not a consideration when designing septic systems. Rather, the soil type relative to the size of the parcel, depth to groundwater, percolation rate, and other factors may limit the ability to develop land without the availability of public sewer. The text in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives has been revised to more clearly articulate this issue as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 194-6 (GP): Please refer to the previous responses to Comments 194-4 and 194-5. Onsite wastewater disposal is discussed in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives under the heading of "Wastewater Collection and Treatment." Applicable policies are PS-4a, PS-4b, and PS-4c.

Response to Comment 194-7 (GP): The commenter suggests that a requirement for proof of a successful groundwater well be placed on newly created residential parcels as a condition of sale. Currently, anyone wishing to construct a residential dwelling must provide information regarding water supply (i.e., public water or private water) at the time of building permit application. El Dorado County Environmental Management Department Policy 800-02 states as that, pursuant to Section 15.16.120, Section 303(a), of the El Dorado County Code, "No building permit shall be issued for the construction of a building having plumbing facilities therein, or the placing of a mobile home, until proof of an adequate water supply is provided by the applicant to the Division of Environmental Health." Policy 800-02 defines adequate

groundwater supply as flow “capable of providing to each connection a minimum of five (5) gallons per minute, either from the well itself or a combination of well and storage, at a minimum of fifteen (15) pounds per square inch pressure.” Wells producing less than one gallon per minute are not considered an adequate water supply, regardless of the contribution from storage.

Currently, the County’s Subdivision Ordinance does not indicate that, for groundwater-dependent development, lots cannot be sold without proof of a successful well. However, the proposed mitigation is unnecessary given the County’s Policy 800-02

Response to Comment 194-8 (GP): The County Environmental Management Department maintains an Internet website with information about well development, although the site does not contain specific information about the typical usage associated with rural residential development. Please see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comment document for a proposed new policy addressing this issue.

LETTER 195: N. BRUCE AND BARBARA E. ASHWILL

Response to Comment 195-1 (GP): The commenters request the Rural Residential (RR) designation for APNs 091-010-33, 45, 46, 47, and 48 and 091-090-17. This request is included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcels are designated Natural Resource (NR) [3] and Rural Lands (RL) [3]. That Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcels are designated RL (4) and NR (2). For that Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. The commenter's concerns and opinions regarding the effects of the other alternatives on his investments is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 196: CAMINO COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Response to Comment 196-1 (GP/EIR): This comment is an accurate reflection of Mitigation Measure 5.10-1(a), with the exception that it does not apply to existing operations or uses. Therefore, this policy would not force the closure of the lumber mill in Camino. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding noise standards and their effect on different industries are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 196-2 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the cumulative impact on agriculture are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 196-3 (GP): Policy 8.1.3.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policy AF-1e of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives address the Right to Farm Ordinance. While there are many parcels of land zoned residential with agricultural operations, especially in the Camino area, there are other areas of the County where such agricultural use is secondary, and could be considered an intrusion on the residential character of the area. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding application of Right to Farm provisions to residentially-zoned parcels are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 196-4 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding application of ranch marketing provisions to smaller parcels within the Agricultural Districts are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 196-5 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 196-3.

Response to Comment 196-6 (GP): The 200-foot setback provisions of Policy 8.1.3.2 of the No Project Alternative have been codified in the El Dorado County Code as Section 17.06.150, "Special setbacks for agricultural protection." The ordinance amendment was adopted in 1997 and has subsequently been enforced.

Response to Comment 196-7 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 196-3.

Response to Comment 196-8 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the agricultural protections of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 196-9 (GP): Implementation Measure AF-E of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives is designed to provide a mechanism for the Agricultural Commission to review and comment on discretionary project approvals that may have an effect on agricultural land and operations. The commenter suggests that this review be extended to nondiscretionary uses in agricultural districts. This approach is proposed by Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a). The commenter's view is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 196-10 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding agricultural spraying are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 196-11 (GP/EIR): This comment accurately reflects the intent of Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(f).

Response to Comment 196-12 (GP): The specific provisions of the Ranch Marketing Ordinance are not before the Board of Supervisors as a part of this General Plan update.

Response to Comment 196-13 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 196-12.

Response to Comment 196-14 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding wineries on SA-10 zoned parcels and permitting other low-impact family activities are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 196-15 (EIR): Regarding requirements for new storage, Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) will result in new development within the County proceeding only upon verification that adequate water supplies are available. While storage is not specified over other means of ensuring available water supplies, the mitigation measure will effectively reduce the probability of water shortages. Regarding water conservation measures, the major water purveyors currently have drought planning and water conservation measures. In addition, Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(c) specifically requires the County to develop and implement a new water use efficiency program for existing and new residential, commercial/industrial, and agricultural uses designed to more aggressively promote conservation and efficient use of the available water supplies and use of recycled water. Taken together, these policies will allow the County to implement the specific suggestions of the commenter as circumstances warrant.

Response to Comment 196-16 (EIR): The commenter's support for increasing water supply storage in Jenkinson Lake is noted. This is a project under the jurisdiction of EID. Please refer to Response to Comment 162-36.

Response to Comment 196-17 (EIR): As described on page 5.5-115 of the EIR, water quality impacts from agricultural runoff would be less than significant. The commenter acknowledges that there are no known nitrogen water pollution problems in the County. Thus, a policy encouraging the use of organic alternatives to pesticides would not be needed to reduce any significant impacts. In addition, the County believes that there are existing State regulatory enforcement agencies and programs such as the RWQCB, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Department of Health Services (DHS), and Department of Fish and Game (DFG) better suited to identify and control potential regional water pollution. As described on page 5.5-102, the SWRCB recently adopted a new conditional waiver program for agricultural irrigation and stormwater runoff that requires widescale water quality monitoring activities. Other regulatory programs include State regulatory authority over pesticide use and application through the licensing of certified pesticide applicators for registered pesticides (CalEPA Department of Pesticide Regulation). These regulatory agencies have the authority to direct changes in available products that are found to be a problem.

Response to Comment 196-18 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the need for signage in agricultural areas are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 197: CAMINO COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Response to Comment 197-1 (GP): Policy AF-1a of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative identifies lands suitable for consideration of the application of the Agricultural District Overlay land use designation. This policy would not limit the planting or production of any agricultural crop within these districts or elsewhere in the County.

Response to Comment 197-2 (GP): Policy AF-1a of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative assigns the responsibility of determining suitability of land for agricultural purposes to the Agricultural Commission. Policy 8.1.1.2, in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, designates the Board of Supervisors as the body to make that determination. In either case, the determination is based on a consideration of appropriate use based on a number of factors, including its suitability for agricultural production. The Board of Supervisors would need to base its decision on recommendations from the Agricultural Commission as well as other experts on appropriate land use.

Response to Comment 197-3 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 196-3 for a discussion of the application of the Right to Farm provisions to nonagriculturally-zoned parcels. Additional discussion regarding the Right to Farm Ordinance is contained in Responses to Comments 173-10 and 173-23. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding application of the Right to Farm provisions to residentially-zoned parcels are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

The County presently requires a zone change to be processed when boundary line adjustments are made between properties with different zoning, so that the resultant parcels do not result in parcels with multiple zone districts. The comment suggests that a zone change application not be required, and that the land be automatically rezoned to a zone that best supports agriculture. A zone change is a legislative action that must go through a public hearing and CEQA review process (California Government Code Section 65804), and therefore, cannot be approved administratively or automatically.

Response to Comment 197-4 (EIR): This comment references Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(c), which relates to visual impacts of ridgeline development. However, the comment addresses limitations on ranch marketing as set forth in Mitigation Measure 5.2-2. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding maximum area for marketing activities and minimum planting requirements are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Response to Comment 263-91.

Response to Comment 197-5 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding application of oak tree protection requirements, as set forth in Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(g) are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 197-6 (EIR): A target goal of 50 percent recycling of construction material was based on a review of other such requirements in California and is aimed at reducing a major source of landfill waste. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding mandated construction materials recycling as set forth in Mitigation Measure 5.6-3 are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. A “Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance” was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on September 23, 2003. This ordinance would require project proponents (with structures exceeding 5,000 square feet) to recycle a minimum of fifty percent by weight of the total debris generated by the project.

Response to Comment 197-7 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding water supplies and allocations to agricultural uses are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Response to Comment 210-7.

Response to Comment 197-8 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding housing for agricultural workers and other low income households are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 197-9 (EIR): Please see revisions to Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding water availability and exempting agriculture from this requirement are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 197-10 (EIR): The mitigation measure is in order to address an impact identified in the EIR. An exemption for agriculture would reduce the effectiveness of this mitigation measure.

Response to Comment 197-11 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding expansion of natural gas service to other parts of El Dorado County are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. PG&E, the public utility that currently provides natural gas to El Dorado Hills, is not regulated by the County. Expansion of service is based on PG&E business decisions and regulation by the California Public Utilities Commission.

Response to Comment 197-12 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(c) indicates that applying the grading ordinance to agricultural activities disturbing one acre or more would

reduce the erosion impacts from clearing for the planting of crops. The proposed policy sets forth a time of the year in which grading activities can occur and when it is restricted or more tightly regulated. Although there are yearly fluctuations in the time that rain and snow falls, the rainy season in the County is from mid-October to the end of April. Therefore, the limitations on grading, which currently exist to a degree under Chapter 15.14 of the El Dorado County Code, are appropriate. The mitigation measure has been revised herein to apply to the conversion of undisturbed land to agricultural land (see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document). The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 197-13 (GP): Each General Plan alternative contains policies to protect historic communities by designating them as historic places and adopting guidelines and standards for historic design review. These include Policies 2.4.1.2, 7.5.1.4, and all policies under Objective 7.5.2 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and Policies LU-6e, CO-8a, and CO-9a, along with Implementation Measures LU-G and CO-A in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 197-14 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding utilization of 30 percent or steeper slopes for grape production are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Response to Comments 280-107 and 281-219, 403 and 404.

Response to Comment 197-15 (GP): Policies 2.3.2.1 and those under Objective 2.6.1 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, Policies LU-6a and LU-6b, and Implementation Measure LU-F direct the County to prepare a scenic corridor ordinance and develop protection measures for the important scenic resources in the County. Mitigation Measures 5.3-1(b) and 5.3-1(c) expand upon those policies. Vineyards and orchards are considered a part of those scenic resources, and any ordinance or standards implementing these policies will take that into consideration.

Response to Comment 197-16 (GP): This comment references the Conservation and Open Space Element of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. However, there is no discussion of "visual appeal" in this element. The Land Use Element contains a section entitled "Visual Quality and Scenic Values" and includes several policies under Goal LU-6, "To maintain and enhance the County's visual integrity and scenic quality." Visual appeal or quality is, by its nature, a subjective term. Any standards established under these policies will be made by the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, and will, therefore, reflect the preferences and perspectives of the community.

Response to Comment 197-17 (GP): The use of soil maps is only one tool used in identifying agricultural lands. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, the Agricultural Districts are also identified by those regions in the County where agriculture is the predominant use (pages 23 and 278, Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, Policy AF-1a; Policies 2.2.2.2 and 8.1.1.1 through 8.1.1.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives). The Environmentally Constrained Alternative also identifies agricultural land by means other than just soil types, including Williamson Act Contract lands and deeds currently under conversion to agricultural production (pages 22-23 and 277-278, Policy AF-1a).

Response to Comment 197-18 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the Right to Farm Ordinance are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Each alternative contains policies that direct the County to expand the Right to Farm provisions (Policy AF-1e and Implementation Measure AF-A in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, and Policy 8.1.3.3 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives).

Response to Comment 197-19 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the need for additional water storage and supply are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Policy PS-2a of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives directs the County to support the Water Agency and water purveyors in developing new water supplies. No similar policy exists in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. Please refer to Responses to Comments 150-22 and 150-23.

Response to Comment 197-20 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding demolition of historic buildings and creation of historic districts are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 197-21 (GP): Policy AF-1a would allow any land that meets the specified criteria to be placed within the Agricultural land use designation. The Right to Farm Ordinance would then apply to these properties (Policy AF-1e).

Response to Comment 197-22 (GP): Policy 8.1.3.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Implementation Measure AF-A would require the Right to Farm Ordinance to be amended to contain a deed restriction requirement that would provide such a disclosure on new parcels created adjacent to agricultural land. The County does not review or regulate land sales, and has no ability to enforce disclosure requirements on existing parcels.

Response to Comment 197-23 (GP): Policy AF-2b in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives provide for the County to

establish a procedure for evaluating land for possible expansion of the Agricultural designation or District, respectively.

Response to Comment 197-24 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding timber farming are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Policy 8.2.2.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives recognizes Christmas tree farms as agricultural operations. The growing of trees for timber production is covered in the Forestry sections of the respective Agricultural and Forestry Element of each alternative.

Response to Comment 197-25 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding restrictions on agricultural water are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 198: KEITH JOHNSON, EL DORADO COUNTY TAXPAYERS FOR QUALITY GROWTH

Response to Comment 198-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment about the Environmentally Constrained Alternative containing almost 50 percent more population growth than the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 198-2 (EIR): The EIR analyzes the impacts of the four equal-weight General Plan Alternatives: the 1996 General Plan Alternative, Environmentally Constrained Alternative, Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, and the No Project Alternative. Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the EIR, which contains the alternatives analysis, makes the determination that the Environmentally Constrained Alternative most adequately protects biological resources.

Response to Comment 198-3 (GP/EIR): The commenter requests preparation of a hybrid map that reflects the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative map population figures with the Important Biological Corridor (-IBC) overlay. Mitigation Measure 5.12-3(b) proposes application of the -IBC overlay to the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative (and the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives as well). If this mitigation measure is adopted, the County would subsequently prepare a map showing the -IBC overlay and the adopted land uses.

Response to Comment 198-4 (GP): As the commenter notes, the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative utilize this density for the High Density Residential designation. Policies LU-3a through LU-3c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative describe a Planned Development (PD) land use designation. The four equal-weight General Plan alternatives take a different approach to planning with regard to the PD designation. The PD concept as proposed in the 1996 General Plan Alternative was determined to not produce the degree of contiguous open space that the approach taken in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives would. By designating open space up front rather than requiring it on a piece-by-piece, project-by-project basis, more valuable contiguous open space is achieved. The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative's approach on this issue is noted and will be considered by the Board of Supervisors during their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 198-5 (GP/EIR): Prior to the adoption of a scenic corridor ordinance, projects requiring a general plan consistency review would be subject to the visual and scenic protection policies in the proposed general plans, including the policies under Goals 2.6 and 2.7 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and Goal LU-7 of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Policy 2.6.1.1 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative (which would also be

applied as an interim policy under the other alternatives with the adoption of Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(c)) lists a number of specific factors to be considered in establishing standards under the scenic corridor ordinance.

Prior to the adoption of those standards, the factors in Policy 2.6.1.1 would be applied on a case-by-case basis to individual projects. Some of these factors and other scenic policies in the General Plan alternatives are applicable to projects within scenic corridors, which will not have been designated prior to the adoption of the scenic ordinance. To ensure in the interim that these policies are applied to projects within potential scenic corridors, Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(b) for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(c) for the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, have been modified. The modifications clarify that, until scenic corridors are established, discretionary projects visible from any of the important public scenic viewpoints identified in Table 5.3-1 and Exhibit 5.3-1 of Volume 1 of the EIR would be subject to design review, and all policies relating to the protection of scenic corridors shall be applicable to such projects. Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. Please also refer to Response to Comment 198-6.

Response to Comment 198-6 (GP/EIR): The "Review Draft" Scenic Highways Ordinance prepared in 1992 only proposed standards for development in the U.S. Highway 50 and State Route 49 corridors. That ordinance was never adopted by the Board of Supervisors. Currently, proposed projects located adjacent to U.S. Highway 50 and State Route 49 which are zoned for commercial, industrial and multifamily uses would be required to go through the design review process. A public hearing would be conducted on the project before the Planning Commission. This process would offer some measure of protection for these particular resources. As discussed in Response to Comment 198-4, the visual protection policies in the General Plan alternatives and proposed mitigation measures (as modified in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document), including the enumerated criteria for developing scenic corridor ordinance standards, would be applied to individual projects on a case-by-case basis until an ordinance is adopted.. Please refer to Response to Comment 198-5.

Response to Comment 198-7 (GP/EIR): The Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative propose Goal LU-2 and accompanying policies relating to visual and physical separation of distinct communities. In addition, the EIR proposes as a mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure 5.1-2) a policy to create distinct community separators through parcel analysis and possible parcel consolidation and transfer of development rights.

Response to Comment 198-8 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 198-7 above. The policies and mitigation measures in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives are geared toward maintaining the separation of the Community Regions along U.S. Highway 50 and State Route 49 by directing growth into the Community Regions and Rural Centers and preserving lower densities in the Rural Regions. The

protections found in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives are greater, however, because the Community Regions are smaller in extent than those in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. The impact on communities is analyzed in the EIR, pages 5.1-35 through 5.1-49 of Volume 1. For the most part, the Land Use Diagrams for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives reflect established development patterns. The proposed Mitigation Measure (5.1-2) as mentioned in the previous response would create a program to maintain distinct separators between communities. However, the EIR concludes that for the Buildout scenario, even with the proposed mitigation measure, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable, due to the inability to predict the success of the program.

Response to Comment 198-9 (GP/EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.3-2, which would create a new policy requiring design of new streets and improvements to existing streets to minimize visual impacts, preserve rural character, and ensure neighborhood quality, is not limited to Rural Regions. The policy would apply to all "new streets" as well as improvements to existing "rural roads." Implementation of this policy includes revision of the County Design Improvement Standards Manual to allow for narrower streets. The development of specific standards requires consideration of a number of technical factors which account for variation in site-specific conditions, and a level of detail more appropriate for a standards manual rather than a General Plan policy. Although the new standards would facilitate countywide application of the policy, the policy can be fully implemented in the absence of such standards on a case-by-case basis.

Response to Comment 198-10 (GP/EIR): The Carson Creek Specific Plan was the subject of litigation, and as the result of a settlement agreement settling that litigation, the project was modified to be a "seniors only" project, which would presume smaller household sizes and lower than average vehicle use. Road width standards for that project were also a component of that settlement agreement. Whether these standards would be appropriate on a countywide basis would be determined by the County as part of its revision to the County Design Improvement Standards Manual, if Mitigation Measure 5.3-2 is adopted. The commenter's opinion that the County should adopt the Carson Creek standards is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 198-11 (EIR): Policy 7.4.2.5 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives requires that "Setbacks from all rivers, streams, and lakes shall be included in the Zoning Ordinance for all ministerial and discretionary development projects." Policy 7.6.1.3(C) requires that "Zoning regulations shall provide for setbacks from all floodplains, streams, lakes, rivers, and canals." Mitigation Measure 5.12-4(b) also requires the Zoning Ordinance to provide buffers and setbacks to protect riparian areas, and limits the circumstances in which exceptions to the setbacks would be allowed. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives contain similar policies (see Policy CO-3c and Implementation Measure CO-C). These policies intentionally avoid identifying specific setbacks from these water bodies, because the width of setbacks needed to reduce impacts on biological resources

and water quality is largely dependent on site conditions, slope, soil stability, vegetation, habitat quality and extent, and other site-specific circumstances. In some cases, small setbacks would be sufficiently protective and in others greater setbacks could be required to protect resources. Thus, a flexible General Plan policy that addresses these issues through zoning was recommended. Detailed standards that address a variety of site-specific circumstances are more appropriately established through amendment of the Zoning Ordinance. Prior to revision of the Zoning Ordinance, the more general setback policies in the General Plan can be implemented through their application to individual discretionary projects (and to ministerial projects if Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) is adopted) on a project-by-project basis. To facilitate this process, the proposed mitigation measures for Impact 5.12-4 have been modified to provide more specific interim setback guidelines. Please refer to Response to Comment 238-2.

Response to Comment 198-12 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 198-11.

Response to Comment 198-13 (GP/EIR): As discussed on page 5.12-113 of Volume 2 of the EIR, the specific mitigation measure requested by the commenter (prohibiting the modification of natural stream beds and flow except at road or bridge crossings) was not proposed because the policies in the proposed General Plan alternatives and mitigation measures provide a comparable level of protection (see Mitigation Measures 5.12-1(d) and (e), and 5.12-4(b)). These policies and mitigation measures would prohibit disturbance of aquatic environments except where avoidance is infeasible, and in such cases compensatory mitigation would be required, providing an equal or greater level of protection without the drawbacks of the categorical policy proposed by the commenter.

The term “stream” is generally used to refer to a wide variety of natural features, including intermittent streams, perennial streams, creeks, and rivers of varying tributary areas and sizes. There are also many natural terrain features that have developed over time that collect and convey rainfall as part of the hydrologic cycle (though not generally referred to as streams) such as swales, gullies, ditches, drainage channels, tributaries, rivulets etc. It is unclear what type of natural features the commenter’s proposed mitigation is intended to cover. As a practical matter, it would be prohibitively expensive to try to place a large creek or river in a storm drainpipe. The more typical circumstances in which the issue arises are in connection with small drainage channels, swales, and intermittent streams.

The proposed General Plan alternatives contain policies that would require retention of drainage into open channels in most instances, for reasons of wetlands protection, riparian corridor protection, flood control, sediment trapping, ground water recharge, and water quality enhancement (see Objective 7.3.4 and associated policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and Goal CO-3 and associated policies in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives). These policies would be strengthened by the mitigation measures proposed in the EIR (e.g., Mitigation Measures 5.12-1(d) and (e), and 5.12-4(b)). However, there are a number of reasons, including issues of health and safety, accessibility, erosion protection, pre-existing land use and drainage patterns, and water quality protection, that a

prohibition on lining, culverting, or piping a natural stream in every instance would be infeasible.

For example, there may be a circumstance where the amount or velocity of flow, and the size of the channel make it hazardous to retain in an open channel, and it becomes necessary to place the drainage in a storm drain pipe (e.g., open drainage channels similar to the one in which, in 1997 a pedestrian fell into alongside Cimarron Road in Cameron Park and drowned). This circumstance often occurs with the development of schools. Open drainages can create an unacceptable hazard to the students, and restriction to the use of the school site, so typically drainages are piped through schools. Provision of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility in a commercial project may also require enclosing a natural drainage channel into a storm drain system.

There are instances where a natural drainage is carving into a steep bank, and causing excessive bank sloughing and erosion. The solution may be to line the channel, or enclose a section of the channel in a pipe. There may also be an instance where a liquid pollutant has contaminated the ground adjacent to a stream channel, and the solution is to pipe the channel to protect wildlife and water quality while the contamination is being cleaned up.

For these and other reasons, an absolute prohibition on the culverting, piping, or lining of streams except at road crossings is considered infeasible and less effective than the mitigation measures proposed.

Response to Comment 198-14 (GP/EIR): In this comment and in Comment 198-15, the commenter states generally that community watershed protection features would minimize environmental impacts to air and water quality, and requests that they be included as mitigation or that mitigation include incentives for implementation of the measures. The commenter does not identify specific policies in the comment, but refers to Appendices A and B to the letter. Appendix A to the letter contains a number of proposed policies, and Appendix B to the letter contains background information. The proposed policies in the commenter's Appendix A are discussed elsewhere in the responses to this letter.

Response to Comment 198-15 (GP): Much of the information requested by the commenter is provided in the EIR [e.g., habitat and riparian areas (Exhibit 5.12), slopes (Tables 5.9-3 and 5.9-5), streams (Exhibit 5.5-1), and parks (Exhibit 5.7-4)].

Response to Comment 198-16 (GP/EIR): The slope standards referenced by the commenter are contained in the *Design and Improvements Standards Manual* and are not being replaced with Policy CO-1d. Implementation Measure LU-H requires the identification of needed revisions to the *Manual* and this issue can be reviewed at that time.

Response to Comment 198-17 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment requesting that the slope protection policy as delineated in the *Design and Improvements Standards Manual* remain in the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer to Response to Comment 198-16.

Response to Comment 198-18 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 198-19 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment requesting that the new Policy 7.4.4.4, Option A, contained in the EIR be the guiding interim policy until Option B is completed, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 198-20 (GP/EIR): The proposed Option B does not seek to place a monetary value on oak woodland, but rather is designed to preserve oak woodland by requiring funding at sufficient levels to preserve the most important expanses of oak woodland habitat to offset the loss of oak woodland on individual parcels, at a 2:1 ratio. Please also refer to Master Response 18 and Response to Comment 299-4.

Response to Comment 198-21 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-3.

Response to Comment 198-22 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-3.

Response to Comment 198-23 (GP/EIR): In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, Policy PR-1b states that the County "shall strive to attain County-owned parkland at a minimum of five acres/1,000 population." Also, in the EIR, Mitigation Measure 5.7-5 proposed for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, adds policy language to provide funding mechanisms for new park development and requires the County to establish a countywide development fee program (in addition to Quimby dedication requirements.) Under these policies, the same standard of park development corresponding with residential growth would occur in the Diamond Spring/El Dorado area as in other urban and suburban regions of the County.

The shortfall in parkland serving this specific community region, is due in part to the requirements of the Quimby Act, codified as Section 16.12.090 of the El Dorado County Code. The Quimby Act provisions mandate a dedication of a certain amount of parkland concurrent with the recording of subdivision or parcel map, or the payment of an in-lieu fee. A formula is used to determine the amount of acreage required for dedication. One factor is the amount of existing parkland acreage, and limitations on exceeding that amount under Quimby. Reliance solely on the Quimby Act for new parkland outside of El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park would continue to result in a shortfall in the desire to attain a level of five acres of parkland per each 1,000 persons. However, the proposed

mitigation would enable the County to acquire and develop additional parkland to alleviate that shortfall.

Response to Comment 198-24 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment requesting that the 5-acres/1,000 population of parkland be required in the Diamond Springs/El Dorado area, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please also refer to Response to Comment 198-23.

Response to Comment 198-25 (GP/EIR): Goal CO-9 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Objective 7.5.2 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative provide policies to ensure that the integrity of the County's historic resources are maintained. In addition, the EIR analyzes the impact on cultural resources (including historic) in Section 5.13. The impact is determined to be significant for all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives and a number of mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. For example, a new policy is proposed to create historic design control combining zone districts that would include guidelines for construction and reconstruction of buildings to aid in maintaining the historic character of historic towns (such as El Dorado, Diamond Springs and Coloma). A revised policy requiring the adoption of a cultural resources ordinance would standardize the treatment of resources at the project level. In addition, a new policy is proposed that would require the treatment of significant cultural resources documented as a result of the conformity review on ministerial projects in accordance with CEQA standards.

Response to Comment 198-26 (GP/EIR): Section 5.3 of the EIR describes the types of visual degradation that would be expected as a result of development under each alternative, and identifies impacts to State Route 49 in particular. In addition to the proposed policies and mitigation requiring the identification and protection of scenic corridors along major roadways, Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(d) for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternative (5.3-1(b) for the other alternatives) would direct the County to nominate State Route 49 for designation as a State Scenic Highway.

Response to Comment 198-27 (GP/EIR): In the portion of the canyon that separates Diamond Springs from Placerville, the land use designation under the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives is Low-Density Residential (LDR) and Rural Lands (RL). Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the land use designation is LDR only if there is a narrower separation between the Community Regions. Additionally, that part of the canyon between the City of Placerville and the Missouri Flat area is identified as an Important Biological Corridor in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Response to Comment 198-28 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 238-3.

Response to Comment 198-29 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Section 5.12 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 198-30 (GP/EIR): The referenced Community Regions are shown on the Land Use Diagram for each alternative. Please refer also to Response to Comment 198-25.

Response to Comment 198-31 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 198-25.

Response to Comment 198-32 (GP/EIR): Goal LU-2 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative contains policies to provide visual and physical separation of distinct communities. Implementation Measure LU-A directs the County to establish standards for providing visual separation between Community Regions. Mitigation Measure 5.1-2 further addresses the issue. Please refer to Response to Comment 198-30.

Response to Comment 198-33 (GP/EIR): Parts of Weber Creek Canyon are included in the –IBC overlay under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please refer to Figure LU-1 following page 20 in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please refer also to Response to Comment 238-3.

Response to Comment 198-34 (GP/EIR): The policy requested by the commenter is included in the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative (Policy 2.2.6.5). This policy is not proposed in either of the two other equal-weight alternatives. The commenter's support for this policy is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during their deliberations on the General Plan. The Texas Hill reservoir is indicated on the Land Use Diagram for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives; however, clarifications to the legend of the diagrams are included in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. The majority of lands adjacent to the take lines is designated Natural Resources (40-acre minimum) and Low Density Residential (5-acre minimum) and represent an already-established development pattern.

Response to Comment 198-35 (GP): The commenter's preference for the policy requiring a 5-acre holding zone in the Placerville sphere of influence, which is included in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 198-36 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Impact 5.1-2 in Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 198-37 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 198-27.

Response to Comment 198-38 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 198-26. U.S. Highway 50 would be included in any scenic corridor ordinance, particularly given the fact that a portion is currently recognized as a State Scenic Corridor.

Response to Comment 198-39 (GP/EIR): Please refer to pages 3-36 through 3-38 of Volume 1 of the EIR. Please also refer to the Land Use Diagram for each alternative. The Cedar Grove area is included in the larger Camino/Pollock Pines Community Region in the No Project, 1996 General Plan, and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, based on the existing continuous high and medium intensity development pattern along Pony Express Trail. It is included in Camino Rural Center in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Response to Comment 198-40 (GP/EIR): Maps showing Community Regions and Rural Centers are provided in each of the proposed alternatives. These areas were modified in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative partially to increase separation of communities. As stated above, the policies in Goal LU-2 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative would aid in the provision of visual and physical separation through lower density buffers. The proposed alternatives already contain policies recognizing the value of the resources identified in the comment.

Response to Comment 198-41 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the Weber Creek watershed could be protected by utilizing site development techniques such as planting shade trees, using open channel drainages and providing narrow roads, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 198-42 (GP): Establishment of design standards for nonresidential development, as required under Implementation Measure LU-A, would aid in the provision of tree planting as suggested by the commenter.

Response to Comment 198-43 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment supporting open channel drainage in the Weber Creek area, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer to Response to Comment 198-13.

Response to Comment 198-44 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 198-9.

Response to Comment 198-45 (GP): The major concerns of the commenter are acknowledged: community watershed protection; Weber Creek Canyon; open channel drainage; native shade trees; traffic calming, narrow roadways, daylighting storm drains and streams; protecting steep slopes, alternative transportation/public access; scenic corridors; separation of communities; rural environment; and air quality, water quality and watershed protections in Community Regions. These concerns are noted for the record

and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 199: RICH AND BARBARA JACKSON

Response to Comment 199-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between land use designations and zoning.

Based on the contents of the commenters' letter and reference to the RE-5 zone district, it appears that they prefer application of the Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation and that their parcels (APNs 043-230-29 and 30) are included in an Agricultural District. While the parcels are in an Agricultural District in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, none of the Alternatives show the property as Low Density Residential (LDR). Under these alternatives, the properties are assigned the Rural Residential (RR)/Rural Lands (RL) land use designations. The reason the parcels are designated Medium Density Residential (MDR) in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is that the parcels are located within the Camino Community Region in that alternative. The uses (such as the commenters' agricultural use) occurring on individual parcels were not considered in development of the Land Use Diagrams. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 200: JOE KEATING

Response to Comment 200-1 (GP): The Agricultural District boundaries as shown on the No Project, 1996 General Plan, and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative Land Use Diagrams are the same as those developed during the last General Plan process. The process included many opportunities for public involvement and was deliberated by the Agricultural Commission, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors. Minor changes may have occurred on the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative Land Use Diagram where Community Region or Rural Center boundaries abut the Agricultural District boundaries because of changes in Community Region and Rural Center boundary lines.

The commenter is requesting that the parcels not be included in the Agricultural District. According to the soil survey for El Dorado County, the commenter's parcels (APNs 084-190-06, 07, and 08) are partially underlain by two soils considered "Choice" agricultural soils. One of the soil types, which comprises at least 50 percent of the area covered by the three parcels, is not a Choice soil. Please refer to Table AF-2 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives for a description of the criteria that must be met for a soil to be designated as "Choice". It is likely that the presence of these soils contributed to the inclusion of the area in which the commenter's parcels occur in the Agricultural District. Also, if there was no objection at the time the Agricultural District boundaries were originally proposed and analyzed, then the Agricultural Commission, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors assumed that the boundaries were suitable.

It should be noted that the commenter's parcels are not identified as Agricultural Lands under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative (an alternative that does not contain the Agricultural District overlay designation). In that alternative, the parcels are identified as Rural Lands.

The Planning Department defers to the County Department of Agriculture and Agricultural Commission on matters that require agricultural expertise. The Planning Department and Department of Agriculture have and intend to maintain a positive working relationship. The Department of Agriculture looks to the Agricultural Commission to advise the Planning Department on agricultural-related matters. Any changes to the Agricultural District boundaries, then, should be deliberated by and advised upon by that commission. During General Plan deliberations, however, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may choose to make modifications to the Land Use Diagram, including the modification requested by the commenter. The commenter's information regarding his inability to obtain agricultural metered irrigation water from the El Dorado Irrigation District will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they conduct these deliberations.

Response to Comment 200-2 (GP): The draft General Plan alternatives contain policies that describe Planned Developments, but none of the General Plan Land Use Diagrams identify any specific areas for Planned Developments. It is not appropriate to identify areas for planned developments in a General Plan. Once a General Plan is adopted, the

commenter may apply for a Planned Development. The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as it applies to the subject parcels and ability to develop them is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. Note that the County is currently addressing only land use designations and not zoning. Once a General Plan is adopted, a Zoning Ordinance update will commence. In addition to meeting the requirements of State law regarding consistency of zoning with General Plan land use designations, the Zoning Ordinance update is also likely to include additional detail regarding Planned Developments.

Response to Comment 200-3 (GP): As noted in Response to Comment 200-1, the proposed Agricultural District boundaries were developed through a public process that involved hearings before the Agricultural Commission, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 200-4 (GP): The commenter's concern and opinion regarding the potential treatment of parcel-specific requests is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. Please refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 201: (INTENTIONALLY BLANK)

LETTER 202: PATRICIA L. MOORE

Response to Comment 202-1 (GP): The distribution of housing commitments and opportunities for each of the alternatives are contained in the land use forecasts prepared by Economic and Planning Systems, Inc. as a part of the General Plan EIR (Volume 3 of the EIR, Appendices B-2 and B-3, and El Dorado County Land Use Forecasts for Draft General Plan (EPS, March 5, 2002). The forecasts are broken down by market areas, with Market Area 1 being the El Dorado Hills area. The percentages are as follows:

- No Project – 45 percent (Table B-2, EPS Report)
- Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" – 57 percent (Table 1, page. 2, App. B-2)
- Environmentally Constrained – 52 percent (Table 2, page 3, App. B-3)
- 1996 General Plan - 26 percent (Table C-2, EPS Report)

Response to Comment 202-2 (GP): The forecasting completed for the alternatives provides growth scenarios for the expected timeframe of the plan, to the year 2025, and for the theoretical buildout scenario. There are many factors that could affect absorption of residential lots, and it is beyond the scope of this EIR to predict when the supply would be exhausted.

Response to Comment 202-3 (GP): The decision to spend revenues collected within the County is made by the Board of Supervisors on a yearly basis as a part of approval of the County's Capital Improvement Program, based on priorities identified by the Board. It is beyond the scope of the Countywide General Plan EIR to identify the fee amount that may be collected in any given community within the County and identify where it may be spent.

Response to Comment 202-4 (EIR): The impact of each alternative is discussed in Section 5.5 of the EIR for water, Section 5.7 for schools, Section 5.11 for air quality, and Section 5.4 for traffic. This EIR analyzes the impacts of the various alternatives on a countywide basis. It is beyond the scope of the EIR to analyze these impacts for one single community within the County.

LETTER 203: MAREN AND MICHAEL PETRE

Response to Comment 203-1 (GP): After correction of the error described in response to Comment 203-2, there is one base land use designation applicable to the entire property (APN 104-150-08) under each of the Alternatives. The commenter requests the Natural Resource (NR) land use designation with the Mineral Resources (-MR) overlay. The parcel is designated Rural Residential (RR)/Rural Lands (RL) under the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, and Natural Resource (NR) under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

In addition to the base land use designation, a portion of the parcel is subject to the Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay designation. This is applied to those lands identified by the California Department of Conservation as MRZ-2a and MRZ-2b lands (lands considered to be important mineral resource areas). In many cases those areas identified by the State do not correspond to existing parcel lines. This leads to only portions of some parcels, such as the commenters', carrying the -MR overlay designation. The -MR overlay has been revised in this Response to Comments document due to the fact that the State has recently revised its mapping of important mineral resource areas. (See the revised Land Use Diagram in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.) According to the State, a portion of the commenters' property is still considered an important mineral resource area.

The requested land use designation, Natural Resources (NR) with the -MR overlay, is met in part by the Environmentally Constrained Alternative (that alternative assigns NR but does not assign the -MR overlay to the entire parcel). Please also refer to Master Responses 8 and 21.

Response to Comment 203-2 (GP): The Open Space (OS) designation was indeed incorrectly assigned to the commenters' parcel on each of the alternative Land Use Diagrams. Each of the diagrams has been corrected to remove the OS designation. The revised proposals are Rural Residential/Rural Lands with the -MR overlay on a portion under the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives and NR with the -MR overlay on a portion under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

LETTER 204: HARRIETT B. SEGEL

Response to Comment 204-1 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 204-2 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding oak tree mitigation through replacement are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please see also Master Response 18 for further discussion of oak canopy.

Response to Comment 204-3 (GP): The purpose of a vision statement is to provide an overarching set of ideals for the County should strive in developing its General Plan and subsequent implementation of that plan. While there may be communities that have already developed so that there is no separation between them, the vision statement referenced may still be applicable to other regions of the County.

Response to Comment 204-4 (GP): The Board of Supervisors has not taken a position regarding the future width of U.S. Highway 50. The action referred to by the commenter was taken by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) as a long range planning issue. This decision is subject to revision when the SACOG Board of Directors does the 3-year update on the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Also, please refer to Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 204-5 (GP): Each of the General Plan alternatives requires new development to pay its fair share of roadway infrastructure costs. The commenter's concern that those per unit costs as well as costs for other infrastructure projects and the costs to existing residents to address existing capacity shortfalls could be higher for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in deliberations concerning the General Plan.

Response to Comment 204-6 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding development agreements are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Fiscal impacts are not considered environmental impacts under CEQA; consequently the EIR does not contain a fiscal analysis.

Response to Comment 204-7 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding transitional residential densities and fire hazards are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Fire protection districts, fire safe councils, and other individuals and agencies provided a significant level of input on the draft policies, and have also commented on this EIR. Please refer to the responses to comments for Letters 26, 155, 169, 187, and 265.

Response to Comment 204-8 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the naming of the Community Regions are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 204-9 (GP): The definitions of the LDR, Low Density Residential, designation is a significant point of difference between the alternatives; therefore, the application is different for each. The reason that LDR is appropriate in the Community Regions and Rural Centers in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is due to the limitation on subdivision to no more than four parcels. This restriction is not applicable to the other alternatives, and more appropriate land use designations are applied to the Community Regions and Rural Centers in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The 1996 General Plan Alternative provides for future expansion of the Community Regions into lesser developed areas and permits the inclusion of LDR within the Community Region boundaries for that reason.

Response to Comment 204-10 (GP): As pointed out in the comment, the detail of permitted uses lies in the Zoning Ordinance and its application to lands designated R&D, Research and Development. The development of the revised Zoning Ordinance, which will commence upon General Plan adoption, will determine which supporting services are most appropriate to support the businesses within R&D areas of the County.

Response to Comment 204-11 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 12.

Response to Comment 204-12 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment in support of Policy LU-3n are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 204-13 (GP): That is the point of the policy, to encourage design that avoids breaking up the ridgelines.

Response to Comment 204-14 GP): The commenter is correct. The original action to create the El Dorado Hills/Salmon Falls Road Impact Fee (RIF) was approved in 1984. It was extensively modified in 1988 with the approval of the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative are corrected accordingly, as shown in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 204-15 GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on funding to mitigate traffic impacts and the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives contain Implementation Measures (TC-B) requiring the County to revise its traffic impact

mitigation fee programs. The issue raised by the commenter will need to be addressed in those revisions. The No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives do not include such an implementation measure, but the policy language in them implies revisions to the fee programs.

Response to Comment 204-16 (GP): At the time Table HO-22 was developed, the affordable apartment units in El Dorado Hills were still under construction. Subsequently, this table, at the direction of the California Department of Housing and Community Development, has been revised to show only those affordable units at risk of being converted to market rate units.

Response to Comment 204-17 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the timeframe for nonconversion of apartments to condominiums are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The Board could choose to extend this period. It should be noted this policy does not affect the affordability of the units.

Response to Comment 204-18 (GP): The County is not bound by the private agreements between sellers and purchasers of property within the County. Regardless, staff is aware of maximum density provisions within certain CC&Rs but is not familiar with any within the El Dorado Hills area with minimum density requirements. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding infill parcels are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 205: RALPH WELSH, JR.

Response to Comment 205-1 (GP/EIR): The policies adopted by Measure Y are contained in all of the General Plan alternatives. The EIR also considers and evaluates the policies, since they are part of each alternative. The Measure Y policies are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives: | Policies 3.2.1.5, 3.2.2.4, 3.2.2.5, 3.5.1.6.1, and 3.5.1.6.2. |
| Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative: | Policies TC-1d, TC-1e, TC-1f, TC-1g, and TC-1h. |
| Environmentally Constrained Alternative: | Policies TC-1d, TC-1e, TC-1f, TC-1g, and TC-1h. |

These policies appear on page 3-8 of Volume 1 of the EIR, which contains a detailed description of Measure Y. Page 5.4-15 of Volume 1 of the EIR traffic and circulation section also contains a summary of Measure Y.

Response to Comment 205-2 (EIR): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 14.

Response to Comment 205-3 (GP): The commenter's opinion regarding inclusion of Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Policy TC-1i is noted. As the commenter and fellow Commissioners deliberate the General Plan, they may choose to select Policy TC-1i, or any of the other policies described (or modifications thereto), for its definition of concurrency. Please refer also to Master Responses 6 and 13.

Response to Comment 205-4 (GP/EIR): The comment regarding characterization of Measure Y is noted. The EIR evaluates impacts associated with various policies, including those based on Measure Y. In order to be objective, the EIR identifies significant effects from all other policies, regardless of their source.

Response to Comment 205-5 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 13 and Response to Comment 2-9. Note that each of the General Plan alternatives include policies requiring infrastructure to be developed concurrently with new development to limit the likelihood that new development will exceed the carrying capacity of the infrastructure available. CEQA does not require fiscal analyses and none were completed for this EIR.

Response to Comment 205-6 (EIR): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 14.

Response to Comment 205-7 (GP): It is not feasible to apply all of the proposed Implementation Measures immediately upon General Plan adoption. The timelines presented

in the Measures are staff recommendations. They may choose to revise timelines during General Plan deliberations.

The EIR recognizes the difficulties associated with General Plan Implementation Measures proposed in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives that may not be applied or completed for a number of years following General Plan adoption. Mitigation Measure 5.1-3 directs the County to establish an interim conformity review should the Board adopt either the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" or Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. Please refer also to Master Response 6.

Response to Comment 205-8 (EIR): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 6 and to Response to Comment 279-2.

Response to Comment 205-9 (EIR): Please refer to Master Responses 15, 13, and 6.

Response to Comment 205-10 (EIR): The commenter's opposition and concerns regarding this mitigation measure are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during their deliberations on the General Plan. This mitigation measure does not necessarily preclude sidewalks. Goal TC-5 in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives addresses sidewalks. The No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives do not directly address sidewalks. Please refer also to Master Response 16.

Response to Comment 205-11 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 205-12 (EIR): As pointed out in the discussion of Impact 5.5-2 and Mitigation Measure 5.5-2, the scope and extent of impacts associated with development of new water supply infrastructure cannot be determined at this time. Also, the decisions regarding the mitigation measures to be adopted for each project will be made by the lead agencies and responsible regulatory agencies. Such measures may or may not be reflective of State standards, and State standards may or may not be in place to address impacts that may occur.

Response to Comment 205-13 (EIR): Traffic impact fees are assessed based on the number of trips being generated by land use development. To the extent that the size of the house has a direct effect on the number of trips generated, the County can develop a fee program that considers size. The County's Interim U.S. Highway 50 Variable Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program includes different fee amounts based on house size. This was accomplished by conducting a survey of El Dorado County residents to ascertain their use of U.S. Highway 50 and the size of their house. A similar survey has not been conducted for the use of County roads, but would be required to establish a nexus that the fees should vary based on house size.

Response to Comment 205-14 (GP): Since the commenter does not provide specific examples, it is assumed that he is referring to the City of Davis’ recent “Interim Infill Guidelines” and “Affordable Housing Ordinance”.

The Housing Element contains an Implementation Measure for development of an infill incentive ordinance (Measure HO-O) and a mandatory inclusionary housing ordinance (Measure HO-C). Examples of other jurisdictions’ efforts at implementing similar programs would be considered during detailed program development, which would occur subsequent to General Plan adoption.

LETTER 206: WILLIAM K. SCHEIBER, BIG CANYON MINING & CATTLE, INC.

Response to Comment 206-1 (GP): The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 206-2 (GP): The County's Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay designation is applied to those lands identified by the State as MRZ-2a and MRZ-2b. According to the *Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County, California* (California Department of Conservation 2001), the subject parcel (APN 091-010-14) is not identified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b (other parcels in the area are identified as such, but not the subject parcel). The parcel is in an area of MRZ-3a for gold deposits formed by hydrothermal processes and deposits formed by volcanogenic processes. However, lands identified as MRZ-3a (which are extensive throughout the western half of the County) are not considered significant mineral resource areas (they are defined as "areas containing known mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance"). If the Department of Conservation receives additional information that shows the area can be reclassified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b, then the status could change and the -MR overlay could be applied. Please refer to Master Response 21 for more information about the revised mineral land classifications.

Response to Comment 206-3 (GP): The commenter's concerns regarding the continuing use of his parcel for grazing are noted for the record.

LETTER 207: KEN AND HEIDI BROWN, DAN AND LAURIE OLIVER; BASEL AND ARBLETTA OLIVER; AND BILL AND JOY PIMENTAL

Please refer also to Letters 88, 89, and 90, and Responses to Comments 85-26, 85-28, and 85-29.

Response to Comment 207-1 (GP): The subject parcels (APNs 070-261-78, 79, 80, and 81) are in the Shingle Springs Community Regions in all four of the equal-weight General Plan Alternatives except the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Response to Comment 207-2 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 8. The commenters' preference for the assignment of the Multifamily Residential (MFR) designation to their properties is noted for the record. The parcels are identified as MFR in all of the alternatives except the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, which identifies the properties as Low Density Residential (LDR). For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers, which were generally more limited in size and extent. The subject properties were not included in the Shingle Springs Community Region and thus could not be assigned the MFR designation (which was only allowed in Community Regions or Rural Centers).

Response to Comment 207-3 (GP): The commenters correctly note that the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative does not allow the subdivision of a parcel to more than four parcels. This is a defining characteristic of the alternative (see Policy LU-1b).

The subject parcels are not in the Shingle Springs Community Region in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Accordingly, no conflict exists in applying the LDR land use designation to the subject parcels under this alternative.

Response to Comment 207-4 (EIR): The Mitigation Measure referred to by the commenter, 5.1-3(a), directs the County to establish a General Plan conformity review process so that projects may be reviewed for conformance with adopted General Plan policies and standards, and so potentially significant environmental impacts can be considered and mitigated if feasible. Whether or not application of a conformity review on any future project proposed by the commenters would require the project to be denied because of proximity to a rare plant preserve is speculative.

Response to Comment 207-5 (GP): The commenters' information regarding the suitability of their parcels for multifamily development is noted for the record. At this time, the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has not indicated that placing the LDR designation on the subject properties would cause that department to withhold certification of the County's Housing Element. HCD is aware that the County will be going through a Zoning Ordinance update subsequent to General Plan adoption and that the update may affect the vacant land inventory. The County anticipates that it will resubmit a revised Housing Element to HCD upon completion of the Zoning

Ordinance update. That revised element will contain a new inventory and outline any additional measures needed to ensure that the County maintains an inventory of lands suitable for the construction of housing for all income groups.

The commenters' preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record.

LETTER 208: SUSAN BRITTING, CALIFORNIA NATIVE PLANT SOCIETY

Response to Comment 208-1 (GP/EIR): Receipt of comments from the California Native Plant Society is acknowledged.

Response to Comment 208-2 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that comparing the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives is difficult, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 208-3 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment requesting that the structure of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative be used in the ultimate General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 208-4 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the vision statement in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is most closely aligned with that envisioned by the commenter, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 208-5 (GP): The commenter presents a statement of their preferred alternative (a blend of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Alternative 12, the compact development alternative), and appends a list of policies and mitigation measures they recommend for inclusion in the adopted alternative. The opinion and proposed policies and mitigation measures expressed in this comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 208-6 (EIR): The County used the most accurate and comprehensive source of information available to identify habitat types on the over one million acres covered by the General Plan, but because of the difficulty of distinguishing riparian habitat using remote-sensing imagery (as described on page 5.12-23 of the EIR), the amount of riparian habitat could not be accurately quantified. Without accurate baseline data, attempting to assess potential impacts in more detail would have yielded results based largely on speculation. The DEIR identifies the significant effects on the environment including potential effects on riparian and wetland habitat and used the best available information to do so. Additional information would not change the significance of this impact or the extent of the mitigation proposed. A new policy is proposed under Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(d) that would include an inventory and mapping of riparian and wetland habitat.

Response to Comment 208-7 (GP/EIR): The commenter expresses a concern regarding the lack of interim standards pending the development and implementation of oak woodland canopy replacement standards and stream setback standards. As discussed in Master Response 18, under Mitigation Measures 5.12-1(f) and (k), the oak canopy “replacement” option allowed under the 1996 General Plan would be eliminated. A new option of providing funding for oak woodland preservation under the INRMP would be available, but not until the INRMP is developed; in the interim, the canopy retention standards would be applied. With respect to stream setbacks, the mitigation measures for Impact 5.12-4 have been revised to include more specific interim setback guidelines. Please see Response to Comment 238-2.

Response to Comment 208-8 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 208-7.

Response to Comment 208-9 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 208-10 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 20 regarding the Pine Hill Preserve.

Response to Comment 208-11 (EIR): The opinion expressed by the commenter who is in favor of including the -IBC overlay in all General Plan alternatives is noted for the record. The staff concurs with the commenter that land important to maintaining habitat connectivity is found outside of the -IBC overlay and that maintaining habitat connections across the landscape depends on the preservation of natural habitat in both the areas covered by the -IBC overlay and areas covered by adjacent Natural Resources and Open Space land use designations.

Response to Comment 208-12 (EIR): A summary of the Oak Woodland Conservation Act is inserted as the fourth paragraph under the heading "Conservation of Oaks and Other Hardwoods" on page 5.12-31 in Volume 2 of the EIR. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 208-13 (EIR): The summary of State protection for special-status plant has been clarified in the EIR. The second paragraph on page 5.12-28 under the California Endangered Species Act heading is deleted and replaced with a summary of the information presented on CDFG's website at www.dfg.ca.gov/hcpb/species/t_e_spp/nat_plnt_consv.shtml. These changes do not alter the conclusions regarding impact significance or mitigation measures. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

LETTER 209: CLINT AND KATHLEEN DONOVAN

Response to Comment 209-1 (GP): As referred to by the commenter, the Planning Commission elected to modify the land use designations of two of the subject parcels, APNs 051-430-04 and 16, during the 1995 parcel-specific request process. APN 051-430-08 was not included in that request; the commenter is currently requesting that this parcel also be assigned the –MR overlay.

Subsequent to the Planning Commission's recommendation in 1995 but prior to adoption of the General Plan in January of 1996, that Commission rendered a policy decision to not establish any new Industrial or Commercial lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers unless the parcel(s) were already zoned for industrial or commercial use. Because the subject parcels were zoned for residential use, their General Plan land use designations were returned to residential (Low Density Residential).

Parcel 051-430-04 is a mineral rights parcel that is encompassed within 051-430-10. Parcel 051-430-10 is identified as an important mineral resource area by the Department of Conservation and thus is assigned the –MR overlay. The State does not identify the other parcels, 051-430-08 and -16, as important mineral resource areas. Because the State has not applied the MRZ-2a or 2b designation to these parcels, they have not been assigned the –MR overlay.

See also Master Response 21.

Response to Comment 209-2 (GP/EIR): Measure A was adopted by the voters in 1998 and is codified at County Code Section 17.14.095. Since its adoption, no litigation has been filed to challenge its validity. Accordingly, it would be speculative to make the change requested by the commenter. If the Courts were to indeed invalidate the measure, then the adopted General Plan would be reviewed and updated as necessary to reflect the invalidation and any new policies adopted in its place. Please refer also to Master Response 15.

LETTER 210: ANE DEISTER, EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT (EID)

Response to Comment 210-1 (GP/EIR): The concerns regarding timely adoption of a new General Plan are acknowledged and noted for the record.

Response to Comment 210-2 (GP): The discussion of future water supply projects has been revised to more accurately describe their current status, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 210-3 (GP): The discussion of recycled water has been revised to recognize EID's planning efforts, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 210-4 (GP): Additional text has been added to the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives recognizing EID's efficiency programs, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 210-5 (GP): All documents were available during the review period in hard copy, via the internet, or on CD-ROM. The staff was not made aware that EID received an incomplete copy of the General Plan document.

Response to Comment 210-6 (GP): It is noted that EID does not differentiate between water users, and that under the District's policies, all users have equal access to water supplies. The purpose of Policy 8.2.1.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives is to provide guidance to the County, with what limited authority it has in the allocation of water resources, to emphasize the importance of providing water to agriculture and employment generating uses.

Response to Comment 210-7 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding new water supplies as it applies to Policy 8.2.1.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please see also Response to Comment 210-6.

Response to Comment 210-8 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 210-13.

Response to Comment 210-9 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the prohibition of structures, including water tanks, along ridgelines are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 210-10 (GP): The EIR discussion of Impact 5.5-3 supports the commenter's position and proposes changes to Policy PS-2d.

Response to Comment 210-11 (GP): Policy PS-3b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative encourages the use of recycled water in new development projects. The same policy in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative provides stronger language that directs the County to develop a program that mandates certain types of development to utilize reclaimed water.

Response to Comment 210-12 (GP): The purpose of the look-up feature for land use designation of parcels on the County web site was to facilitate public understanding of each alternative.

Response to Comment 210-13 (GP): As the commenter notes, parcels within the Texas Hill Reservoir take area are designated Open Space (OS) on all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The commenter requests that these lands, which are owned by EID be designated Natural Resource (NR). These lands include APNs 051-011-09, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 23, and 27; 051-420-02, 03, 06, 08, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16; 051-430-17; 051-450-11, 12, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 27, 28, and 29; 051-481-06, 07, 12, 13, 37, 63, 34, 72, and 75; 051-490-01, 02, and 03; 051-550-24 and 28; 096-090-09 and 11; 098-010-04, 05, 07, 10, 15, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, and 26; 098-021-33, 35, 36, and 37; 098-030-19 and 30; and 098-050-01.

The OS designation was approved as part of the Land Use Diagram associated with the previous General Plan (adopted in 1996), largely because the County determined it was the best way to protect the area from development that may be incompatible with future use of the site as a reservoir. Existing development within the take area is allowed to remain. In the event EID ultimately decides not to construct the reservoir and to use the lands for another purpose that is incompatible with the OS designation, it may apply for a General Plan amendment to have the land use designations changed.

Lands identified as OS on the 1996 General Plan Land Use Diagram were, for the most part, carried over into the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives as OS as well. The Texas Hill Reservoir lands fell into this category.

Each of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives identify OS as an appropriate designation for the delineation of areas necessary for the protection of public health and safety, including, but not limited to, areas required for the protection of drinking water supplies (Policy 7.6.1.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policy CO-11b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives). Given that EID intends to eventually develop a water supply reservoir at the site, this designation is appropriate. While other designations such as NR may provide similar protection, there is currently no need to change the land use designations of the parcels from OS to NR. If the reservoir is not built and EID proposes a use that may not be consistent with the OS designation, the appropriate designation can be addressed at that time.

Responses to Comment 210-14 (GP): No additional comments were forwarded to the County regarding other properties owned by EID. Most of the lands around Project 184

facilities, which are at higher elevations than the Texas Hill site and are already developed with water storage and transmission infrastructure, are designated NR (Natural Resources).

Response to Comment 210-15 (GP): Although the parcels identified in the comment have a different land use designation on the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, it retains the Public Facility designation in the other equal-weight General Plan alternatives. An approved development plan for EID’s headquarters still applies to the site. Should EID or their successors choose to use the property for some other purpose, they may apply for a General Plan Amendment and an appropriate land use designation will be considered at that time.

The commenter requests the Commercial (C) or Industrial (I) designation for APNs 327-230-03 and 327-250-14, 15, 16, and 35. Collectively these parcels are referred to as the Bray Reservoir properties.

None of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives identify all of the parcels as C and/or I. The designations under the alternatives are as follows:

| | No Project/1996 General Plan Alternative | Roadway Constrained Six- Lane "Plus" Alternative | Environmentally Constrained Alternative |
|------------|---|---|--|
| 327-230-03 | PF | PF | RL |
| 327-250-14 | PF | PF | MDR |
| 327-250-15 | PF | PF | OS |
| 327-250-16 | PF | PF | RL |
| 327-250-35 | I | I | MDR |

In the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were proposed. For the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the assignment of nonresidential land use designations was based on the 1996 General Plan Alternative Land Use Diagram, with some exceptions for Commercially-designated lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. The land use designations assigned under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative acknowledge the commenter’s earlier request to remove the PF designation from the properties but do not identify any of the parcels as C or I. The parcels were given residential land use designations under this alternative (with the exception of the Bray Reservoir itself, which is identified as OS under this alternative) given the stated oversupply of Commercially-designated lands in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. This difference provides a choice for the decisionmakers to consider as they deliberate the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 210-16 (GP): A number of EID properties are inappropriately designated on the draft alternative Land Use Diagrams. Parcels identified as Adopted Plan

(AP) remain as originally designated since these properties are within areas having adopted Specific Plans (thus the AP designation). For the other parcels, please see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for a listing of the changes proposed to respond to this mapping error.

Response to Comment 210-17 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding inappropriate land uses adjacent to EID facilities are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Policies LU-3o (Environmentally Constrained Alternative), LU-3n (Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative), and LU-7d (both of the above) direct the County to provide buffers and to locate incompatible uses away from each other. Mitigation Measures 5.1-3(a) through (d) provide additional mitigation to address this concern. Without knowing the specific parcels that EID may be concerned with, it is not possible at this point to determine if land use designation changes are appropriate.

LETTER 211: ANE DEISTER, EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Response to Comment 211-1 (EIR): The commenter's comments on and support for the EIR are noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for their consideration in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 211-2 (EIR): The intent of the subject mitigation measure is to discourage jurisdictions outside the County's authority from siting facilities in land use designations that could result in future incompatible land uses. The mitigation measure has been revised to specifically address facilities such as those operated by the District.

Response to Comment 211-3 (EIR): This impact assessment was based on information collected by EDCWA for the Countywide water supply and demand planning process. The impact analysis was coordinated closely with the sources referenced in Subsection 5.5.1 of the EIR. The approach used in the EIR was consistent with the cited water resources planning analyses. A water supply was defined to exist if the water rights were secure and physical facilities existed to deliver the water. Neither Project 184 nor "Fazio" (P.L. 101-514) Project water were considered to be part of EID's water supply under existing conditions because they were not fully developed from a regulatory standpoint. In addition, the approach is consistent with typical approaches to impact analyses for CEQA compliance. The baseline for the EIR was selected to represent only those firm yield water supplies that existed at the time the NOP was published.

Inadequate service to existing water users was established as a potentially significant impact. Development within the County resulting in additional demands on water service providers' supplies in advance of secure and physically available water supplies could reduce levels of service. This impact could occur in the future based on the balance of projected demand and supply shown in Table 5.5-1. Nevertheless, County staff and the EIR fully acknowledge that EID (and GDPUD) are actively seeking new water supplies, some of which have been largely entitled. Further, a Superior Court ruling released after the EIR was published provided somewhat greater assurances that water rights procured through Project 184 could be subject to fewer restrictions than projected in the EIR, although this is subject to further discretion by the State Water Resources Control Board and potential additional legal challenge. Success in procuring new supplies and building necessary infrastructure will reduce the magnitude of, or eliminate, the impacts described in Impact 5.5-1. Because this success is not assured, the stated impacts have the potential to occur.

Response to Comment 211-4 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) was developed for two reasons. First, to consolidate the requirement for verification of sufficient and available water supply for all public and private water systems, and all approval actions, be they ministerial or discretionary. Currently, Ordinance 4325 only applies to parcel and subdivision map approvals. Ministerial approvals for development of existing parcels or large agricultural water uses are examples where water use would increase without triggering compliance with Ordinance 4325 or the State laws (enacted through SB 610, SB 910, and SB 221). Thus, a substantial amount of development could be approved without any meaningful consideration

of long-term water supplies. Second, to avoid approving development in advance of assured water supplies, particularly among the public water systems. Consequently, a key provision of the mitigation that is not addressed by any of the State mandates or Ordinance 4325 is the provision for there to be a higher level of assurance that water supplies and delivery facilities are available at the approval stage. The current policies for water meter purchases do not reflect this requirement and allow approvals based on facility availability extending to the time when service is required. Nevertheless, the staff agrees that Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) should be modified. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comment document.

Response to Comment 211-5 (EIR): The comment suggests a number of revisions to Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b). The measure has been revised in response to some parts of this comment. The revisions are shown in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document and are discussed in this response.

The comment first suggests that the County take potential water entitlements into account where there is sufficient evidence to indicate that the entitlement can be obtained. The EIR identifies a number of factors that can interfere with perfecting water rights entitlements and explains that it can often take many years to resolve water rights disputes. Accordingly, no revision to the mitigation is recommended in this regard. In order to assure adequate water supplies for proposed development in the County, the EIR recommends that water supply assessments be based on existing entitlements. The comment also suggests that it may be unrealistic to require that water delivery infrastructure be available at the time of the project approval. Because infrastructure development is subject to less uncertainty, it is reasonable to revise the mitigation measure to require simply that the infrastructure be available at the time the development commences.

The comment also suggests that because the mitigation measure as proposed would have required available water supply for any discretionary determination, water suppliers would be required to obtain and reserve water supplies based on land use designations alone. While it is prudent to plan for uses permitted by General Plan policies, the impact identified in the EIR can be mitigated by ensuring that supplies are available at the time development is approved rather than at the time of a General Plan amendment or rezone. Accordingly, the mitigation measure has been revised to apply to subdivision approvals and building and grading permits rather than all discretionary and ministerial acts.

The comment indicates that the reference in the measure to “impediments” to the availability of water is vague. Upon review it appears that the language is unnecessary as availability of water supply can be assured simply by requiring that the supply be available prior to any ground disturbing activities. The measure has been revised accordingly.

Concern is also expressed regarding the requirement that the assessment consider a project’s “highest projected demand.” This is not, as the comment suggests, a requirement that the supply be adequate to meet all demands during a drought year. Instead, it is to

assure that projections take into account the highest consuming uses authorized by the project approval in question

Finally the comment notes that EID does not issue "will serve" letters. Because the water supply verification process will ensure the adequacy of supply the policy has been revised to require demonstration of a right to service prior to ground disturbing activities and to allow the right to service to be shown by issuance of a water meter rather than requiring a "will serve" letter.

Response to Comment 211-6 (EIR): Please see Response to Comment 211-5.

Response to Comment 211-7 (EIR): This comment is noted and does not change the analysis or conclusions of the EIR.

Response to Comment 211-8 (EIR): This comment is noted and does not change the analysis or conclusions of the EIR.

Response to Comment 211-9 (EIR): The EDCWA water plan was not available when the DEIR was released. This clarification is noted and does not change the analysis or conclusions of the EIR.

Response to Comment 211-10 (EIR): The comment regarding EID's drought management plan is noted. It does not change the analysis or conclusions of the EIR.

Response to Comment 211-11 (EIR): Page 5.5-25 of the EIR is revised in response to this comment. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 211-12 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(c) on page 5.5-49 is revised to refer in response to this comment. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. The support for Best Management Practices (BMPs) developed to USBR criteria is noted.

Response to Comment 211-13 (EIR): This list of future water supply projects in the EIR is based on County-provided information. The relatively small supply referred to in the comment would not change the significance conclusions as based on the data in Table 5.5-1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 211-14 (EIR): The clarification in the number of active sewer accounts for Deer Creek WWTP is noted for the record and does not change the conclusions of the EIR.

Response to Comment 211-15 (EIR): The clarification to the description of the Deer Creek WWTP on page 5.5-75 of Volume 1 of the EIR is noted made in response to this comment. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 211-16 (EIR): The statement referred to by the commenter, that “Within the service area for EID’s wastewater collection system, all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives would generate similar amounts of wastewater,” was intended to convey that the overall EID service area would generate similar amounts of wastewater under each of the alternatives, rather than that each of EID’s service areas would generate an equal amount of wastewater. The statement was not intended to indicate that the service areas correspond with the specific areas of development under the alternatives. The staff agrees, and the referenced Impact 5.5-4 acknowledges, that there could be some differences in wastewater flow generation between alternatives that was not captured by the estimation method used. However, based on the service-area scale evaluated, different methods for estimating wastewater flows would presumably make relatively small differences in the overall results. More importantly, the impact was determined to be significant (capacity of the treatment plant would be exceeded and expansion would be required, leading to potential construction and water quality impacts) and this conclusion would not change based on modifications to estimated flow generation. In all alternative cases, future capacity expansions would still be required, and the extent of impacts and required mitigation measures would be the same, even if expansion is greater or lesser than shown in the EIR.

A programmatic analysis of the potential impacts associated with developing additional wastewater conveyance and treatment capacity was conducted for the EIR. Project-specific CEQA compliance would be necessary for major infrastructure improvements. Regarding approval of a plan that would fully use Deer Creek WWTP capacity, based on available information provided by consultants to EID, it is believed that each alternative will ultimately use available capacity at the plant, although the timing may be sooner under the higher density Environmentally Constrained and 1996 General Plan alternatives than under the No Project and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives.

Once a General Plan is adopted by the County, EID will be able to use information in the plan, including potential development in traffic analysis zones, to more accurately plan for future EID’s infrastructure needs.

Response to Comment 211-17 (EIR): Page 5.5-92 of Volume 1 of the EIR has been revised to reflect the clarifications that describe the status of Deer Creek WWTP permit compliance. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 211-18 (EIR): County staff agrees that backyards are also candidates for recycled water use. Mitigation Measure 5.5-7 on page 5.5-127 (applicable to all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives) is revised to reflect this comment. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 211-19 (EIR): Please see Response to Comment 211-16.

Response to Comment 211-20 (EIR): The commenter’s characterization of growth-inducement is not entirely consistent with the EIR. As stated on page 7-21, a physical obstacle to growth would include lack of public infrastructure or infrastructure capacity.

Thus, provision of such infrastructure could induce growth by removing one obstacle, although other obstacles to growth may remain. Even if the growth would be consistent with the General Plan, the enabling infrastructure would nevertheless be considered a growth-inducing impact within the definitions provided in Section 15126.2(2) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Response to Comment 211-21 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment regarding prior costly investments in water and sewer infrastructure to serve land use densities contemplated in the 1996 General Plan Alternative are noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for consideration in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 211-22 (EIR): Section 7.4 of the EIR (Volume 2) addresses significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. The comment regarding not fully utilizing costly water and sewer infrastructure is an economic and not an environmental issue within the context of CEQA.

LETTER 212: BAHMAN FOZOUNI

Response to Comment 212-1 (GP): The information provided by the commenter regarding the history of proposed land use changes in his neighborhood is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. Please refer also to Letter 39.

Response to Comment 212-2 (GP): As the commenter notes, the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives propose different land use patterns and Community Region boundaries for his neighborhood.

The proposed General Plan land use designations are separate and distinct from any Covenants, Codes, and Restrictions placed on the commenter's property. If the Low Density Residential designation was assigned to the commenter's property, the County could not approve any future subdivision to parcels smaller than five acres unless a project proponent applied for and received approval on a General Plan amendment. The General Plan Community Region boundaries are separate and distinct from the boundaries of the El Dorado Hills Community Services district and/or any future incorporation of El Dorado Hills. Please refer to Response to Comment 27-2 and Master Response 11.

By their nature, the alternative land use plans are different from one another in a number of ways. One of these differences is in the various Community Region boundaries. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, boundaries were based on land use designations. Land use designations were largely assigned based on Policy LU-1b, which limits future subdivision to no more than four new parcels. This is a fundamental difference in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative has fewer and smaller Community Regions countywide, not just in the commenter's neighborhood. Placement of the Community Region boundary in this alternative was based on existing parcel sizes and a desire to control the extension of higher density development into areas that are currently more rural in character. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives are two of four choices. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will make the ultimate decisions regarding land use designations and Community Region boundaries. As they deliberate the General Plan, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will consider the concerns and opinions of property owners such as the commenter.

Response to Comment 212-3 (GP): The commenter's concerns and opinions regarding the future ability to subdivide his parcel into three acre parcels, his property rights, and the comments of the El Dorado Hills Area Plan Advisory Committee are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. As the commenter notes, the requested Community Region boundary and land use designation are incorporated into and evaluated accordingly under the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

LETTER 213: BRIAN G. HABERSACK

Response to Comment 213-1 (EIR): The commenter has several areas of concern with the adequacy of the General Plan EIR. The EIR meets its obligations under CEQA, including its public policy goals of full public disclosure, by acknowledging a number of issues for which there is no clear or simple solution, as well as identifying that some impacts cannot be avoided.

Response to Comment 213-2 (GP/EIR): The commenter supports maintaining a lower development intensity between El Dorado County and the City of Folsom. As noted by the commenter, that is accomplished by the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. The commenter's support for the approach used in that alternative is noted.

Response to Comment 213-3 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment supporting the designation of a buffer area between the Promontory and Crescent Ridge, as it is designated as a red-legged frog core area, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 213-4 (EIR): The commenter is directed to responses to Comment Letters 156, 163, 168, and 183 for detailed discussion on the issue of the extension of Saratoga Way to the County line.

Response to Comment 213-5 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the General Plan and EIR lack clear direction due to the many, varied, options presented, are noted for the record. The EIR exceeds the basic requirements of CEQA by conducting a full analysis of four possible General Plan alternatives, and does so, among other reasons, to analyze whether different levels of development and different policy approaches could resolve significant environmental effects. By so doing, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors have been presented with a spectrum of information to use in adopting the General Plan. With respect to the proposed traffic mitigation measures referenced by the commenter, these will be considered by the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 213-6 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment requesting that the DEIR be revised and recirculated, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. County staff believes the General Plan alternatives are clearly defined and that recirculation is not warranted.

LETTER 214: MICHAEL J. McDOUGALL, MJM PROPERTIES, LLC

Response to Comment 214-1 (GP): As the commenter suggests, mapping of the “Village P” area of the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan on the Environmentally Constrained Alternative Land Use Diagram was in error. The Land Use Diagram has been revised to show the area as Commercial. Please see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

LETTER 215: (INTENTIONALLY BLANK)

LETTER 216: JOHN MACCREADY

Response to Comment 216-1 (GP): The OS (Open Space) designation is used for a variety of purposes on the Land Use Diagrams for each alternative. The purpose is described on the following pages: page 22 (Policy 2.2.1.2) – No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives; page 21 – Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative; and page 23 – Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The designation is applied primarily to public lands, although in some cases it is also appropriate on private lands. Please also refer to Responses to Comments 107-2, 107-5, and 107-13.

Response to Comment 216-2 (GP): In some parts of the County, existing parcel sizes are less than the minimum lot size for the land use designation. This is due to the mix of parcel sizes in the rural regions. Land use designations were applied based on the primary or most appropriate use of the land in the general area, with some substandard lots resulting.

Response to Comment 216-3 (GP): Georgetown is identified as a Community Region on the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative Land Use Diagram and in the text (page 19). It is identified as a Rural Center in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative (page 210) but is shown as a Community Region on the Land Use diagram. This is an error. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative Land Use diagram has been corrected to reflect that Georgetown is a Rural Center, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 216-4 (GP): As a member of the Planning Commission, the commenter may discuss and make a recommendation to the Board regarding the identification of agricultural lands. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment noting the desire for both Agricultural Districts and Agricultural Land use designations are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 216-5 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment desiring names on the maps for Rural Centers and Community Regions are noted for the record. As a member of the Planning Commission, the commenter may discuss and make a recommendation to the Board regarding how the maps are presented.

Response to Comment 216-6 (GP): Although population growth is reliant upon water, an assumption has been made in each of the alternatives that the County and the water purveyors will develop sufficient water supplies to accommodate the anticipated demand. Plan Assumptions on page 5 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives addresses this. It is implied in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives based on the Vision Statements on page 8. Should the water resources not be developed, however, there are policies in place that would limit the growth until such supplies are available (Policies LU-7a, PS-1d, PS-1f, and PS-1g of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus"

Alternatives; Policies 5.1.2.1, 5.2.1.2, and 5.2.1.4 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.) Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) expands upon these policies by adding a new policy regarding water availability.

While the absence of a reliable water supply may create some greater demand in the Rural Regions, there are a number of policies in each of the alternatives that discourage and limit development outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers, especially on agricultural lands (Policies PS-2b and the policies under Goals LU-1 and LU-4, together with Policies AF-1d, AF-1e, and AF-1f in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives; Policy 5.2.1.6, policies under Goal 2.1, and the policies under Objectives 8.1.3 and 8.1.4 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives).

Response to Comment 216-7 (GP): Currently, the County's rural areas are largely dependent upon groundwater. Any future residential subdivision in such areas would have to be consistent with the adopted or subsequently amended Land Use Diagram and could not create parcels smaller than five acres (see Policy 5.2.3.5 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policy PS-2e of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives). Furthermore, before building permits can be issued, Environmental Management Department Policy 800-02 requires demonstration that adequate water supplies exist, regardless of location.

All of the General Plan alternatives state that future growth should be directed to established Community Regions and Rural Centers. Of the Community Regions, which are projected to accommodate the most dense and extensive growth, all but one occur in the western half of the County (the exception is South Lake Tahoe in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives). Although Rural Centers are scattered throughout the County, their much smaller sizes will ultimately limit the amount of growth that can occur within them. "Growth areas" served by public water must also comply with Policy 800-02. This EIR includes a mitigation measure that addresses water supply in areas served by public water (5.5-1[b]).

According to the El Dorado Irrigation District, it is currently projected that the District can supply growth associated with development of any of the General Plan alternatives (please refer to Response to Comment 211-3). The District does not currently serve many of the dominant agricultural production areas of the County and does not plan to expand its service solely for specific types of uses such as agriculture (please refer to Responses to Comments 210-6 and 210-7).

Response to Comment 216-8 (GP): Buildout is a theoretical level of growth that could occur if every parcel were developed to the full extent permitted by the General Plan. There is no defined timeframe for buildout, and it is unlikely that the County would reach full buildout due to the oversupply of commercial land, inaccessibility of certain parcels, and so on. Additionally, after or near the end of the 20-year life of this plan, the County is likely to adopt a new plan, taking into consideration relevant factors at that time.

Response to Comment 216-9 (GP): As suggested, densities of residential development in Rural Centers are limited by the availability of public water and sewage disposal as set forth in Policies 5.2.1.3, 5.2.2.1, and 5.3.1.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policies LU-7a, PS-2b, PS-2e, PS-4c, and PS-4d of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Analysis of traffic impacts and LOS standards contemplated the potential development of the Rural Centers, as reflected in Policies 3.2.1.1 through 3.2.1.5 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and Policies TC-1c, TC-1d, and TC-1e of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 216-10 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 66-7.

Response to Comment 216-11 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding directing growth to Community Regions where water and sewer is available are noted for the record. Several policies do direct growth in this manner, including Policies LU-1a, LU-2c, LU-3j (LU-3k in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative), LU-4a, and LU-7a in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, and Policies 2.1.1.2 and 2.1.2.2 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 216-12 (EIR): Statements in the DEIR that describe the formation of Jenkinson Lake and responsibilities for services provided by EID are not inconsistent with the comment. The DEIR does not attribute any particular emphasis on the various uses of water within the County compared to the historically dominant use for agricultural activity. Therefore, no change to the DEIR is needed.

Response to Comment 216-13 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding expansion of the wine grape industry are noted for the record. The Wood Rodgers report, as described on page 5.5-30 of Volume 1 of the EIR, shows a 10 percent (or higher) rate of annual growth in agriculture through 2025 and beyond, which is a very high rate of growth.

Response to Comment 216-14 (EIR): The commenter correctly notes that agriculturally-zoned parcels have a minimum acreage requirement for winery tasting rooms and accessory uses (20 acres) and that commercial zone districts do not. See Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for the text change that corrects this error.

Response to Comment 216-15 (EIR): In addressing the identified impact of incompatibility between land use (Impact 5.1-3), the EIR identifies several mitigation measures that could reduce that impact. These are Mitigation Measures 5.1-3(a) through 5.1-3(d). These measures create an additional level of review for development in the County that currently does not require any conformity review. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding how that review would affect individual property owners are noted for the record. As a member of the Planning Commission, the commenter may discuss and make a recommendation to the Board regarding potential effects of conformity review.

Response to Comment 216-16 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 216-4.

Response to Comment 216-17 (GP): Upon adoption of a General Plan, the County will conform the Zoning Ordinance to that plan. In most cases, the zoning, which will reflect the maximum densities permitted by the land use designation will limit the number of parcels that could be created. However, as stated on page 8 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, and as provided in Policy LU-1b, the maximum number of parcels that could be created from a parcel existing at the time of adoption of the plan if this alternative is selected, is four, and the number could be fewer depending on the zoning or General Plan land use designation.

Response to Comment 216-18 (GP): The commenter refers to the development of fire safe plans and other fire prevention planning discussed on page 12 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. The Fire Safe Council is made up of nonprofessionals as well as professionals, as suggested by the comment.

Response to Comment 216-19 (GP): The information sought by the commenter can be found on page 273 of the draft Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative.

Response to Comment 216-20 (GP): Red-legged frog habitat only occurs in a portion of the County. The text has been revised to reflect that as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comment document. As stated on page 13 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the habitat covers the lower elevation regions of each fork of the Cosumnes River drainage and the Weber Creek drainage.

Response to Comment 216-21 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the appropriateness of R&D zoning in Rural Centers are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 216-22 (GP): The boundaries of a Rural Center are established on the Land Use Diagrams, and any expansion beyond those boundaries requires a General Plan amendment. There is no provision for a Rural Center to become a Community Region, and the size established by the boundaries would preclude that from occurring, thus protecting the adjacent agricultural lands. Policy LU-2c of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives specifically directs the County to ensure that infill of a Rural Center is accomplished before considering expansion of the boundaries.

Response to Comment 216-23 (GP): Policy LU-4a of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives provides a general statement that residential uses are permitted in Rural Regions, but agriculture, mining, and other land- and resource-based activities are the primary land uses in the Rural Regions. Policies AF-1c through AF-1f, along with Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(c) specifically address the conversion of

agricultural lands to other uses. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding extending the Right to Farm Ordinance to other resource-based industries are noted for the record. As a member of the Planning Commission, the commenter may discuss and make a recommendation to the Board regarding the extent of resource-based industry protection.

Response to Comment 216-24 (GP): Policy LU-4b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative establishes a maximum number of parcels that could be created at four. Depending on the lot size and land use designation, subdivision could be restricted to less than four, or even precluded, if the parcel is at the minimum lot size permitted by the applicable land use designation. Restriction of development by this policy in the Community Regions will direct a greater level of growth to the Rural Regions, as described in the EPS reports (Appendices B-2 and B-3 of Volume 3 of the EIR). Rural Lands is a land use designation with a minimum parcel size of 10 acres. It is only appropriate in Rural Regions except in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, where it may also be used as a method of limiting future subdivision on larger parcels inside Community Region boundaries.

Response to Comment 216-25 (GP): This policy creates performance standards for an individual to follow. Policy LU-6b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative would create some limitations on an individual property owner's ability to build where it may affect certain specified scenic views enjoyed by the general public. The policy and Implementation Measures LU-A and LU-F would limit this restriction to specified scenic corridors to be identified by ordinance by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors after public hearings. As a member of the Planning Commission, the commenter may discuss and make a recommendation to the Board regarding restrictions on ridgeline development.

Response to Comment 216-26 (GP): The adoption of a Scenic Corridor Ordinance, as provided by Implementation Measure LU-F, would require a series of public hearings before both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors at a minimum. Public participation in the development of the draft ordinance will ensure wide acceptance of it and is expected to be part of the ordinance development process, based on direction from the Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 216-27 (GP): Coordination between school districts and the County is recommended by Policies PS-9b and PS-9c in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, and Policies 5.8.2.1 and 5.8.2.5 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. However, the districts are independent agencies, and are not strictly tied to the County's plan and its policies. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding school location are noted for the record.

Similar coordination is provided for EID and the other water purveyors in the County through Policies PS-1a, PS-1b, PS-1c and PS-2b in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, and Policies 5.1.3.1 and 5.2.1.1 in the No Project

and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, along with policies in the Land Use Element directing growth to Community Regions where services are generally, or can be made available. Please refer also to Response to Comment 216-6.

Response to Comment 216-28 (GP): Implementation Measure HO-DD directs the County to develop universal design standards to increase accessibility for the handicapped as a result of Policies HO-4b and HO-4c. These policies only encourage homebuilders to incorporate these designs into new homes and direct the County to assist in providing the opportunity for such design.

Response to Comment 216-29 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding reservation of water for agricultural use are noted for the record. It should be noted that the water agency is a separate entity from the County. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 210-6 and 210-7 (El Dorado Irrigation District) and 216-7.

Response to Comment 216-30 (GP): This is an implementation measure that directs the County to develop a program to identify certain areas with groundwater limitations. Policy PS-2e states that a ten-acre minimum applies to such areas. It is not necessary to duplicate the policy in the implementation measure.

Response to Comment 216-31 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding gated subdivisions are noted for the record. As a member of the Planning Commission, the commenter may discuss and make a recommendation to the Board regarding gated subdivision policies.

Response to Comment 216-32 (GP): A limitation of new mining operations within 10,000 feet of existing residences is a provision of Measure A (El Dorado County Code Section 17.14.095), adopted by initiative in 1984. The commenter suggests that the reverse should be true, or at least a disclosure statement be signed by new residential developers or purchasers acknowledging that an existing mine is operating and will not interfere with the mining operation (i.e., "right to mine" ordinance). The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment are noted for the record. As a member of the Planning Commission, the commenter may discuss and make a recommendation to the Board regarding additional protection for ongoing mining.

Response to Comment 216-33 (GP): If adopted, Policy CO-6a of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative becomes a statement of County interests. Therefore, the additional text proposed by the commenter is unnecessary.

Response to Comment 216-34 (GP): Special expertise will be necessary for development of the program to identify special-status species habitats. This is not typically the expertise an Agricultural Commissioner or members on an Agricultural Commission might have.

Response to Comment 216-35 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 216-34.

Response to Comment 216-36 (GP): The purpose of these implementation measures is to identify and then to protect oak woodlands and other important habitat. It would defeat the purpose of these measures to add provisions to replace the native species that make up the habitat with “other faster growing trees,” as suggested by the commenter. While the Agricultural Commission will have input into the development of Implementation Measure CO-J, the primary responsibility for the development lies with the Planning Department.

Response to Comment 216-37 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 66-49.

Response to Comment 216-38 (GP): There is insufficient differentiation between the colors representing Urban Land and Unique Farmland. Figure AF-1 has been revised to correct this problem. Please see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. It is unclear what policy language the commenter is suggesting relative to this figure. Numerous policies in the Agriculture and Forestry Element in each of the alternatives direct the County to identify important farmland and develop mechanisms to protect that farmland from urban encroachment and conversion.

Response to Comment 216-39 (GP): The provision that land be under cultivation in Policy AF-1a of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is only one of several criteria for identification of appropriate boundaries for the Agricultural Districts. It is not necessary that all lands within the district be under cultivation.

Response to Comment 216-40 (GP): Because much of the timberland in the County is on public land, it was deemed important to show that distribution in Table AF-3. The situation is not the same for agricultural land, and such a chart was therefore not developed as it was not determined to be necessary for the Agriculture and Forestry Element.

Response to Comment 216-41 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 216-7.

Response to Comment 216-42 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the timeframes for implementation are noted for the record. The Agricultural Department is and will continue to be involved in each of the measures identified in the implementation program for the Agriculture and Forestry Element. As a member of the Planning Commission, the commenter may make recommendations to the Board regarding more appropriate timeframes for implementation.

Response to Comment 216-43 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the placement of public facilities in Agricultural Districts are noted for the record. As a member of the Planning Commission, the commenter may discuss and make a recommendation to the Board regarding the prohibition of public facilities in Agricultural Districts. Several policies in each alternative direct public facilities to more appropriate areas, including Policies AF-1d, AF-1f, and PS-9c in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, and Policies 5.8.2.1 and 8.1.4.2 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 216-44 (GP): The suggested text has been added to the discussion of tourism in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 216-45 (GP): Policy PR-3b of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives directs the County to review discretionary projects for consistency with hiking and bikeway master plans, and to require dedication of trails easements where appropriate. The updates to both the *Bikeway Master Plan* and *Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan* will be completed with input from a broad range of interest groups, and ultimately will be adopted by the Board of Supervisors. Future trails will need to be located to accommodate the population and to limit impacts on land uses where recreation uses would create conflicts. Because most new discretionary development that would lead to the need for new trails will be in Community Regions and Rural Centers, the likelihood of trails being located across agricultural land is minimal. However, the concerns and opinions expressed in the comment are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 216-46 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding attracting major recreational events are noted for the record. As a member of the Planning Commission, the commenter may discuss and make a recommendation to the Board regarding limitations on tourist-drawing events.

Response to Comment 216-47 (GP): A reference to the wine industry and other agricultural activities associated with economic development has been added to the text of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 216-48 (GP): This body would be appointed by or recognized by the Board of Supervisors, and consist of representatives of various industry groups and economic development specialists within the County.

Response to Comment 216-49 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding development of an economic policy framework are noted for the record. As a member of the Planning Commission, the commenter may discuss and make a recommendation to the Board regarding how the economic policy framework is developed.

LETTER 217: THOMAS G. MAHACH, EL DORADO COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

Response to Comment 217-1 (GP): The land use designation standard tables in the referenced General Plan alternatives specify the maximum density and intensity of use permissible in each of the General Plan land use designations as required by law. The commenter's preference that the table also include a minimum density and intensity standard is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan. The adoption of a Zoning Ordinance to implement the General Plan will be a separate process with additional opportunities for public participation in developing zoning standards to implement the various General Plan policies including land use designations.

Response to Comment 217-2 (GP): This General Plan effort does not address zoning, although modifications to zoning will subsequently occur as a part of implementation. Please refer to Master Response 7. Until a General Plan is adopted; the Board has regained land use authority; direction is given regarding update of the Zoning Ordinance; and an update is drafted; it is speculative at best to try and project what changes to zoning on individual parcels might be considered. The number of acres in each land use category in each alternative is shown in Table 3-4 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 217-3 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Master Response 4.

Response to Comment 217-4 (GP): As noted by the commenter, the County held hearings in August 2002 on the draft policies. The County also held hearings during the comment period on both the Draft General Plan and the DEIR. Both sets of hearings were widely noticed. At both sets of hearings, all individuals wishing to speak were heard, with several speakers returning to the podium numerous times to make comments. There has been full compliance with Government Code Section 65033 to date. Additionally, 12 future hearings are planned – please see Response to Comment 67-13. This Response to Comment document contains individual responses to all “parcel-specific requests” submitted during the 98-day comment period on the Draft General Plan. Additionally, it documents other requests received outside of the comment period (see EIR Volume 2 Appendix A). There is no evidence to support the claim that the County has failed to hold appropriate public hearings, nor is there evidence to support the claim that parcel-specific requests have been ignored. Parcel-specific requests are also discussed in Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 217-5 (GP): Many of the policy options included in the draft alternatives were developed based on comments from members of the public during testimony to the Board of Supervisors and others were developed by staff in response to direction from the Board of Supervisors to develop a range of options for consideration by the public and the Board. Public review of those policies has been ongoing. Please see Response to Comment 67-1 and Master Response 8. A history of the process of identifying General Plan alternatives is provided in Volume 1 of the EIR commencing on page 3-9. The –IBC overlay is a tool proposed as a part of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative that

emphasizes the protection of natural resources. The limitation on subdivision in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative is a way to ensure some greater use of parcels that could otherwise be split, but still maintain U.S. Highway 50 at six lanes and meet Measure Y level-of-service constraints.

Response to Comment 217-6 (GP/EIR): The Writ of Mandate did not order the County to make changes in the text or background information in the 1996 General Plan. The Writ of Mandate directed the County to vacate its approval of that plan because it found that in adopting the Plan, the County had not complied properly with CEQA. The Writ of Mandate directed the County to perform additional environmental review in connection with the 1996 General Plan including consideration of a broader range of alternatives and land use projections supported by substantial evidence. For a broader discussion of the requirements of the Writ of Mandate, please see Master Response 3.

The Writ of Mandate and CEQA require the County to conduct an independent evaluation of the various project alternatives in light of the information presented in the new environmental documentation. Following that evaluation and after considering public comments and evidence submitted by the public, the Board will certify the adequacy of the EIR and select from among the General Plan alternatives to adopt a final General Plan. As part of the General Plan adoption, the Board will consider the mitigation measures proposed by the EIR. Based on evidence in the EIR and provided by the public, the Board will make findings concerning the feasibility of the measures proposed. After a final General Plan is adopted, the County will prepare a detailed report to the Court documenting the manner in which the County has complied with the Writ of Mandate. Appendix G of the DEIR (revised in this Response to Comments document – please see Appendix C.2 of this document) is intended to inform the public how the issues raised by the Writ of Mandate are addressed in the EIR. Some of the issues raised in the Writ of Mandate cannot be addressed in the EIR and can only be addressed at the time the Board makes findings concerning the mitigation measures to be adopted. The information in Appendix G (as revised in Appendix C.2 of this Response to Comments document) will be updated and used in the report to the Court after the EIR is certified and a General Plan adopted. The commenter’s opinion that this approach is inappropriate and not what the public expected is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations concerning the plan.

Response to Comment 217-7 (GP/EIR): The Court’s Writ of Mandate is included in full in Appendix A of the Draft No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. The Court’s initial decision, which is the larger document referenced by the commenter was not included due to its size and the fact that the Writ of Mandate provides the substantive direction to the County as to the specific steps that must be taken prior to adoption of a new General Plan. Nonetheless, this document is a public document and copies have been and continue to be available through the County Counsel’s office. A copy of the decision has been scanned and posted on the General Plan web site (see Response to

Comment 261-15). The commenter is correct that the Judge did not identify any legal inadequacy in the 1996 General Plan itself. The Court required the County to vacate the General Plan because the Court found the County did not have legally adequate environmental information concerning the effects of that plan at the time it was adopted and the County did not provide sufficient evidence to document its rationale for rejecting policies and alternatives that would have lessened the environmental effects of the plan. Please see page 3-7 of Volume 1 of the EIR for additional clarification.

Response to Comment 217-8 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 217-9 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions of the commenter regarding the similarity among the project alternatives is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. The EIR analyzes four equal-weight General Plan alternatives and an additional eight comparative alternatives. This is fully compliant with the requirements of CEQA to evaluate "...a range of reasonable alternatives..." (CCR Section 15126.2) and the comment does not suggest any feasible alternatives that should have been considered. A summary of the policy differences between the alternatives appears: 1) in Chapter 3.0 of Volume 1 of the EIR (Project Description) commencing on page 3-23; 2) in the "Summary of Differences between the Equal Weight General Plan Alternatives" (April 9, 2003) released with the draft General Plan alternatives and on the County website; and 3) in Master Response 6.

Response to Comment 217-10 (GP): Staff disagrees with the comment that the plan alternatives are internally inconsistent because different elements focus on different policy objectives. Many of the policy options from which the County must select have competing interests, including the trade-offs between fire protection and maintaining natural vegetation and a rural landscape. Policies within the Public Health and Safety Element of each alternative provide methods to address the potential for fire hazards while maintaining buffers and open space regions. These policies have been expanded and otherwise modified based on the recommendations of the El Dorado County Fire Safe Council in Comment Letter 265, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 217-11 (GP): As concluded on page 7-2 of Volume 2 of the EIR, a General Plan EIR is cumulative by nature in that it takes into account impacts throughout the entire county. Section 7.1 of the EIR addresses regional cumulative impacts, beyond those identified in Chapter 5.0 of the EIR. The comment is taken out of context from the analysis on page 7-12 of regional human health and safety issues. Impact 5.8-10 concludes that fire hazard is a significant unavoidable issue countywide.

Response to Comment 217-12 (EIR): Estimated labor needs and costs for implementation of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are provided in Appendix B of this Response to Comment document. Please also refer to Master Responses 5 and 6.

Response to Comment 217-13 (GP): The commenter is correct that no such analysis has been prepared. A study to analyze the potential effects of the proposed policies, both in terms of enhancing and detracting from property values is beyond the scope of the planning process.

Response to Comment 217-14 (GP): The Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative both reduce the potential densities of undeveloped lands throughout the County, in differing ways and for different reasons. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative Land Use Diagram directs anticipated growth into areas most capable of supporting new residential development, based on access, availability of public services and physical constraints. Greater limitations were developed in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative by limiting the total number of new units that could be created on any existing parcel to four or fewer, regardless of location. The creation of these alternatives, and the methodology used in doing so, was based on direction from the Board of Supervisors.

The assertion that promoting development in regions in need of infrastructure improvements would result in those improvements being completed (road widening, development of water supplies, etc.) has not been proven in the past. Furthermore, it is arguable whether the land use patterns that exist in the County today would facilitate such large scale improvements when most of the development would most likely occur on an incremental basis, and the economies of scale are insufficient to support the needed infrastructure. The development in those areas are just as likely to worsen the fire hazard by placing more people in harm's way without the needed infrastructure to provide for emergency ingress and egress, water supplies for fire fighting capabilities, etc. and increasing the risks from greater numbers of people in the wildlands interface zone, with more likelihood of fires starting by debris burning, power equipment, and other accidents. Policies HS-2d and HS-3a direct the County to work with the appropriate agencies to develop fire safe plans and fuel reduction programs.

Response to Comment 217-15 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 9. The case referenced by the commenter does not change the legal principles described in this Master Response.

Response to Comment 217-16 (EIR): Impact 5.5-1 (beginning on page 5.5-31 of Volume 1 of the EIR) identifies the potential for surface water shortages as a result of increased water demand under the General Plan development scenarios, and mitigation measures are provided to reduce this impact, although not to a less-than-significant level. Agricultural water demand is primarily served by groundwater wells at the present time, and Impact 5.5-3 (beginning on page 5.5-61) identifies the potential for increases in groundwater demand as well, with partial mitigation identified.

Response to Comment 217-17 (GP): Although not stated as policy, it is in fact the responsibility of the agency or property owner managing the open space preserve or conservation easement. For example, BLM has worked closely with CDF to reduce the fuel buildup and fire hazard along the perimeter of the Pine Hill Preserve unit adjacent to

Cameron Park. This will result in costs for the agencies responsible for management, as suggested by the commenter.

Response to Comment 217-18 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 217-7.

Response to Comment 217-19 (GP/EIR): The County is tasked with adopting a legally adequate General Plan that is responsive to the needs of the citizens of the El Dorado County. The commenter may be referring to discussions that have occurred from time to time regarding how “good” the General Plan can be, beyond meeting the requirements of adequacy, given the legal, financial, and time constraints the County faces. There has been discussion and debate regarding whether or not it is feasible or even possible to adopt a “perfect” General Plan. The Project Manager has advocated recognition of the fact that there are indeed constraints on this process, and that there is nothing to preclude the Board from making further improvement to the General Plan over time, after a Plan is adopted and in place, and the Writ of Mandate is lifted. It is not possible to predict the cost or nature of subsequent General Plan amendments without adoption of a General Plan and further direction from the Board.

Response to Comment 217-20 (GP): At the point in which the Board of Supervisors makes a final decision regarding adoption of a General Plan for the County, all of the alternatives will have been through required public, legal, and CEQA review. A Zoning Ordinance update will be necessary with any alternative chosen. The commenter’s recommendations and opinions regarding expenditures of funds for the General Plan process, and in support of the 1996 General Plan Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. The Findings of Fact the Board is required to adopt in conjunction with certification of the EIR and adoption of a General Plan will provide the best documentation of the Board’s reasoning for their decision (please refer to Master Response 6). Estimated costs to implement the various General Plan alternatives have been provided in Appendix B of this Response to Comment document. Costs will vary depending on what mitigation measures are accepted by the Board and other decisions made during the adoption process. Estimated costs of future litigation are not known at this time, as there is no way to predict the focus of any such litigation or the effort that may be needed to provide a defense.

LETTER 218: ART MARINACCIO, REPRESENTING DIAMOND QUARRY

Response to Comment 218-1 (GP): The subject parcels (APNs 098-021-60 and 099-040-01) are identified as Industrial under all of the alternatives except the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. That alternative does not allow the assignment of Industrial to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcels are not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the Industrial land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 218-2 (GP): The commenter's preference for a General Plan that mirrors the plan adopted by the Board of Supervisors in January 1996 is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

LETTER 219: ART MARINACCIO, REPRESENTING ERIC BRUNIUS

Response to Comment 219-1 (GP): The commenter's request to apply a "designation that recognizes their value as a current and future material source" to a number of properties is noted for the record. The General Plan alternatives protect APNs 093-150-12, 21, and 22 by virtue of the assigned land use designations, which is "Public Facility" in all cases under each of the Alternatives (those parcels are publicly owned). Parcel 093-190-01, the only parcel owned by the property owner whom the commenter is representing, is identified as Rural Residential/Rural Lands (RR/RL) under the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives and Natural Resource (NR) under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The designation assigned under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative would offer better protection than the designations proposed under the other Alternatives, though policies in all of the alternatives identify RR/RL and NR as appropriate for the extraction of mineral resources (Policies 2.2.2.7 and 7.2.2.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives and Policy CO-2b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained alternatives). Finally, parcel 093-150-11, which is not owned by the property owner the commenter is representing, is designated Low Density Residential (LDR) under all of the Alternatives. None of the parcels are identified by the State Department of Conservation as important mineral resource areas (i.e., none of the parcels are identified as MRZ-2a or MRZ-2b).

Because parcel 093-190-01, which is owned by the commenter's client, is not designated by the State as an important mineral resource area and is not currently an active mine, application of the –MR overlay is not appropriate. Please also refer to Master Response 21.

LETTER 220: ART MARINACCIO, REPRESENTING SIERRA TERRA

Response to Comment 220-1 (GP): The subject parcels, APNs 095-011-49 and 50, are incorporated and evaluated accordingly as Natural Resource under all of the General Plan alternatives. This land use designation is compatible with application of the currently defined Mineral Resource zone district.

Response to Comment 220-2 (GP): The commenter's opinion that the 1996 General Plan Alternative is the only alternative that recognizes the importance of the County's economic resources is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

LETTER 221: ART MARINACCIO, REPRESENTING DENNIS GRAHAM/DOUBLE D SPRINGS, INC.

Response to Comment 221-1 (GP): The commenter opposes the exclusion of the subject property (APN 115-010-30) from the Cameron Park Community Region and opposes the proposed land use designations in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel has a designation of Natural Resource (NR). That Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel has a designation of Rural Lands (RL). For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers, which were generally more limited in size and extent. The subject property was not included in the Cameron Park Community Region. Furthermore, the LDR designation is not permitted in Community Regions. The policy regarding school siting that is referred to by the commenter simply recommends that schools be placed in Community Regions and Rural Centers (Policy PS-9c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives). Because the County has no authority to dictate the future locations of schools, it can act in an advisory role only. Policy PS-9c reflects that role.

Similar to the policy regarding schools siting, the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives both discourage but do not prohibit the extension of public water into the County's Rural Regions. Water is not supplied by the County, so the County cannot place restrictions on where water service will be provided. The commenter's opinion that including the property in the Cameron Park Community Region for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives would allow for appropriate planning for future infrastructure needs is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 221-2 (GP): As the commenter implies, the County is currently using a Zoning Ordinance that is not necessarily consistent with the General Plan alternatives. Once the Board of Supervisors adopts a new General Plan, the County can pursue a Zoning Ordinance update. Because the Zoning Ordinance must be consistent with the General Plan, it would be premature to develop and propose a Zoning Ordinance in advance of General Plan adoption.

The commenter is correct in his implied assumption that the updated Zoning Ordinance will better address project specific issues.

Response to Comment 221-3 (GP): The history of the Green Springs Ranch Project is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan.

Response to Comment 221-4 (GP): The commenter's preference for using the 1996 General Plan Alternative as a base for General Plan deliberations and as the preferred

alternative plan is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan.

LETTER 222: ART MARINACCIO, REPRESENTING THELMA AND LORING BRUNIUS, SIERRA TERRA, AND “OLD FOOTHILL SAND AND GRAVEL PROPERTIES”

Response to Comment 222-1 (GP): Based on the contents of the comment letter, it appears that the commenter objects to the land use designations proposed for the subject parcels (APNs 317-120-08, 102-150-16, and 102-150-28 [Brunius]; 105-150-25 [Sierra Terra]; and 102-140-51, 52, 54, 81, 82, and 83 [“old Foothill Sand and Gravel property”, owned by a number of different parties]) under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. With the exception of APN 102-140-54, all of the parcels are identified as Industrial under the No Project, 1996 General Plan, and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives (APN 102-140-54 is identified as Low Density Residential (LDR) under those Alternatives). The Environmentally Constrained Alternative proposes the Rural Lands (RL) designation for all of the parcels.

As noted in Responses to Comments 51-55 and 218-1, parcels outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative cannot be assigned the Industrial land use designation. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 222-2 (GP): The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative designations is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan. The commenter's concern that removal of the Industrial designation for “the Quarry” (assumed to be Weber Creek Quarry, APNs 102-150-16 and 28 and 317-120-08) under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative would be inconsistent with the approved reclamation plan is also noted. The commenter has not provided evidence that assignment of a different land use designation (e.g., Rural Lands or Natural Resources) under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative would invalidate the reclamation plan.

Response to Comment 222-3 (GP): A reclamation plan is not an “entitlement”. It describes a proposed end use, and requires the operator to reclaim the site to a condition suitable for that end use, but it does not entitle the property owner to any particular zoning, land use designation, or use following reclamation. The 1996 General Plan did not establish any entitlements and the Writ of Mandate had no effect on the reclamation plan or the right to mine.

Response to Comment 222-4 (GP): The commenter requests that the lands formerly owned by Foothill Sand and Gravel and of Sierra Terra retain the Industrial designation. The request is included in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Because these parcels are outside a Community Region or Rural Center, they could not be assigned the Industrial land use designation in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcels are designated Rural Lands (RL). According to Policy CO-2b of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, this land use designation is considered compatible with mining. Please also refer to Response to Comment 221-1.

Response to Comment 222-5 (GP): APN 102-150-25 is identified by the State as supporting an important mineral resource area. Accordingly, the resources associated with this parcel are protected by application of the –MR overlay designation. All of the General Plan alternatives respect the State’s designation by application of the overlay designation. Please refer to Master Response 21.

Response to Comment 222-6 (EIR): The EIR contains mitigation addressing potential incompatibilities between mineral resource extraction and other uses. Please refer to Mitigation Measures 5.1-3(a), 5.9-5(a), 5.9-5(b), 5.9-6(b), and 5.9-6(c). Mitigation 5.9-6(c) addresses the minimum parcel size requirements referred to by the commenter.

The commenter’s preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative designations is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 222-7 (GP): The parcel base used for the General Plan alternatives represents a “snapshot in time”. It is recognized that Boundary Line Adjustments and other modifications allowed pursuant to the Writ of Mandate have continued since the draft General Plan Land Use Diagrams were developed. Once the Board of Supervisors adopts a Land Use Diagram, the staff will ensure that the most recent parcel base is applied and that any minor corrections, such as the one suggested by the commenter, are incorporated into the distribution of land use designations.

Response to Comment 222-8 (GP): As noted in Response to Comment 222-1, there is a policy reason for removing the Industrial designation from some lands in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. By limiting truly Industrial operations to areas having the greatest level of infrastructure, the potential for adverse environmental impacts associated with the development of new industrial operations in the Rural Regions is reduced. Additionally, restricting the Industrial designation from Rural Regions would avoid land use conflicts between industrial users and dispersed residential uses and reducing vehicular traffic on rural roads.

LETTER 223: KATHERINE MIDKIFF

Response to Comment 223-1 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 156-1 and 156-4.

Response to Comment 223-2 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 156-1 through 156-5 and 183-2, 183-6, 183-7, and 183-8.

Response to Comment 223-3 (EIR): The commenter has been added to the County's General Plan mailing list.

LETTER 224: DON MORRISON

Response to Comment 224-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation for the 27 parcels north of Marshall Road in Book 60, page 69. The commenter owns APN 060-690-40; the remaining 26 parcels are owned by other parties. This request is included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. The parcels are designated Low Density Residential (LDR) under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. Under these Alternatives, these parcels could not be identified as MDR because they are outside of the Coloma Rural Center.

The commenter also requests the MDR designation for the six parcels south of State Route 49 in Book 89, page 5. The commenter owns APNs 089-050-28 and -29; the remaining four are owned by other parties. This request is included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. The parcels are designated Low Density Residential (LDR) under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. Under these Alternatives, these parcels could not be identified as MDR because there is no Community Region or Rural Center in the area.

The commenter requests the Multifamily Residential (MFR) designation for APN 329-301-19. This request was not included in any of the General Plan Alternatives. Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the parcel has a split designation of MFR and High Density Residential (HDR). In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel has a split designation of MFR and LDR. Land use designations under this Alternative are based on Policy LU-1b, which limits future subdivision to a maximum of four new parcels. This affected the assignment of land use designations under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated HDR. One of the goals of this Alternative was to reduce overall density countywide. Since there were many other MFR parcels within this area, the density was reduced for this parcel.

Regarding APN 329-301-19, please refer to responses to Comment Letters 65 and 123, which were submitted by representatives of the property owner (Federated Church). Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 225: DENNIS A. NICKSON

Response to Comment 225-1 (GP): The commenter's preferred land use designation is High Density Residential (HDR), which is included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. The assignment of an LDR land use designation under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative to the commenter's parcel (APN 116-030-31) is based on Policy LU-1b, which prohibits subdivision to no more than four parcels. Please refer to Master Response 8 for a description of how the land uses were assigned under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative.

LETTER 226: DENNIS A. NICKSON AND DAN RUCKLE

Response to Comment 226-1 (GP): The land use designation of Multifamily Residential (MFR) is proposed for APN 109-050-12 (which is not owned by the commenters) for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, is consistent with the current multifamily zoning designation. The parcel is not zoned for commercial uses, as stated by the commenters. The statement that the Barnett Business Park was approved with a provision prohibiting residential use within the park is not true. In fact, the County has recognized the value of providing higher density housing close to the commercial and industrial uses in the area and, as the commenters point out, has approved multifamily development in the area subsequent to creation of the business park. Some of this development occurred on commercially-zoned lands, consistent with policy in effect at that time.

The staff is aware of the concerns associated with residential development within the business park. Any approval of new residential projects would require a thorough analysis of the potential effects (both new and cumulative) and could assign mitigation to address identified issues. The decisionmakers could also choose to deny a project based on information gathered during project processing.

A tentative map for the Sierra Gold Condominiums project on the subject parcel was approved in 1995. The proponent of that project applied for time extensions on that tentative map, consistent with State law. As the commenter implies, the current time extension application for the project is on hold pending compliance with the Writ of Mandate. Once the Writ of Mandate is lifted, the proposed tentative map extension may be considered. The zone change referred to by the commenter was approved in 1995; it is not the subject of the current tentative map extension application on file with the Planning Department.

The commenters' concerns and opinions regarding the suitability of MFR lands within the Barnett Business Park (and adjacent to the commenters' parcels) are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 226-2 (GP): All Community Services Districts have received notice of the availability of the draft General Plan documents. Because the General Plan has the potential to affect every resident of the County, it is not feasible or financially possible to personally notify every resident regarding proposed General Plan changes. In addition to legal notices, the County has used large newspaper advertisements, posted announcements in a number of public places, and provided extensive information on its Internet website.

When any zone change or General Plan amendment is processed, property owners living within 500 feet of the project property are notified, consistent with CEQA. To the extent that a landowner wishes to be notified of actions that he/she may not otherwise be aware of, an official request can be made to the Planning Department.

LETTER 227: WAYNE ORDOS

Response to Comment 227-1 (GP): Gated communities are precluded under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and discouraged under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative, as provided by Policy HS-2e. The 1996 General Plan Alternative contains no policies on gated communities. The commenter does not support restrictions on gated communities and indicates that gated communities are safer than nongated communities. The comment does not include any evidence in support of this conclusion. This opinion and concern are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 228: MERRITT RICE

Response to Comment 228-1 (GP): The comment is noted.

Response to Comment 228-2 (GP): The commenter is correct that the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are structured differently. The No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative have a Statement of Vision (page 3), Plan Objectives (page 7) and Principles (the first page of each element). The Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives contain the same Vision Statement (page 7) but do not include the Plan Objectives or Principles. These were not included as they were considered superfluous in light of the vision statement and goals within each element.

For the purposes of the CEQA alternatives analysis, however, the County staff identified one set of objectives that all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives would accomplish, that could also be used for comparison of the eight “comparative alternatives” examined in Chapter 6.0 of Volume 1 of the EIR. These are identified on page 3-13 of Volume 1 of the EIR and restated on page 6-1 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 228-3 (GP/EIR): The EIR analyzes 12 General Plan alternatives, four at an equal-weight level of detail (throughout the EIR) and eight at a comparative level of detail (Chapter 6.0 of Volume 2 of the EIR). This exceeds the requirements of CEQA, which extend only to a comparative analysis of a “reasonable range” of alternatives. Two of the Comparative Alternatives (Alternatives #6 and #8) are rejected from further analysis due to legal infeasibility. The remaining six are given a full comparative analysis as required by CEQA, and none of these six have been eliminated from consideration. Please refer to Response to Comment 228-2 regarding Plan Objectives. It is noted for the record that the commenter requests additional analysis of consistency with the objectives stated in the 1996 General Plan Alternatives. A similar type of analysis is already included in the EIR as described in Response to Comment 228-2. Please refer also to Master Response 6.

Response to Comment 228-4 (GP/EIR): The term “equal-weight” refers to the level of detail in the CEQA analysis for the four primary alternatives. Please refer to Master Response 6 regarding choices between these alternatives.

Response to Comment 228-5 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 67-13 and 217-4 and Master Response 8. The land uses requested by the commenter have been evaluated as part of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. The commenter’s views on the justification for those land uses is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberation on the Plan.

It is important to point out that the direction of the Board was that the 1996 General Plan Alternative be the maximum growth scenario, with other alternatives representing more constrained growth as required by the Writ of Mandate. It is also important to note that there will continue to be opportunity for property owner comment and involvement in the

consideration of the preferred General Plan alternative. The public review process is summarized in Master Responses 1 and 8.

The commenter refers to unspecified documents from the 1992 to 1995 period. None of this information is attached, and therefore, it is not addressed as a part of the comment. Given the dates, however, this information (if submitted to the County) would have been addressed during the original 1996 General Plan process. No further response is necessary.

LETTER 229: SUSAN A. RODMAN

Response to Comment 229-1 (GP): The time that the commenter spent on organizing her comments and presenting them to the County is recognized.

Response to Comment 229-2 (EIR): These issues are addressed in Impact 5.5-2. Please refer to Response to Comment 187-6.

Response to Comment 229-3 (GP): There has been no evidence provided that demonstrates that there is a “serious water pollution problem downstream” from five-acre parcels utilizing septic systems for sewage disposal. The County has utilized strict standards regarding setbacks, percolation rates and other criteria for the siting of septic systems on parcels smaller than five acres for a number of years without indications that groundwater contamination has resulted. However, the concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding allowing septic systems on parcels less than five acres in size are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 229-4 (GP): The use of reclaimed water is recommended in Policy PS-3b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. That policy differs in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative by mandating the County to develop a classification of projects for which the use of reclaimed water is required. Please refer also to Response to Comment 210-11. Policy PS-3c has been amended, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document, to reflect the suggestion that water conserving landscaping should be required for commercial development projects as well as capital improvement projects.

Response to Comment 229-5 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) (as modified in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document) requires water supply assessments and confirmation to be developed for multiple dry years (drought conditions); therefore, drought protection is built into the requirement.

Response to Comment 229-6 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding plan assumptions related to water supply are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 187-6 and 229-5.

Response to Comment 229-7 (GP): Please refer to previous Responses to Comments 229-2, 229-3, and 229-4.

Response to Comment 229-8 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the emphasis on directing growth to areas with adequate infrastructure in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane

"Plus" Alternatives are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 229-9 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding compact residential development and fire hazard reduction are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 229-10 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the emphasis on clustered development in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 229-11 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding fuels reduction, safety and evacuation needs are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to the responses to Comment Letter 265 (Fire Safe Council).

Response to Comment 229-12 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding higher densities and the ability to utilize reclaimed water are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 229-13 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the land use designations of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 229-14 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding support for the -IBC corridor in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The EIR has found that agricultural activities are essentially incompatible with maintaining natural habitats in that the conversion to agriculture removes native vegetation necessary for food and shelter. (See discussion of Impact 5.12-1, Loss and Fragmentation of Wildlife Habitat, beginning on page 5.12-32, and the Master Response 18 as it relates to agricultural conversion.)

Response to Comment 229-15 (GP): The policies under Goal CO-5 in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives all relate to "special status species", and not just threatened and endangered.

Response to Comment 229-16 (GP): Each of the alternatives provide a range of land uses, including high-density residential and commercial. The primary difference between the alternatives is the extent and location of those uses.

Response to Comment 229-17 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding Agricultural District lands are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 229-18 (GP): The Planned Community designation in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives has been removed based on the fact that four of the five have already been approved, either as a specific plan (Valley View, Promontory, and Carson Creek) or a Master Circulation and Financing Plan (Missouri Flat). The fifth, in the Pilot Hill area, has been withdrawn. Although the Land Use Diagram does not show any PC designation, the text was not revised to recognize this. This has now been done as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 229-19 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding support for the designation of agricultural uses on the most productive soils in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Similar policies and land use designations exist in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 229-20 (GP): The EIR proposes mitigation measures that would address the lack of provisions for wildlife in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. Please refer to Section 5.12 of the EIR (Volume 2).

Response to Comment 229-21 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding fire safety are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 229-22 (GP): The Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives set forth the framework for accomplishing the objectives set forth in this comment. It is intended to be implemented through Implementation Measure HS-B. Please refer also to the responses to Comment Letters 187 (Eldorado National Forest) and 265 (Fire Safe Council).

Response to Comment 229-23 (GP): Implementation Measure HS-B provides a list of possible measures that should be taken by the County, working cooperatively with experts in fire prevention and safety, to reduce wildfires and the damage that they can

cause. The list is not exclusive, and adoption of fuels management standards would be an appropriate action under this measure.

Response to Comment 229-24 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 229-23.

Response to Comment 229-25 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 187-4.

Response to Comment 229-26 (GP): As the commenter noted, improving U.S. Highway 50 within the City of Placerville, whether by a raised freeway section or some other method, is outside of the jurisdiction of the County. The City of Placerville and Caltrans would be the lead agencies for such a project. The El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC), another agency external to the County, would be involved in the funding of those improvements. The County would be involved in coordination with projects in other (nonjurisdictional) areas of the County to the extent relevant. All four equal-weight General Plan alternatives contain language requiring the County to coordinate its efforts with those of these other agencies.

Response to Comment 229-27 (GP): It should be noted that these issues with road standards in rural areas will be dealt with in the form of revisions to the County's Design and Improvements Manual and Standard Plans and enforcement of these revised standards. This is an Implementation Measure in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives – Measure TC-C. It is implied in the policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives – Objective 3.1.2 and Policy 3.1.2.1. It is a goal of all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives to provide safe roadways in the County in both the urbanized areas and the rural areas.

Response to Comment 229-28 (GP): While the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives contain Goal 3.14 and its related Objectives and Policies, the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives do not include such specific language. Routine maintenance of facilities is not normally included in a General Plan document as a specific goal or policy. The maintenance of roadways is an implied task under the overall goal of providing safe roads and is included in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

The second part of the comment is reflective of the commenter's concerns regarding stream sedimentation. The County is currently in the process of implementing the requirements of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and developing Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize erosion, sediment, and other maintenance and construction-related pollutant discharge associated with roadways.

Response to Comment 229-29 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 229-25, 229-26, and 229-27.

Response to Comment 229-30 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding open space policies in the Environmentally Constrained and

Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives and the need to maintain the County's character are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 229-31 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding trail system connections are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Policies PR-3a and PR-3c of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives provide for the connections suggested in the comment.

Response to Comment 229-32 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding planning for recreational needs are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 229-33 (GP): With the exception of some of the regional parks (Henningsen-Lotus and Pioneer Parks for example) most of the active recreation facilities are developed and maintained by separate recreation or community services districts as discussed on pages 292-295 in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and 290-293 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. The County supports the acquisition of new parkland through imposition of the "Quimby Act" parkland dedication requirements as set forth in Section 16.12.090 of the El Dorado County Code. The amount of parkland required to be dedicated is proportional to the density and size of the project.

Response to Comment 229-34 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 229-31. Policy 9.1.2.8 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives provides the direction to the County to integrate and link trails.

Response to Comment 229-35 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the importance of open space are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 229-36 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding recognition of agriculture and forestry are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 229-37 (GP): Grazing land is recognized in all of the alternatives as an important element of the agricultural industry. Objective 8.1.2 and its associated policies in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives set forth provisions for identifying and protecting grazing lands. Policy AF-1g in the

Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives also provide direction to the County relative to the importance of protecting grazing lands.

Response to Comment 229-38 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 229-1.

LETTER 230: KENNETH ROEBBELEN

Response to Comment 230-1 (GP): The commenter would be able to cluster homes under all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives contain a policy and implementation measure that would require the County to develop a transfer of development rights ordinance, which would satisfy the commenter's request. The commenter's requested Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use designation is not contained within any of the alternatives because the parcels are not within a Community Region or Rural Center. The 1996 General Plan Alternative land use designations are the same as the current General Plan, Low Density Residential (LDR). The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers, which were generally more limited in size and extent. The intent of having alternatives is to provide a range of options for consideration by the decisionmakers. The commenters' preference for the constraints set forth in the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 231: HUNTER SALING, LEGACY LAND COMPANY LLC

Response to Comment 231-1 (GP): It is assumed that the parcel-specific request referred to by the commenter is Letter 209. That letter specifically requests the application of the –MR overlay, not redesignation to Natural Resources. Application of the -MR overlay would serve to identify the subject parcels as important mineral resource areas. Assessors Parcel Number 051-430-04, which is an assessment of mineral rights contained within parcel 051-430-10, is identified by the State Department of Conservation as an important mineral resource area and is thus assigned the –MR overlay. Because the State has not identified APN 051-430-16 as an important mineral resource area, it has not been assigned the –MR overlay.

Assignment of the Natural Resources designation would allow mining as long as all of the other conditions allowing mining are met. This includes compliance with State requirements as well as the County Code. As noted above, assignment of the –MR overlay would serve to officially identify the subject parcels as important mineral resource areas.

The history of mining on the subject parcels is noted for the record. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will consider the information as they deliberate the General Plan. Please also refer to Master Responses 8 and 21.

Response to Comment 231-2 (GP): The commenter’s description of the access easement and pending litigation is noted for the record. The NR designation is proposed for the subject properties to reflect the underlying mineral resources. The existence and status of any easements which may or may not have been established between or among adjoining landowners is a private civil matter and not related to the General Plan.

Response to Comment 231-3 (GP): Measure A (County Code Section 17.14.095) prohibits the establishment of new mining operations within a linear distance of ten thousand feet from any existing residential, hospital, church, or school use. If the owners of the subject parcels were to apply for a special use permit to operate a mine, the County would have to complete an analysis of compliance with the County Code. In order to approve a special use permit, the County would have to find that the proposal did not violate Section 17.14.095.

Response to Comment 231-4 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between land use designations and zoning.

As the commenter notes, one of the subject properties is the focus of an enforcement action by the State Mining and Geology Board (the action is against a mining operator, not the owners of the parcel). This action is separate and distinct from any action the

County may take associated with this General Plan. At this time, the County does not have an application for a special use permit or rezone for the property.

Response to Comment 231-5 (GP): The commenter's concern with the parcel-specific request articulated in Letter 209 is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. The draft General Plan and EIR documents provide guidance on compatible land use designations for parcels assigned the –MR overlay. Please see the Conservation and Open Space Element in each draft General Plan document and Section 5.9 of Volume 2 of the EIR for more information in land use incompatibility with mineral resource extraction.

LETTER 232: WILLIAM K. SCHEIBER, SCHEIBER RANCH

Response to Comment 232-1 (GP): The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 232-2 (GP): The commenter is requesting that APN 090-010-01 be assigned the Low Density Residential (LDR) designation and be included in the Shingle Springs Community Region and opposes the proposed land use designations in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. The subject parcel is included in the Shingle Springs Community Region in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel has a designation of Natural Resources (NR). That alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel has a designation of Rural Lands (RL). For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers, which were generally more limited in size and extent. The subject property was not included in the Shingle Springs Community Region. Furthermore, the LDR designation is not permitted in Community Regions.

The commenter's detailed history of the 1996 General Plan adoption process and his concerns and opinions regarding the suitability of his land for continued farming are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 233: ROBERT A. SMART, JR.

Response to Comment 233-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment on community livability and how affordable housing is located, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 233-2 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment suggesting that incentives such as parks, sidewalks and paths be provided to communities in exchange for affordable housing, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 233-3 (GP): Implementation Measure PR-E in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative requires an update of the *Bikeway Master Plan* and the *Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan*. Policies 9.1.2.2 and 9.1.2.9 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative also require updates of these plans.

Response to Comment 233-4 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 2-22.

Response to Comment 233-5 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's preference for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative as they relate to recreation issues, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 233-6 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the 1996 General Plan is more a reflection of past thinking and needs updating, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 233-7 (GP): Policy 9.1.1.7 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative is clear in this regard. The Board of Supervisors could choose to make the requested change.

Response to Comment 233-8 (GP): Implementation Measure PR-A in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative would require the preparation and implementation of a *Parks Master Plan*. Part of this process would necessarily be a needs assessment to identify target areas in the County that are lacking in park facilities. There will be opportunities for public input at various times during this process.

Response to Comment 233-9 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment stating that a policy should be added to the General Plan encouraging the

County to transfer developed parks to service districts and other entities, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 233-10 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 66-84.

Response to Comment 233-11: Policy 9.1.2.9 requires the County to update the *Bikeway Master Plan*. Please refer also to Master Response 16.

Response to Comment 233-12: See Response to Comment 233-11.

Response to Comment 233-13: Revisions have been made to the EIR text to clarify the issue raised by the commenter. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. The conclusion on page 5.4-38 of Volume 1 of the EIR remains valid. None of the proposed General Plan alternatives would preclude the attainment of the objectives set forth in any of the current or updated bikeway or trail plans. Rather, each alternative sets forth goals and objectives that promote the expansion and funding of coordinated safe and viable bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the County.

Response to Comment 233-14 (GP): Implementation Measure PR-E, concerning the updating of the *Bikeway Master Plan* and the *Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan*, requires the participation of the Airports, Parks, and Grounds Division of the General Services Department and the Department of Transportation.

Response to Comment 233-15 (GP): Policy PR-4b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative require the revision of the *Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan*. Funding issues could be addressed at the time of the update.

**LETTER 234: GENE E. THORNE, GENE E. THORNE & ASSOCIATES, INC.,
REPRESENTING LEN MILLER**

Response to Comment 234-1 (GP): As the commenter notes, the preferred land use designations for APNs 077-011-60 and 61, Low Density Residential (LDR), are included in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. In the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, APN 077-011-60 is assigned the Natural Resources (NR) designation because it is adjacent to Weber Creek. APN 077-011-61 is assigned the Rural Lands (RL) designation, which is consistent with the surrounding parcels. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

**LETTER 235: GENE E. THORNE, GENE E. THORNE & ASSOCIATES, INC.,
REPRESENTING ERVIN RANCH PARTNERSHIP**

Response to Comment 235-1 (GP): The commenter's request is to maintain the Rural Region (RR) and Natural Resource (NR) designations as proposed in the 1996 General Plan Alternative for APNs 087-030-55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64; 087-050-15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, and 23. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcels are designated NR. This Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the subject parcels are assigned the NR and Agriculture (A) designations. The NR and A designations are consistent with other similarly-sized parcels in the area. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative differs from the other alternatives in that it includes an Agricultural Lands land use designation (the other alternatives have an Agricultural District overlay, which is combined with a base land use designation). The Agricultural Lands designation was applied to lands of at least 20 acres and that are currently in Williamson Act Contracts, contain Choice Agricultural Soils, are used for grazing, or are used to produce a commercial agricultural product. A review of the landowners' parcels indicates that a number of them are in or were formerly in Williamson Act Contracts. Assignment of the Agricultural Lands designation to these parcels, then, is appropriate.

The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

**LETTER 236: GENE E. THORNE, GENE E. THORNE & ASSOCIATES, INC.,
REPRESENTING AMAR GHORI**

Response to Comment 236-1 (GP): The descriptions of the land use designations provide guidelines for assignment of land use designations for each of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. Other factors, such as the intent of or policy contained in the alternatives, also contributed to the process of establishing the various land use designations.

The intent of having alternatives that differ from one another is to provide options for the decisionmakers to deliberate as they go through the General Plan adoption process.

As noted by the commenter, the requested land use designation of High Density Residential (HDR) for APNs 102-210-12 and 102-220-13 is not included in any of the General Plan alternatives. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers, which were generally more limited in size and extent. The subject property was not included in the Shingle Springs Community Region, and therefore could not be assigned the HDR designation. Furthermore, the assigned Rural Lands (RL) designation is consistent with the land use designations of surrounding parcels. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcels are designated RL and LDR, respectively. This Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

LETTER 237: JOHN D. BERRY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOREST SERVICE, ELDORADO NATIONAL FOREST

Response to Comment 237-1 (GP): El Dorado County has received a number of comment letters supporting the fire safe council's recommendations. Please see the responses to Comment Letter 265, submitted by Vicky D. Yorty, Coordinator of the El Dorado County Fire Safe Council.

LETTER 238: DOUGLAS WEINRICH, U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Response to Comment 238-1 (GP/EIR): The commenter outlines his understanding of the four Draft General Plan Alternative and the DEIR.

Response to Comment 238-2 (GP): Policy 7.4.2.5 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative requires that setback standards for rivers, stream and lakes be included in the Zoning Ordinance. Implementation Measure CO-B in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative require creation of guidelines for development projects that may affect surface water resources. These guidelines would include buffer standards. The commenter's recommendation for 100-foot setback buffers as measured from the upland edge of the wetland or stream course will be considered when the standards are developed. In developing the standards, the County will need to consider a number of variables that determine the setbacks necessary to protect these resources under differing circumstances, and may establish different standards for different situations. Please refer also to Response to Comment 198-11.

Prior to the establishment of standards through revision of the Zoning Ordinance, the general setback policies in the General Plan can be applied on a project-by-project basis. To facilitate this process, the proposed mitigation measures for Impact 5.12-4 have been modified to provide more specific interim setback guidelines. The revised mitigation measures require a minimum setback of 100 feet from all perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and 50 feet from intermittent streams and wetlands, unless more detailed information relating to slope, soil stability, vegetation, habitat, or other site- or project-specific conditions indicates that these setbacks should be modified in a particular instance. Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for the text of the revised mitigation measures.

As noted in the comment, in areas of special concern, such as California red-legged frog habitat, the USFWS will be consulted on a project-specific level. In addition, the EIR proposes a mitigation measure to be included in the No Project Alternative, 1996 General Plan Alternative, and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative requiring application of the Important Biological Corridor overlay to lands having high wildlife habitat values. As part of this overlay, increased riparian corridor and wetland setbacks would be required in these areas. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment recommending adoption of the policies in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative as outlined in Goals CO-3 and CO-4, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please also refer to Master Response 20.

Response to Comment 238-3 (EIR): A description of how the overlay area was developed is included on pages 3-34 and 3-35 and 5.12-50 and 5.12-51 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Mitigation Measure 5.12-3(b) would add the Important Biological Corridor overlay to all four of the equal-weight alternatives of the General Plan. Implementation

Measure CO-K (now only in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative) requires development of the overlay. The purpose of the Important Biological Corridor overlay is to protect biological resources in the foothill region where they are most threatened by urban development. The –IBC overlay designation links areas with the Open Space and Natural Resource designations. It is not necessary to include those lands within the –IBC overlay, because the land use designations require a minimum parcel size of 40 or 160 acres and this limit on development provides sufficient habitat protection. Linking the Important Biological Corridor to federally-managed lands that are not threatened by development would not necessarily help to achieve this goal. Extending the Important Biological Corridor eastward to the headwaters of the Weber Creek watershed would not have an obvious benefit to the red-legged frog because of the large parcel size required by the land use designations in that region.

Response to Comment 238-4 (EIR): The County will consider recovery objectives identified in the *Recovery Plan for the Red-Legged Frog*, as appropriate, during the process of developing the INRMP (refer to page 5.12-39 of Volume 2 of the EIR). Because these topics and others related to conservation of aquatic resources will be addressed in that plan, a separate aquatic management strategy is not necessary. Further, any potential impacts on this species resulting from the General Plan would be required to be mitigated in order to comply with the federal Endangered Species Act, which prohibits take of a species.

Response to Comment 238-5 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment recommending adoption of policies of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, as outlined in Goals CO-5 and CO-6, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 20. An exhibit showing the differences between the Ecological Preserve Overlay and the federal Recovery Plan boundaries have been added included. Please refer to Appendix E.4 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 238-6 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 20 and responses to Letter 73.

Response to Comment 238-7 (GP): The commenter’s suggestion that Measures CO-A through CO-K of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative could provide the beginning framework for meeting the requirements of a satisfactory Habitat Conservation Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 238-8 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(d), requiring the development of an INRMP that identifies important habitat, defines “important habitat” to include habitats that support special-status species. In areas where rangeland is considered to be important habitat Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(e), as modified in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document (refer to change to page 5.12-60 identified

in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document) would require that grading for agricultural purposes that results in the loss of more than one acre of important habitat would require mitigation for the loss through payment of a fee to support the INRMP conservation fund. This measure would discourage conversion of rangeland designated as important habitat to more intensive agricultural uses such as vineyards or row crops, and would require mitigation where such conversion occurs. Please refer also to Master Response 18.

LETTER 239: TOM WUNSCHHEL

Response to Comment 239-1 (GP): Based on the contents of the letter, it is understood that the commenter requests a Rural Residential (RR)/Rural Lands (RL) designation for APN 069-280-10. The requested land use designation is included in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. The Natural Resource (NR) land use designation is not inconsistent with the designations of other parcels in the area. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 240: DAVID L. ZWECK

Response to Comment 240-1 (GP): The commenter's concerns and opinions regarding the proposed land use designation for APNs 090-190-02, 090-380-07 and 19 under the No Project, Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus", and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. The parcels are included in the Shingle Springs Community Region in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. The commenter also opposes the proposed land use designations in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcels are designated Rural Lands (RL) (APN 090-190-02, 090-380-19) and LDR (090-380-07). That Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcels are all designated RL. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers, which were generally more limited in size and extent. These parcels are consistent with other parcels also outside the Community Region boundaries. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 240-2 (GP): The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan, as adopted by the Board of Supervisors in January of 1996, is noted for the record (that document differs from the 1996 General Plan Alternative in a number of ways, including the Circulation Diagram, Housing Element, and policies that were formerly time sensitive). The concerns and opinions regarding policies contained in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, what kind of planning needs to occur in the area, and how development of the commenter's and other's parcels would be an asset to the area, will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan.

It should be noted that the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives provide for density transfers. Please refer to Implementation Measure LU-I of those alternatives.

LETTER 241: V. DALE SMITH, ALFA OMEGA ASSOCIATES

Response to Comment 241-1 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on "the overly complex, ponderous and confusing language" of the EIR and the General Plan, and the need to have the documents rewritten, are noted for the record. Staff acknowledges that the EIR is lengthy and there is a lot of information contained within it. The need to sufficiently evaluate the environmental impacts of four equal-weight General Plan alternatives addressing different land uses over a million acres of land, has been balanced with the need to make the document accessible to the public. The body of the EIR does not present raw data (appendices in Volume 3 of the EIR include this type of data) and plain language is used throughout the document. County staff does not agree that the document requires reorganization and feels it is fully compliant with the spirit and intent of CEQA for full disclosure.

Response to Comment 241-2 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on the lack of compliance with "policies, procedures, laws and ordinances" and EIR and the General Plan, are noted for the record. Please see specific responses below.

Response to Comment 241-3 (EIR): The commenter raises three main issues, which allege the use of inaccurate traffic count data, incorrect analysis methodologies, and inadequate policy treatment of traffic safety in the General Plan alternatives. The commenter suggests that the County relies on inaccurate or faulty traffic count data and incorrect analysis methodologies on the basis of a professional review of a traffic impact study for the Circle K/76 Mini-Mart and Gas Station proposed at the Shingle Springs interchange, a development project previously considered by the County. The commenter's view that policies on traffic safety in each of the General Plan alternatives are not consistent appears to be the basis for the third issue. The adequacy of the analysis of the Circle K project is not relevant to the General Plan process nor was it used or relied on in the General Plan traffic analysis.

With regard to traffic count data, no specific issues regarding inaccurate counts were provided in the comment. The General Plan EIR relies on a variety of traffic count sources including El Dorado County DOT, Caltrans, and various consultant-generated traffic counts. The El Dorado County DOT traffic counts are conducted annually and published in a report that includes the specific location and date of the count. The counts used in the EIR analysis reflect nonsummer conditions when school is in session.

The General Plan EIR transportation analysis was conducted using methodologies contained in the *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM), Transportation Research Board, 2000. This is the latest version of the HCM and is the prevailing measurement standard used throughout the United States as described on page 5.4-5 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

The General Plan alternatives do contain different policies and implementation measures on traffic safety. The No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives include Goal 6.9, Objective 6.9.1, and Policies 6.9.1.1, 6.9.1.2, and 6.9.1.3 related to traffic safety in the Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives contain Goal TC-1, Policy TC-1a, TC-1b, and TC-1o as well as Implementation Measure TC-A related to traffic safety in the Transportation and Circulation Element. Although organized in a different manner, these goals, policies, and implementation measures are similar in their content, which is to ensure the safe movement of goods and people in the County.

Response to Comment 241-4 (EIR): As required by CEQA, the General Plan EIR focuses on potential physical impacts to the environment. Liability and risk management are not related to environmental impacts. However, the General Plan alternatives do address public safety as it relates to the transportation system by including goals, objectives, and policies to ensure that roadways are constructed to the latest applicable design standards and that discretionary funding be spent first on maintaining the existing system and constructing safety improvements when these improvements would reduce the number and/or severity of accidents (e.g. Policy TC-1o of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative). Finally, the comments on a mini-mart/gas station are not comments on the General Plan or the General Plan EIR and no specific responses can be provided.

Response to Comment 241-5 (GP/EIR): The commenter is mixing the environmental documentation and issues and impacts of a specific ongoing project with the larger scale issues of the General Plan. The commenter is also referring to proposed Goal TC-1 as if it has already been adopted.

The General Plan alternatives contemplate the subject property to be some type of commercial use. However, the General Plan does not suggest the specific use of this site, i.e., a future gas station. Development on this site will have to go through a site-specific environmental review process before it could move forward. Please refer also to Master Response 2.

It should be noted that the issues of road and safety standards in both the urban areas and the rural areas will be dealt with in the form of revisions to the County’s Design and Improvements Manual and Standard Plans and enforcement of these revised standards. This is an Implementation Measure in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives – Measure TC-C. It is implied in the policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives – Objective 3.1.2 and Policy 3.1.2.1. It is a goal of all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives to provide safe roadways in the County in both the urbanized areas and the rural areas.

The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter’s position on tort liability arising out of the General Plan policies and the EIR, are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 241-6 (GP/EIR): The commenter is confusing the environmental documentation and issues and impacts of a specific ongoing project with the larger scale issues of the General Plan. The commenter is also referring to proposed Goal HS-8 as if it has already been adopted.

With respect to the General Plan EIR analysis of air quality, Table 5.11-5 summarizes current pollution levels of various air pollutants (including ozone-generating pollutants and particulates). Table 5.11-6 depicts trends and forecasts of these pollutants, Table 5.11-7 calculates the pollution generation of each alternative for each of the air pollutants, and Table 5.11-9 shows levels of carbon monoxide generation under worst-case conditions. In all cases air pollution is identified as a significant and unavoidable impact. The analysis is a cumulative analysis in that it considers development of the entire General Plan (including, but not limited to, road improvement projects). The comment, although it alleges defects in the air quality analysis, does not specifically identify any, so direct responses are not possible. Also, please refer to Response to Comment 281-465 regarding air quality issues.

Regarding mitigation measures, they are not put off for future study; rather, they are specifically identified. Regarding SAROAP, please see pages 5.11-13 through 5.11-15 of the EIR, Volume 1.

Response to Comment 241-7 (EIR): Please refer to Master Responses 15 and 13 as well as Response to Comment 205-1.

Response to Comment 241-8 (EIR): The commenter indicates being discouraged by “time and monetary” considerations in participating in the CEQA process. The Board of Supervisors has been very sensitive to these two concerns and as such early on the staff was directed to make all CEQA documents available for review free at the Planning Department counter and in County libraries, and fully accessible online as well. Also the Board extended the CEQA comment period on the DEIR from 47 days to 76 days (see Master Response 1) for the sole purpose of giving the public extra time to respond.

Response to Comment 241-9 (EIR): Thank you for the summary of various sections of CEQA. The General Plan team includes several experts in CEQA. This EIR has been prepared to be fully compliant with both the Act and the Guidelines.

Response to Comment 241-10 (EIR): The EIR does not meet the criteria of CCR Section 15088.5 requiring recirculation, so recirculation is not proposed. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 241-1 through 241-9 for individual responses to each comment.

LETTER 242: CHUCK BACCHI, BACCHI RANCH

Response to Comment 242-1 (GP): The commenter supports the No Project Alternative and provides the reasons why, including high job growth coupled with low housing growth. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 242-2 (GP): The commenter expresses support for the premise of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative and states why. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment 242-3 (GP): The commenter indicates support for the Agricultural policies of the No Project Alternative over the others, and particularly as compared to the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 242-4 (GP): The commenter expresses opposition to the requirements for trail connections under the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives.

Response to Comment 242-5 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 242-1.

LETTER 243: CHUCK BACCHI, BACCHI RANCH

Response to Comment 243-1 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding protection of agricultural enterprises are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 243-2 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment that the impact of ranch marketing activities removing productive acreage is not significant, and the expression of support for Policies 2.2.5.10, 8.1.3.5, 8.2.4.2 and 8.2.4.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 244: KATHY PREVOST, BASS LAKE ACTION COMMITTEE

Response to Comment 244-1 (GP): The attached letter has been made a part of the record. Please refer to Response to Comment 244-2, below.

Response to Comment 244-2 (GP): The proposed Bass Lake Park would be located on lands to the north and east of Bass Lake. This land is designated LDR, Low Density Residential, on each of the alternatives except the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, where it is designated RL, Rural Lands. In all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, the development of a park would be permitted by right or by special use permit, depending on the type of improvements (i.e. lighted play fields or other more intensive uses) proposed. A separate environmental analysis is presently underway, in which specific impacts such as noise, traffic, and lighting must be addressed.

Bass Lake Road is designated an urban collector, and the circulation diagram (Figure TC-1) in each of the alternatives shows that it will be improved to a four-lane divided road from U.S. Highway 50 to a point just beyond the proposed park site. The timing of the improvements will be set forth in the County's annual capital improvement program, based on the timing of development activities in the region and the resultant impacts on Bass Lake Road.

General Plan policies in each of the alternatives set forth the goal of providing at least five acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents in the County (Policy 9.1.1.1 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policy PR-1b in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives). It is also the goal of the County to provide adequate recreational facilities throughout the County to serve the needs of the residents, as set forth in Goal 9.1 (Policies 9.1.1.3, 9.1.1.4, 9.1.1.10 and 9.1.1.11 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Goals PR-1 and PR-2 (Policies PR-1a and PR-4a) of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

LETTER 245: DEANNA DALTON

Response to Comment 245-1 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on the need to protect wildlife corridors and support for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, are noted for the record. The information presented in the comment letter on wildlife use of the monitored corridors is consistent with the EIR. Regarding the casino project, the Shingle Springs Rancheria Casino/Hotel is not under the County's jurisdiction but was considered in the EIR (see discussion on page 3-22 of Volume 1 of the EIR).

Response to Comment 245-2 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's suggestions for mitigation to reduce impacts to wildlife corridors, are noted for the record. The staff concurs with the commenter regarding the need to reduce barriers to wildlife movement and addresses this issue in the EIR (see pages 5.12-88 through 5.12-90 of Volume 2). The EIR adequately describes the importance of wildlife corridors and potential impacts associated with implementation of the General Plan. The staff identified and then incorporated a number of corridors linking natural habitat into the –IBC overlay. The County would consider habitat connectivity as part of the habitat acquisition component of the INRMP.

Response to Comment 245-3 (EIR): The Important Biological Corridor Overlay [-IBC](Policy CO-6d of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative), as mentioned above, would address the methods of providing for wildlife movement identified by the commenter. This overlay is further described on page 261 of this Alternative. It is also noted that proposed Mitigation Measure 5.12-3(b) contained in the EIR would require that the –IBC Overlay be applied in the No Project Alternative, 1996 General Plan Alternative, and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative.

Response to Comment 245-4 (EIR): All of the suggestions described by the commenter could be incorporated into the –IBC Overlay, if adopted. Proposed Mitigation Measure 5.12-3(b) mentioned above contains a list of items which could be included in this overlay designation.

Response to Comment 245-5 (EIR): The staff looks forward to receiving the information on a continuation of the wildlife corridor study and also the data collected on proposed surveys on the rare plant preserves.

LETTER 246: CYNTHIA AND MARK BASTIAN

Response to Comment 246-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between land use designations and zoning.

To accomplish the commenters' goals, the Rural Residential/Rural Lands designation would need to be applied to APN 104-440-10. This designation is included in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the assigned Natural Resource (NR) designation is consistent with the densities of other parcels in the area, all of which are located between the State Park lands to the west and agricultural lands to the east. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 247: THIAA BESAN

Response to Comment 247-1 (GP): Policy PR-4b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative require the County to revise and implement the *Bikeway Master Plan* and the *Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan*. Implementation Measure PR-E of these Alternatives requires the plans to be updated within three years of General Plan adoption. Implementation Measure PR-B of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires the maintenance and implementation of the *El Dorado County River Management Plan*. Policies 9.1.2.2 and 9.1.2.9 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative concern the updating of the *Bikeway Master Plan* and the *Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan*.

Response to Comment 247-2 (GP): The *Parks Master Plan* referred to in the General Plan Alternatives and the EIR would only apply to County parks. As stated in Policy PR-1a of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Policy 9.1.1.6 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the primary stated responsibility of the County is for establishment of regional park facilities. Implementation Measure PR-D of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires development of a plan to coordinate County park planning efforts with those of other districts. Objective 9.1.5 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative requires coordination of parks development with other outside districts within the County.

Response to Comment 247-3 (GP): Mitigation Measure 5.7.5 (Provide Funding Mechanisms for New Park Development) would require several new policies for all General Plan Alternatives. For the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative, policies would require developers to provide mechanisms such as homeowners' associations or benefit assessment districts for the ongoing development, operation and maintenance of parks facilities and establishment of a countywide development fee program applicable to all new development to fund park and recreation improvements (in addition to Quimby Act requirements). For the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, new policies would also require the establishment of a countywide development fee program for projects that are subject to the Quimby Act and for those that are not (this could potentially include nondiscretionary projects).

Response to Comment 247-4 (GP): It would be the responsibility of the local recreation provider (in this case the Georgetown Divide Recreation District) to investigate potential funding sources such as homeowners' associations or benefit assessment districts or to pursue alternative methods such as federal, State or private grants, user fees and private contributions of land or funding. The commenter is directed to the description of the functions of the district on page 5.7-67 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 247-5 (GP): If the new policies requiring establishment of a countywide park fee program proposed for all General Plan Alternatives are adopted by the Board of Supervisors, implementation programs would be created to ensure that the programs are adopted in a timely fashion. The fees collected would be based on the type and scope of development in all areas of the County. As stated above, the County's primarily responsibility is for the establishment of regional parks facilities. Districts such as the Georgetown Divide Recreation District were created to provide for neighborhood and community park needs.

Response to Comment 247-6 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 247-5.

Response to Comment 247-7 (EIR): Each of the sections in the EIR evaluates impacts from development of the General Plan alternative land use plans, and this includes development of parks. Impact 5.7-6 examines impacts peculiar to parks. It is not possible to be more specific about the types of adverse impacts on the environment that might result from establishment of parks throughout the County because such impacts are site specific. As stated in the discussion of Impact 5.7-6, traffic, nighttime lighting, and noise are usually identified as specific concerns when parks are developed. However, individual sites may have additional constraints, such as the presence of endangered species, excessive slope, or potential to adversely affect water quality of nearby surface waters. These potential impacts would be evaluated for individual park projects through both the environmental review process and the compatibility processes required in Mitigation Measures 5.7-6(a) and 5.7-6(b).

Response to Comment 247-8 (EIR): The general nature of the mitigation measures, raised as a concern by the commenter, relates to the site-specific nature of the required reviews. Mitigation Measures 5.7-6(a) and 5.7-6(b) refer back to Mitigation Measures 5.1-3(b) and 5.1-3(d). These land use measures place limitations on the locations for parks and recreational facilities and require the County to review any proposed site for compatibility with surrounding land uses. These compatibility requirements would be identified during the General Plan compatibility review conducted by the Planning Department under Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) for the individual park projects or during review of capital improvement plans, as stated in Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d).

LETTER 248: DAVE BOLSTER, AGRICULTURAL COUNCIL, EL DORADO COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Response to Comment 248-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the need to preserve and enhance the County's agricultural base are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 248-2 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the level of detail in the plan alternatives are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Of the alternatives, the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives are the more detailed, at least in some regards. That level of detail in many cases has been identified as necessary in follow-up ordinances in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, as set forth in the Implementation Programs at the end of each element.

Response to Comment 248-3 (GP): Each of the alternatives contain a policy or provision to implement a deed restriction and disclosure requirement for new land divisions adjacent to agricultural operations (Policy 8.1.3.3 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Implementation Measure AF-A in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives).

Response to Comment 248-4 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding Agricultural Districts and zoning are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 248-5 (GP): Policy LU-6b of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives requires that the County prohibit the placement of structures and roads on ridgelines. It does not apply to agricultural activities.

Response to Comment 248-6 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the conflict between agricultural land uses and the application of the -IBC, Important Biological Corridor overlay designation of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 248-7 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the need for new water rights and storage facilities are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Comment Letter 210 (El Dorado Irrigation District) regarding the reservation of water for agricultural uses.

Response to Comment 248-8 (GP): The establishment of the Agricultural Districts and Agricultural land use designation are based on several criteria, including existing agricultural use (Policy 8.1.1.2 I the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policy AF-1a in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives). By creating an A, Agricultural land use designation, instead of the Agricultural District overlay, the Environmentally Constrained Alternative attempts to give greater protection to agricultural lands. Overlay land use designations, by definition, are subservient to base land use designations.

Response to Comment 248-9 (GP): Any follow-up ordinances, standards or other programs would be developed utilizing Agricultural Commission and public input, and would be adopted after public hearings before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 248-10 (GP): The EIR has analyzed the Agricultural District boundaries as adopted in the 1996 General Plan. The expanded boundaries referenced in the comment were presented after the analysis was completed, and has not been included in any of the alternatives. Policy 8.1.1.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and AF-1a of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives provide a mechanism and standards for review of Agricultural District boundaries. Upon adoption of one of the alternatives, the County may undertake an analysis of the proposed boundaries and modify the plan accordingly.

Response to Comment 248-11 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the diversity of agricultural activities are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. However, each alternative has different sections on horticulture, grazing and forestry. Additionally, the "Setting" section of the Agriculture and Forestry Element of both the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives (pages 275 and 273, respectively) describes the wide variety of crops grown in the County.

Response to Comment 248-12 (EIR): The comment expresses the view that mitigation measures addressing residential, industrial, and commercial development will have the effect of threatening agricultural operations in the County. CEQA requires the EIR to identify measures that will mitigate the impacts associated with a proposed project. Accordingly, mitigation measures that would apply to agriculture were proposed as required where the EIR identified a potentially significant impact related to agricultural operations authorized by the General Plan. Because removal of oak trees for agricultural operations results in similar impacts to oak woodlands as removal for other purposes, agricultural activities are proposed to be subject to those mitigation requirements. Similarly, if an agricultural facility requiring a County permit will use groundwater, that facility will create the potential for loss of groundwater supplies; accordingly, the mitigation measure would apply to such activities. The Right to Farm Ordinance is intended to protect agricultural operations from conflicts that can result from encroachment of more

intensive uses into primarily agricultural areas. The ordinance is not intended to exempt agricultural operations from environmental protection requirements. Existing agricultural operations would not be subject to some of the policies identified in the General Plan, which would apply only to new projects.

Response to Comment 248-13 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the economic contribution of agriculture to the County are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. This fact is one of the reasons that the County chose to add an Agriculture and Forestry Element, an optional element. The policies in each of the alternatives relative to agriculture are intended to protect agricultural land and enhance the economic competitiveness and viability of the County's agricultural industry.

Response to Comment 248-14 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the rural quality provided by agriculture are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer to Response to Comment 248-13, above.

Response to Comment 248-15 (GP): Planning staff worked closely with the Water Agency and the consultants to ensure the coordination of the Water Resources Development and Management Plan (Eco:Logic. Draft Report. June, 2003) and the draft plan alternatives. Several policies in the Public Services and Utilities Element of each alternative provide direction to the County to continue that working relationship to ensure long term water reliability, including Policies 5.1.1.1 and 5.2.1.1 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and Policies PS-1b, PS-2a, and PS-3a in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

LETTER 249: J. CLEVE LIVINGSTON, BOYDEN, COOLURIS, LIVINGSTON & SAXE PC

Response to Comment 249-1 (EIR): The traffic counts used in the EIR analysis are contained in Appendices D-3A through D-3D in Volume 3 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 249-2 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the potential employment opportunities that may be provided at the El Dorado Hills Business Park are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 249-3 (GP): The organized manner in which the commenter provided his comments is appreciated. Each of the points will be addressed in the following, applicable responses.

Response to Comment 249-4 (GP/EIR): This Response to Comments document contains responses to all comments, including comments on the alternative General Plan documents.

Response to Comment 249-5 (GP): The commenter suggests that a significant reduction in the allowable building intensity in the El Dorado Hills Business Park would infringe on the Park owners' development rights. Policy 2.2.1.5 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and the Table LU-1 in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives establish a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) standard of .25 for areas designated R&D, which has been in effect since adoption of the General Plan in 1996. The FAR standard in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is .20, and is .30 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. Depending on the alternative selected by the County, the FAR standard could increase, decrease or stay the same. Please refer also to Master Response 12. In any event, a reduction in the FAR would not infringe on any entitlements held by the EDH Business Park owners. Please refer also to Response to Comment 249-10.

Response to Comment 249-6 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the effect of regulatory constraints in the El Dorado Hills Business Park on job creation in the west county area are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The differences in FAR standards among the alternatives would likely affect the amount of commercial development in the business park to some degree, but not enough to create an internal inconsistency with any of the proposed jobs-related policies.

Response to Comment 249-7 (GP): Please see Response to Comment 249-12.

Response to Comment 249-8 (GP): Please see Response to Comment 249-12.

Response to Comment 249-9 (GP): The commenter suggests that new restrictions on floor area would undermine the County's comprehensive planning process. A number of policy decisions must be made by the Board of Supervisors when adopting a General Plan, many of which will balance competing interests. One of these is the frequent conflict between job and housing growth and the associated traffic impacts. By proposing a variety of alternative strategies for reducing these impacts, including reducing FAR standards, and comparing the effectiveness of those alternative strategies in the EIR, the County is serving the purposes of its comprehensive planning process. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 249-10 (GP): The commenter states that the El Dorado Hills Business Park should have been treated, like development agreements, as "existing commitments." Development agreements are considered existing commitments for purposes of the EIR because they vest in a developer a right to proceed with a certain level development, regardless of future changes in applicable land use regulations. The undeveloped portions of the El Dorado Hills Business Park, however, have not been granted any vested rights or other entitlements to develop at a particular intensity. Neither the approval of parcel maps, nor the establishment of an assessment district, nor identification of the park as cumulative development in EIRs for other projects creates any vested rights or entitlements under California law. The only entitlements granted to the undeveloped portions of the Business Park were the right to record the approved parcel maps, which the developer exercised a number of years ago. The commenter further suggests that the County relied upon the existence of the Business Park, and its future development, as mitigation for the EIRs prepared for several large residential projects (Valley View and Carson Creek Specific Plans) that are now supported by development agreements. This is incorrect. Although the County considered the potential future development of the Business Park when approving these projects, it was for purposes of analyzing cumulative impacts, not as mitigation. In addition, the analysis in these EIRs, which were prepared subsequent to the adoption of the 1996 General Plan, assumed that potential development of the Business Park would be limited by the .25 FAR as provided in the policies adopted with that plan. Nothing in these EIRs suggests that the County was warranting, committing to, or otherwise authorizing a particular level of development in the Business Park.

Response to Comment 249-11 (GP): The commenter indicates that future job growth in the Business Park will provide jobs for El Dorado County residents that would otherwise travel to Sacramento County and contribute to traffic congestion west of the Business Park. It is possible that that employment growth in the Business Park could divert some traffic congestion west of the park, but this would depend on the extent to which the Business Park creates the types of jobs that would be filled by El Dorado County residents. It is acknowledged that the Business Park has the potential to become a major employer of El Dorado County residents. To the extent this occurs the Business Park

may provide some marginal improvement to traffic flow on the portion of U.S. Highway 50 west of the El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road interchange. However, these minor improvements would not offset the substantial new traffic on Latrobe Road and White Rock Road, and the El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road and future Silva Valley Parkway interchanges with U.S. Highway 50, that would be caused by job growth in the Business Park. Regardless of the potential benefits that the Business Park may provide elsewhere in the County, some form of mitigation will be required if the County wishes to avoid substandard levels of service on these specific roadways.

The commenter's opinion regarding the intent of the County in approving land use plans authorizing Business Park uses is noted for the record. To the extent residential growth has outpaced job growth as suggested by the commenter, this has not been the result of any County-imposed planning constraint on job growth in the Business Park. The Business Park has had for many years and continues to have substantial capacity that has not yet been developed.

Response to Comment 249-12 (GP): The commenter raises legal issues that are outside the scope of this EIR. The staff is not aware of any legal authority to support the commenter's assertion that local governments are prohibited from adopting more restrictive land use regulations for lands that are subject to an assessment district, based on a fiduciary duty to maximize the value of those lands. With respect to the commenter's assertion that a reduction in the allowable intensity of development in the Business Park is not legally permitted under *Furey v. City of Sacramento*, the staff does not concur that the FAR standards of any of the proposed alternatives would restrict development so as to deprive the owners of Business Park parcels of the benefits of the improvements funded by the assessment. In addition, assessment districts that are formed at the request and for the primary benefit of a developer (such as the assessment districts formed for the Business Park) do not provide a basis for recovery under *Furey* (see *Furey v. Sacramento*, 780 F.2d 1448 (1986)). If any property owner believes that the particular General Plan alternative ultimately adopted by the County precludes it from using such improvements, that owner can seek a reassessment and refund at that time. Such a process is available as a remedy.

Response to Comment 249-13 (GP/EIR): The commenter's reference to a statement in the EIR that the 1996 General Plan did not include maximum nonresidential FARs (page 3-24 of Volume 1) pointed out an error in that document. In fact, Policy 2.2.1.5 of the 1996 General Plan established a .25 FAR for the R&D land use designation (along with C, Commercial, and I, Industrial). This error has been corrected as provided in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. The Business Park has been living under the constraint described since adoption of the 1996 General Plan in January, 1996. There have been some exceedences of this standard due to the fact that the Zoning Ordinance was not updated to conform to the General Plan, as described in more detail in Master Response 12; however, as pointed out, the average intensity of development has been at an intensity of 0.23. This ratio is less than the maximum permitted under the 1996 General Plan and that would be permitted under all four of the equal-weight General

Plan alternatives except the Environmentally Constrained Alternative (2.0 maximum). No data have been supplied to support the conclusion that the imposition of a FAR standard would “result in a significant increase in the land costs as a percentage of the total cost of development...” The commenter’s opinion on the effect the proposed FAR standards will have on the marketability of the Business Park will be considered by the Board in its deliberations.

Response to Comment 249-14 (GP): As discussed in Response to Comment 249-10, there are no vested rights to develop the Business Park in accordance with a particular FAR standard. The commenter asserts that the El Dorado Hills Business Park is a “master planned” development, and that there was an expectation the developers relied upon “as if they had been vested by a development agreement”. The only approval granted by the County for this project was a series of parcel maps. No building layout, density or intensity of use, or other improvement standards other than the normal nonresidential parcel map standards were included with this project. The Business Park is not a “master planned project”, although its importance in providing employment opportunities and tax revenues is recognized. No written agreement was entered into by the County with the developers other than the approval of parcel maps and subsequent construction approvals on individual lots. If the developer desires to lock in specific development standards and designs, the development agreement is the appropriate tool to utilize, as noted by the commenter. No development agreement has been entered into for the Business Park.

Response to Comment 249-15 (GP): Staff concurs that promoting and establishing employment-generating development is important to the economic health of the County, and can sometimes provide positive environmental benefits by reducing some vehicle trips and trip lengths. However, the design and location of employment centers play a role in the success of these secondary environmental benefits, and the El Dorado Hills Business Park is isolated from the residential areas and creates its own significant traffic impacts, as identified in Section 5.4 of Volume 1 of the EIR. The Board of Supervisors will consider the effects of the various alternatives on both employment generation and traffic during its deliberation of the General Plan, and a decision made regarding the priorities of the County to the extent the goals and objectives of the plan in these areas come into conflict with each other. Please refer also to Response to Comment 249-16.

Response to Comment 249-16 (GP/EIR): The General Plan EIR includes Mitigation Measures 5.4-1(a), 5.4-1(c), and 5.4-1(d) that provide alternatives to growth controls for the Business Park to reduce potential LOS impacts. Nevertheless, constraining growth in the Business Park does not exacerbate a jobs/housing imbalance in the County in the future given the large surplus of land available for employment uses. As shown in Table 5.4-8 in the General Plan EIR, a minimum of 98,143 employees could be accommodated under buildout conditions with any of the General Plan alternatives. By 2025, approximately 65,000 to 73,000 jobs are projected, which is substantially less than the buildout capacity. By constraining employment growth in a particular location to avoid or

minimize LOS impacts would not create a countywide impact related to a jobs/housing balance.

Please refer to Response to Comment 249-18 for additional information.

Response to Comment 249-17 (EIR): The commenter states that implementing growth control in the Business Park to limit traffic congestion would be contrary to State General Plan law and the portion of the County's proposed vision statement addressing the importance to assure sufficient supply of job-generating land uses to balance increases in residential supply. Nothing in State law or the proposed vision statement suggests that the County may not limit nonresidential development as a means of mitigating traffic impacts caused by that development. As noted in Response to Comment 249-16, limiting development in the Business Park would not significantly affect the supply of developable nonresidential land in the County. Regarding the effects on traffic from restricting Business Park development, please refer to Response to Comments 249-11 and 249-18.

Response to Comment 249-18 (EIR): The commenter states that the EPS land use forecasts utilized FAR assumptions and employee generation rates for projected future development that do not reflect development patterns in the El Dorado Hills Business Park over the past 20 years, and that as a result the EIR overstates traffic impacts associated with the Business Park and the need to mitigate those impacts. The pattern of business park development over the last 20 years does not necessarily reflect future development patterns. The FAR assumptions and employee generation rates used by EPS for the business park are within industry standards.

To mitigate traffic LOS impacts identified in the EIR, Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b) calls for growth controls on land use development that would access Latrobe Road or White Rock Road to avoid potential peak hour LOS impacts. One potential area for these controls to apply would be the El Dorado Hills Business Park, which has substantial land for potential development. Fehr & Peers conducted an additional travel demand model run for the 1996 General Plan Alternative to test the effect of limiting growth in the Business Park to the levels forecasted by the commenter. The differences in employment land use assumptions for traffic analysis zones (TAZs) 148 and 344 used in the DEIR and in the model test run are set forth below. The model test run assumptions are based on the employment forecasts presented by the commenter in a letter dated September 10, 2003 (please refer to Appendix E of Volume 3 of the EIR).

| TAZ | 2025 Land Use Forecasts | |
|--------------|---|---|
| | 1996 General Plan Alternative (per the DEIR) | 1996 General Plan Alternative (with growth controls) |
| | Employment (Jobs) | Employment (Jobs) |
| 148 | 11,775 | 6,964 |
| 344 | 8,008 | 3,081 |
| TOTAL | 19,783 | 10,045 |

The modified employment levels in the table above were input to the travel demand model to generate p.m. peak hour forecasts and roadway segment LOS. The table below compares the p.m. peak hour traffic volume forecasts and resulting LOS for the following two scenarios (see Appendix E of Volume 3 of the EIR for detailed analysis results).

- Scenario 1) 2025 1996 General Plan Alternative contained in the DEIR
- Scenario 2) 2025 1996 General Plan Alternative with growth controls

| Roadway Segment | 2025 P.M. Peak Hour Traffic Volume Forecasts and LOS | | | |
|---|--|-----|------------|-----|
| | SCENARIO 1 | | SCENARIO 2 | |
| | Volume | LOS | Volume | LOS |
| Latrobe Road (Investment Blvd. to Carson Creek) | 4,110 | D | 3,210 | D |
| Latrobe Road (Carson Creek to White Rock Rd.) | 7,260 | F | 5,330 | E |
| Latrobe Road (White Rock Rd. to U.S. Highway 50) | 6,870 | F | 5,530 | E |
| White Rock Road (Manchester Dr. to Latrobe Rd.) | 4,850 | F | 3,340 | D |
| White Rock Road (Latrobe Rd. to Silva Valley Pkwy.) | 5,460 | E | 4,150 | D |

As shown in the table above, Scenario 2 has lower volumes and better levels of service than scenario 1. These results are consistent with the level of land use reduction (i.e., 49 percent reduction in employment between scenarios 1 and 2). As a result, all LOS F impacts on Latrobe Road and White Rock Road would be eliminated under scenario 2.

This finding indicates that the 1996 General Plan Alternative with growth controls that would limit Business Park development to the levels described by the commenter (through, for example, employee allocations) would be consistent with Policies 3.5.1.6 and 3.5.1.6.2 under 2025 conditions and would not create any LOS F impacts. However, this scenario would still create LOS inconsistencies with Policy 3.5.1.1. This policy under the 1996 General Plan Alternative establishes the following LOS thresholds.

- Latrobe Road - LOS C or better operations on all of the segments listed above
- White Rock Road – LOS C from Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Parkway
- White Rock Road – LOS D from Manchester Drive to Latrobe Road.

Only the segment from White Rock Road between Manchester Drive and Latrobe Road would meet the LOS thresholds established by Policy 3.5.1.1 under this new scenario. In addition, a new impact occurs to Country Club Drive between Merrychase Drive and Cambridge Road. When forecasting future 2025 conditions, the model redistributes all trips in response to changes in land uses or the roadway network. The Scenario 2 distribution results in slightly higher volumes using Country Club Drive. As a result, the 2025 p.m. peak hour volume on Country Club Drive increases slightly under the test scenario resulting in LOS D conditions where the 1996 General Plan Alternative requires LOS C to be maintained. To mitigate Impact 5.4-1 fully under the test scenario, Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c), which would establish LOS E as the minimum acceptable LOS for all County roadways, would still be necessary to eliminate the impacts to Latrobe Road, White Rock Road, and Country Club Drive. Alternatively, the County could also decide to upgrade Country Club Drive between Merrychase Drive and Cambridge Road to a two-lane urban arterial in the circulation diagram. This improvement would provide LOS C operations during the p.m. peak hour under 2025 conditions.

Based on this additional information, application of Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b) and 5.4-1(c) in a manner consistent with the test scenario could be applied to avoid LOS F impacts on Latrobe Road, White Rock Road, and Country Club Drive. This would apply to all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives under 2025 conditions although additional actions such as Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(b) would be required to eliminate LOS F impacts for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative under 2025 conditions due to the limited capacity of U.S. Highway 50, and for buildout conditions for all of the alternatives.

The commenter also raised questions about the residential land use forecasts for the Carson Creek project and for TAZ 147. Although Carson Creek may develop as an age-restricted senior residential project, changes in development conditions could be made in the future that would allow the project to develop as traditional single family residential. Since single family residential uses would generate more trips than an age-restricted residential project, the DEIR provides a reasonable worst case scenario for identifying potential roadway LOS impacts and no changes are considered necessary to the DEIR. TAZ 147 is projected to have 823 households by 2025 under the 1996 General Plan Alternative. El Dorado County Planning Department staff reviewed the maps and prior

approvals for projects within this TAZ and confirmed the forecast of 823 households. The lot count alone would not have provided sufficient information to determine the number of households because of multifamily projects in this TAZ which account for 333 of the projected households.

The commenter also states that the traffic analysis appears to assume a 1.0 FAR for commercial and industrial land for the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. The traffic analysis was based on population and employment forecast data generated by EPS. The EPS forecasts for both of these alternatives assumed a 0.20 FAR for commercial and industrial land.

A final question raised by the commenter was why the traffic volume forecasts in Appendix D of Volume 3 of the EIR appeared to show a 50 percent increase in trips on Latrobe Road when it is widened from two to six lanes. The commenter was contacted regarding the specific location of concern, which he identified as the section from Carson Creek to White Rock Road. Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the 2025 p.m. peak hour volume on this segment is projected to increase from 4,890 to 7,260 due to the circulation diagram improvements. Most of this increase is caused by the redistribution of trips from TAZ 344 located in the southeast quadrant of the Latrobe Road/White Rock Road intersection. This TAZ has access to both Latrobe Road and White Rock Road. Under the 2025 model run without the circulation diagram improvements (referred to in Appendix D of Volume 3 of the EIR as the deficiencies scenario), approximately 4,200 p.m. peak hour trips from TAZ 344 are assigned to White Rock Road and 1,320 are assigned to Latrobe Road. With the circulation diagram improvements in place (referred to in Appendix D of Volume 3 of the EIR as the improvements scenario), approximately 2,740 p.m. peak hour trips are assigned from TAZ 344 to White Rock Road and 2,803 are assigned to Latrobe Road. This is a reasonable shift in trips to take advantage of the higher capacity on Latrobe Road with six lanes versus four lanes on White Rock Road.

The remainder of the difference between scenarios is due to the redistribution of longer trips that were previously avoiding the northern section of Latrobe Road due to capacity constraints with only two lanes and using alternative routes. Again, the resulting shift is reasonable especially when considering that the deficiencies scenario is not realistic. This scenario includes all of the development projected to occur for each alternative by 2025 and loads the resulting traffic onto the existing roadway network. As a result, substantial congestion occurs and traffic is assigned to multiple alternative routes. In reality, this level of congestion would not occur and some of the routes would not be used. However, this scenario is the first iteration of a multiple iteration process that is used to identify future deficiencies and then test alternative improvement options. The final improvements scenario provides a more realistic picture of the future.

LETTER 250: CARY BROOKS, REPRESENTING SIERRA HOPE CHURCH

Response to Comment 250-1 (GP): The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record. As they deliberate the General Plan, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will consider the commenter's information regarding the appropriateness of Commercial designations along the proposed Pleasant Valley connector, potential benefits to the economy, and potential traffic congestion relief associated with additional commercial development on parcels such as those owned by Sierra Hope Church.

LETTER 251: DAMON R. POLK, BUILDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF SUPERIOR CALIFORNIA

Response to Comment 251-1 (GP): As the commenter notes, the draft Housing Element is the same in each of the draft General Plan alternatives. The different alternatives are mentioned in the Housing Element. The State Department of Housing and Community Development, the entity that must certify the Housing Element, is aware of the County's General Plan adoption process. As noted under Response to Comments 94-4 and 94-9, it is anticipated that the Housing Element will need to be revised concurrent with adoption of a new Zoning Ordinance (which would be consistent with the adopted General Plan). It was not feasible to create different versions of the Housing Element for the different alternatives or to wait for General Plan adoption because of the state-established time schedule for Housing Element completion.

A vacant lands inventory using the proposed General Plan alternative land use proposals was not undertaken because any of those proposals could be changed by the decisionmakers. It is recognized that it may not be possible to meet the County's regional housing needs allocation if the No Project Alternative is adopted. However, based on the results of Economic and Planning Systems, Inc.'s (EPS 2002) land use forecasts for the General Plan alternatives, it is anticipated that the County could supply the necessary vacant land under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus", Environmentally Constrained, and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. The EPS numbers could not be definitively used in the Housing Element because they project to 2025. The Housing Element is intended to apply only through 2008.

Response to Comment 251-2 (GP): The commenter's support for policies that address ministerial approval of multifamily developments is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 251-3 (GP): The quote is from the Housing Element. The Housing Element was drafted to be used with all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. These alternatives have different concurrency policies and would result in different roadway costs. Implementation Measure HO-I requires consideration of a fee waiver or fee reduction ordinance for affordable housing projects.

Response to Comment 251-4 (GP): The commenter's support of policies recognizing the connections between housing affordability and regulations is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 251-5 (GP): The commenter's opposition to the policy and implementation measure mandating the inclusion of affordable housing into discretionary residential projects is noted for the record.

Past “voluntary” affordable housing construction programs did not provide effective incentives for developers to propose and develop affordable housing projects. Because of the voluntary nature of past programs, they produced very few units (none in the case of the previous density bonus program). A number of programs to encourage developers to construct affordable housing in addition to and in support of the proposed inclusionary program are proposed including a (new) density bonus program, a housing trust fund (which could be used to subsidize construction), and fee waivers and fee reductions. Additionally, a number of organizations offer grants to help offset affordable housing construction. The commenter’s concerns and opinions regarding the need to shift the cost burden to market rate customers is noted. According to the National Housing Conference October 2000 report on inclusionary zoning, opinions on this matter vary within the industry:

Home builders have reacted in a variety of ways to the inclusionary mandates. Some view the mandates as the cost of doing business in a profitable, high-cost area. Some believe that if density bonuses are provided, the builder can break even on the affordable units or even realize a profit. Other builders maintain that the requirements impose significant costs and regulatory burdens on the building industry and further increase the cost of market-rate housing in already costly areas, thereby making housing even less affordable for many families who are not eligible for the units built under the requirements.

(Excerpted from “A Home Builder’s Policy View on Inclusionary Zoning”; Innovative Housing Institute. 1999. Inclusionary Zoning. World Wide Web page <<http://www.inhousing.org>.)

Response to Comment 251-6 (GP): The staff agrees, State Housing Law does not require jurisdictions to develop inclusionary housing programs. It was identified as part of a menu of programs that can assist in achieving affordable housing goals. HCD has not expressed opposition to this approach.

Response to Comment 251-7 (GP): It is recognized that there would be challenges in developing and implementing an inclusionary housing program. Because many other jurisdictions have already gone through the process, the staff anticipated reviewing those efforts. The commenter’s opinions that potential burdens associated with the requirement of an inclusionary housing program are too great and that the program, as presented in the Housing Element, needs revision or replacement, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. The decisionmakers will also consider the commenter’s suggestion that a stakeholder group be formed to discuss replacement programs to promote the development of affordable housing.

Response to Comment 251-8 (GP): The commenter’s opinions that Policy HO-1k is too specific and that construction of dispersed affordable development is too burdensome are noted for the record. Policy HO-1k as written is very general. All housing construction is more cost-effective when completed to a larger scale, regardless of its intended occupant. Many jurisdictions have successfully constructed affordable units alongside and within market rate developments and in fact there is little outward evidence that some of the units

are “affordable” (which may mean priced for moderate income households), particularly when there may be no reason to use different constructions plans or techniques to build the affordable housing. Studies have shown that the integration of affordable housing units into market-rate housing developments avoids problems such as overconcentration, “ghettoization” and stigmatization generally associated with solely provided and isolated affordable housing efforts (Municipal Research and Service Center of Washington. 1999. Affordable Housing Techniques—Inclusionary Zoning. World Wide Web page <http://mrsc.org>).

Response to Comment 251-9 (GP): The commenter’s concerns and opinions regarding the timing of construction of affordable units are noted for the record. The Policy has not been deleted as requested, and remains for consideration by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. “Affordable” units do not necessarily need to look different and, as noted above in Response to Comment 251-8, they can easily be incorporated into market rate housing developments.

Response to Comment 251-10 (GP): See Response to Comment 251-5. The statement that the requirement to provide affordable housing as part of certain discretionary residential projects would result in an undue cost burden on developers, is speculative in the case of El Dorado County. There are many experts nationwide that could argue either side. Until a program is developed and implemented, the potential effects upon construction costs cannot be demonstrated. During its deliberations, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may choose to modify the County’s approach to providing affordable housing. They will consider information such as that presented by the commenter.

Response to Comment 251-11 (GP): The commenter’s support for Policies HO-1g through HO-1j, Policies HO-1o through HO-1w, and Implementation Measures HO-F, FO-G, and HO-V is noted, as is his request for the Building Industry Association’s involvement in implementation outlined in Measures HO-K, HO-O, HO-T, HO-U, and HO-DD.

It is anticipated that the Board of Supervisors will identify stakeholders to assist in the implementation of Measure HO-K. The County Planning, Building, and Community Services Departments will seek input from a number of local developers as they develop the programs outlined in Measures HO-O, HO-T, HO-U, and HO-DD.

LETTER 252: DAMON R. POLK, BUILDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF SUPERIOR CALIFORNIA

Response to Comment 252-1 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 252-2 (GP): The commenter states that the alternatives other than the 1996 General Plan Alternative would restrict the County's ability to move forward in a manner consistent with current fee programs, development agreements, capital improvements programs, and the Caltrans Transportation Concept Report, which calls for eight lanes on U.S. Highway 50. This is noted for the record. These other alternatives would not restrict the County's ability to move forward; however, the fee program would need to be adjusted depending on the alternative chosen, including the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

Response to Comment 252-3 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 252-1. The commenter's concerns and opinions regarding the inflexibility of the No Project, Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus", and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan.

Response to Comment 252-4 (GP): The commenter expresses concern that the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative would compromise affordable housing. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 252-5 (GP): The commenter expresses concern that the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative are structured too much like an ordinance rather than "generalized plan". All the General Plan alternatives present policies at a General Plan level, although some standards are included in the policies and implementation measures.

Response to Comment 252-6 (GP): The commenter expresses concern regarding the County's ability to fund programs outlined in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. No funding mechanisms have been developed for any of the alternatives. This response to comments document includes information regarding the level of effort associated with implementing the alternatives.

Response to Comment 252-7 (GP): The commenter is opposed to Policy CO-1c (relating to grading) as being unnecessary and duplicative because of existing regulation. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board

of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. State and federal regulations may change, and this policy was included to ensure a policy base within the General Plan for this existing regulation and to establish more specific performance-based standards for the regulation. Please refer also to Response to Comment 46-11.

Response to Comment 252-8 (GP): The commenter supports scientific bases for any mitigation ratios. The ratios recommended in the EIR are based on commonly accepted standards. The commenter supports 1:1 mitigation ratios. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. Ratios greater than 1:1 are proposed where there is a risk that the resource characteristics of land protected as mitigation may not be of the same resource value as lands that are being developed or where there is a possibility that certain restoration programs may not be successful. Note that impacts to wetlands, and other flora and fauna in general, often involve specifically designated sensitive species for which State and federal agencies have responsible agency, trustee agency, or other regulatory authority. This authority supercedes that of the County, and generally includes separate and distinct authority to mitigate at ratios and thresholds set by the regulating agency.

The commenter suggests that the County allow “stacked mitigation.” Typically, once a property is used as formal mitigation for a particular impact, it cannot be used again for other subsequent mitigation needs. Were this not the case, all impacts for all projects could be mitigated on the same property with no gains for environmental protection and it would be difficult, if not impossible, to make certain CEQA findings related to mitigation of impacts. In some circumstances it may be possible to allow a single mitigation site to be used as mitigation for multiple impacts associated with a single project if that site is managed in a manner that fully mitigates all the impacts in question. For example, in the Sacramento Valley, land protected by an agricultural conservation easement created as mitigation for loss of agricultural land has also been managed to provide habitat for the Swainson’s hawk as mitigation for impacts to hawk habitat (e.g. City of Woodland). These programs must be carefully designed to ensure full mitigation of impacts and may preclude the ability to qualify for many grants that fund habitat restoration and management. Nothing in the mitigation measures as proposed would preclude use of stacked mitigation in circumstances where it will fully mitigate impacts to the degree required by the General Plan.

Response to Comment 252-9 (GP): Estimated labor needs for implementation of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are provided in Appendix B of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 252-10 (GP): The County shares this concern about impacts to the affordability of housing. It is important to point out that the County does not control many of the fees that affect housing in El Dorado County – rather they are set by a variety of special districts and other agencies, such as the School Districts and EID. Housing

affordability is explored in the Housing Element of the Draft General Plan. The Board of Supervisors must balance the issue of affordability with the many other issues affecting the region including, environmental protection, traffic congestion, State mandates for housing requirements and many others. The Housing Element examines a variety of options for addressing affordability, including rental verses ownership and inclusionary requirements.

Response to Comment 252-11 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 227-1.

Response to Comment 252-12 (GP): The commenter's concerns regarding limiting the subdivision of land to no more than four new parcels per existing parcel are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. This limit is confined to the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, and is a fundamental feature of that alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 252-13 (GP): Please see responses to Letter 251.

Response to Comment 252-14 (GP): The commenter's support for a General Plan alternative that includes future expansion of U.S. Highway 50 to eight lanes is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. Please also refer to Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 252-15 (GP): The comment regarding jobs/housing balance and the most healthy ratio is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 252-16 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 217-2 and Master Response 7.

Response to Comment 252-17 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 252-18 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 252-19 (GP): In Response to Comment 211-6 (preceded by several supporting comments) from EID, the relevant Mitigation Measure (5.5-1(b)) was revised to reflect a policy more in line with what was deemed achievable by the largest water purveyor in the County, while still providing assurances that development would not precede water availability. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for changes to Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b).

Response to Comment 252-20 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 253: TERRY ROSCOE, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Response to Comment 253-1 (GP): The commenter's role as a responsible and trustee agency is acknowledged. It is also acknowledged that the comments reflect concerns regarding potential resource impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed General Plan and EIR, including potential impacts to blue oak woodland, migratory deer, and rare Gabbro soil plants.

Response to Comment 253-2 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the vision statement that encourages clustering in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative should also be included in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The commenter believes that such clustering can offer greater biological benefit than application of the Important Biological Corridor overlay.

Response to Comment 253-3 (GP): A discussion of the differences and similarities of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives is included in Chapter 3 of Volume 1 of the EIR. A discussion of how the Environmentally Constrained Alternative was developed is contained on pages 3-53 through 3-61 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 253-4 (GP): The EIR acknowledges that agriculture, a "medium-intensity" land use (refer to page 5.12-35 of Volume 2 of the EIR), would contribute to significant and unavoidable impacts on biological resources. Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(e) has been revised to address conversion of wildlife habitat to agricultural uses. Refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for the text of this mitigation measure. Please also refer to Response to Comment 238-8.

Response to Comment 253-5 (GP): The scope of agricultural uses allowed on lands having the Agricultural Lands designation would be described in the Zoning Ordinance under the individual agricultural zone districts.

Response to Comment 253-6 (GP): The commenter's support for the Natural Resources designation being limited to parcels of 160 acres above the 2,500 foot elevation and 40 acres at lower elevations is noted for the record. Regarding the protection of migratory deer habitat at lower elevations, most of the important migratory deer habitat in the County is designated for at least a 40-acre minimum parcel size. Deer migration corridors were considered in establishing the Natural Resources designation (which has a minimum parcel size of 40 acres) for each alternative and the -IBC overlay in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please see Response to Comment 299-3 and Appendix E.2 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 253-7 (GP): The staff recognizes the value of allowing transfers off of other land use designations and has included a modification to Policy LU-7f in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 253-8 (GP): Groundwater in fractured hard rock is discussed on pages 5.5-62 through 5.5-65 of Volume 1 of the EIR. The relationship between groundwater withdrawals and effects on other wells, surface springs, wetlands, and streams is not as predictable as in alluvial situations. In addition, it is more difficult to establish information to predict or quantify such effects because individual wells in a single area can have dramatically different yield and depth-to-water characteristics. As noted on page 5.5-70, it is this uncertainty regarding localized groundwater conditions that led to the recommendation in the EIR to revise Policy PS-2d to eliminate the requirement for development of parcels served by groundwater to demonstrate that “drafting of groundwater will not adversely affect the operation of wells on lands in the vicinity of the proposed project.” It is known that most groundwater in the County is found in pockets within fractured bedrock, and there may be little connectivity with surface water resources. Given this information, no additional conclusions can be drawn with respect to this issue. Please also refer to Responses to Comments 281-153 and 281-154.

Response to Comment 253-9 (GP): Please refer Response to Comment 238-2.

Response to Comment 253-10 (GP): The commenter correctly states that some projects that may be excepted under Policy CO-3c would be subject to CEQA review. If such projects have the potential to affect resources under the jurisdiction of DFG, notification to DFG may be required. It is assumed that any potential effects would be mitigated pursuant to the results of CEQA analysis and DFG involvement. The policy strikes a balance between resource protection and the transportation and recreation needs of the County. Regardless of the applicable General Plan policies, such projects remain subject to relevant State and federal regulations such as those listed by the commenter.

Response to Comment 253-11 (GP): The commenter’s support for the development of conservation easements as a means of permanently protecting land for Ecological Preserves and other wildlife reserves is noted. Implementation Measure CO-G in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative directs the County to cooperatively develop (with DFG and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) a long-term preserve strategy. The County anticipates that long-term funding issues not addressed through the current rare plant mitigation program will be addressed through this strategic planning process.

Response to Comment 253-12 (GP): Implementation Measure CO-J of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires preparation and adoption of an Oak Woodland Management Plan and proposed Mitigation Measure 5.12.-1(g) in the EIR requires development and implementation of an Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(e) proposed for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, would require the adoption of a no-net-loss policy and mitigation program for

important habitat, including oak woodlands. The commenter's suggestion on inclusion of snag protection is noted for the record and is an appropriate subject for consideration in the development of the Oak Woodland Management Plan and Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. Please refer also to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 253-13 (GP): It is acknowledged that DFG staff has worked with PAWTAC in developing biologically sound protection, conservation and restoration strategies for oak woodlands in the County and will continue to help coordinate on this issue. Continued coordination with DFG is anticipated as the proposed oak woodland and oak tree protection measures are implemented. Please also refer to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 253-14 (GP): Some agriculture-designated land may be better as rangeland than in other forms of agriculture with lower habitat value. Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(e) has been revised to address the impacts of grading for agricultural conversion on important habitat. Please see Response to Comment 238-8. It is recognized that reducing habitat fragmentation is important to protect many sensitive biological resources including songbirds that are subject to parasitism by brown-headed cowbirds. Several mitigation measures presented in Section 5.12 are intended to reduce habitat fragmentation. While certain agricultural activities may attract brown-headed cowbirds, reducing habitat fragmentation is expected to benefit songbirds more than placing restriction on livestock feed lots, dairy operation areas, and cattle confinement areas.

Response to Comment 253-15 (GP): Access points to public open space areas will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis during environmental review completed for each project. As part of this process, the Department of Fish and Game would be consulted as a responsible or trustee agency, as appropriate.

Response to Comment 253-16 (EIR): The commenter supports Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) (General Plan conformity review). The comment is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 253-17 (EIR): A wide range of options for evaluating potential impacts were considered, including those noted by the commenter. Recognizing that there are financial and other limitations that restrict the number of ways any one particular impact can be analyzed, methods which would determine the impacts accurately given data availability and other constraints were selected. An example of analysis by land use intensity can be found on pages 5.12-36 through 5.12-38 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 253-18 (EIR): The staff is aware of the various options for comparing existing land use characteristics relative to proposed land use designations and has access to the GIS software that could be used to complete such analyses. When appropriate, this software will be used for various land use analysis and planning. GIS-based data were used extensively in the draft General Plan alternatives and EIR. The cost of preparing the specific analyses requested is not justified in light of the fact that the

information that would be presented is already contained in the EIR. The analysis presented in the EIR adequately supports the impact conclusions.

Response to Comment 253-19 (EIR): The General Plan specifically addresses protection of rural areas by limiting or restricting development. Goal 2.1 in the General Plan Land Use Element for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternative (page 11) directs the County to curtail urban/suburban sprawl. Policy LU-2a in the General Plan Land Use Element for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative (page 25) and Environmentally Constrained Alternative (page 26) states that Community Region boundaries shall not extend beyond those areas needed to accommodate existing and anticipated development, as outlined on the General Plan Land Use Diagram. This policy continues that, in order to promote infill within the Community Regions, the expansion of a Community Region boundary shall not be approved unless it can be demonstrated, based on substantial evidence, that there is insufficient undeveloped land within the Community Region to meet the quantity of housing or type of nonresidential land use that would be accommodated by the proposed expansion. Additionally, assignment of higher intensity land use designations to Community Regions and Rural Centers would allow for the concentration of higher intensity development in those areas. This would further the maintenance of the rural nature of the County's Rural Regions. Clustering development in urban areas can be utilized as a strategy for protecting wildlife habitat in rural areas, however it must be recognized where lots can be legally developed.

Response to Comment 253-20 (EIR): Table 5.12-2 on page 5.12-14 of the EIR has been revised. Please see Chapter 20 of this Response to Comments document. The status of Layne's butterweed is revised to reflect its current federal status as a Threatened species. This category has also been added at the end of the table. This clarification does not alter the conclusions of the EIR.

Response to Comment 253-21 (EIR): The commenter's support of Mitigation Measure 5.1-2 is noted. A number of potential landowner incentive programs were explored and it was determined that Mitigation Measure 5.1-2 was the only potentially feasible option available. No other feasible options have been presented to the County. The commenter's recommendation that the County develop additional incentive programs is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 253-22 (EIR): The commenter concurs that residential, timber production, mining and mineral extraction, as allowed uses under the NR Land Use designation, will create the potential for incompatible land uses. The EIR explains that by buildout, much of the existing habitat at lower elevations could be fragmented or removed by urban and agricultural development under each of the alternative. The comments on limiting agricultural expansion on land designated as NR, including the feasibility of such action, will be forwarded to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for their consideration during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 253-23 (EIR): The role of CDFG and other pertinent State agencies is summarized on page 5.5-15 of Volume 1 of the EIR. The summary does not describe all the responsibilities of CDFG but the descriptions are adequate for the purpose of this EIR. The commenter's clarification of the additional roles is noted.

Response to Comment 253-24 (EIR): It is acknowledged that the use of drought-resistant landscaping for new residential and commercial uses as well as landowner education regarding drought tolerant landscaping would reduce demands on surface water supplies. Policies designed to conserve water through the use of drought tolerant plant species are presented in the Conservation and Protection of Water Resources section of the General Plan for each alternative. Further, the County currently requires water conserving landscaping for certain types of projects (Resolutions 69-93 and 105-99). The recommended mitigation measure referred to by the commenter on page 5.5-48 will require that additional steps are taken to conserve water, but also acknowledges that substantial conservation measures are already in place. Although this measure does not include specific requirements, it specifies the use of "Best Management Practices" to reduce water use, which would include the use of drought tolerant landscaping and other methods.

Response to Comment 253-25 (EIR): Table 5.5-12 (page 5.5-153) of the EIR list potential impacts associated with lining canals, ditches, and other waterways; page 5.5-57 acknowledges that these impacts are the responsibility of EID and other water purveyors. Page 5.5-60 lists mitigation to reduce this impact. Furthermore, the EIR addresses potential impacts to riparian and wetland vegetation in Section 5.12. Mitigation is provided in Section 5.12 that would reduce the impacts identified by the commenter, including measures that would protect special-status species including the western pond turtle. However, impacts to sensitive habitats including riparian and wetland vegetation is considered significant and unavoidable. The EIR concludes that it is not feasible to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Response to Comment 253-26 (EIR): Impacts associated with implementation of fire safety methods are identified as a potentially significant effect on wildlife habitat on page 5.12-36 of Volume 2 of the EIR. It is recognized that clustering development in urban areas can be utilized as a strategy for protecting wildlife habitat from vegetation removal associated with fire safety and other secondary impacts in rural areas. It is also recognized that legal lots can be developed and that, in fire prone areas, clearing vegetation near structures can reduce the risk of property damage. Please also refer to Response to Comment 253-19. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment are noted for the record and forwarded to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for consideration in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 253-27 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on the need to protect streams, rivers and lakes, and other aquatic areas from excessive sedimentation through the regulation of

grading are noted for the record. It should be noted that the County currently regulates grading through its grading ordinance and pursuant to the federal Clean Water Act (NPDES program). Please also see the discussion of sedimentation on pages 5.5-115 through 5.5-120 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 253-28 (EIR): On pages 5.12-47 and 5.12-48 of Volume 2 of the EIR it is acknowledged that mining is generally not considered compatible with protection of wildlife habitat and that it can have long-lasting effects on wildlife populations. Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(c) for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives would prohibit surface mining on land designated as Open Space. Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(h) for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative would remove the Open Space designation from the list of land use designations considered compatible with application of the Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay. Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(m) for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative would also remove the Open Space designation from the list of land use designations considered compatible with application of the Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay and would prohibit surface mining on land designated as Open Space. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position limiting the size and cumulative number of ongoing mineral extraction projects in the -IBC overlay areas, will be forwarded to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for consideration in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 253-29 (EIR): It is acknowledged that the introduction and spread of noxious weeds is a source of habitat degradation. This impact is noted as a potentially significant secondary impact on wildlife habitat on page 5.12-36. A new policy is proposed under Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(d) that identifies removal of nonnative plant species as a potential restoration and management action associated with an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan. A summary of threats to biological resources associated with the spread of noxious weeds is also inserted under the heading "County Planning Issues" on page 5.12-31 of the EIR. See Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for these revisions.

Response to Comment 253-30 (EIR): The commenter's clarification of DFG's current trout stocking practices at alpine lakes in El Dorado County is noted for the record. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for the proposed text revision that clarifies the description of DFG's program.

Response to Comment 253-31 (EIR): Because there are no important anadromous (i.e., migratory) fish populations in El Dorado County, waterway obstructions are not expected to pose serious impediments to migratory species. Local movement, including movement between areas of suitable spawning and foraging habitat, by resident fishes could be impeded by these obstructions.

Response to Comment 253-32 (EIR): The discussion of the historical distribution of anadromous salmon and steelhead under the "Fisheries" heading on page 5.12-11 is revised in this Response to Comments document (see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document).

Response to Comment 253-33 (EIR): Table 5.12-2 includes 29 special-status plants. The federal status of Layne's butterweed has been revised to indicate that it is federally-listed as threatened. Please refer to Response to Comment 253-20 and Chapter 2.0.

Response to Comment 253-34 (EIR): The commenter's clarification of take authorization for listed species in conjunction with a Natural Communities Conservation Plan is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 253-35 (EIR): The role of CDFG as a trustee and responsible agency is described on page 5.5-15 of the EIR. Please refer to Response to Comment 253-23.

Response to Comment 253-36 (EIR): The commenter's clarification of protected birds under the Fish and Game Code is noted.

Response to Comment 253-37 (EIR): The commenter's clarification of State protection of candidate species for listing as threatened or endangered, take under ESA and CESA, and the CESA consistency review process is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 253-38 (EIR): Based on information provided by the commenter, the second paragraph under the "California Endangered Species Act" has been revised and the text pertaining to State protection of special-status plants has been clarified. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 253-39 (EIR): The comment, which addresses CDFG regulatory authority over rivers, streams, and lakes, is noted for the record. The discussion of this authority is included in the EIR (page 5.12-29, Volume 2).

Response to Comment 253-40 (EIR): The commenter concurs with EIR that loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat as summarized under Impact 5.12-1 is significant and unavoidable for all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 253-41 (EIR): The percentages presented in Table 5.12-4 are based on acreage totals calculated by overlaying GIS layers of land use intensity groupings (see methodology described on pages 5.12-34 and 5.12-35 of Volume 2 of the EIR) on to land-cover data (as described on pages 5.12-1 and 5.12-2 of Volume 2 of the EIR). The land-cover data, which is updated regularly by CDF-FRAP, represents recent if not current habitat conditions. The land use intensity groupings were developed independently for the analysis of biological impacts in Section 5.12 of the EIR; they do not

directly equate to the density of land uses, as shown in the General Plan land use designations. The definitions of the intensity categories are articulated on pages 5.12-34 and 35 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 253-42 (EIR): The commenter identifies several sources of information that may be useful in future efforts to develop an oak woodland management plan.

Response to Comment 253-43 (EIR): Development of standards at the level of detail proposed by the commenter is not feasible as part of the General Plan. Implementation Measure CO-K requires development of an implementation ordinance that would address the issues raised by the commenter. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 253-44 (EIR): If an INRMP is developed, the County will develop a program that is consistent with applicable State and federal regulatory requirements protecting biological resources (e.g., CEQA, NEPA, CESA, ESA). Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(d), which outlines the major components of the INRMP, requires that the INRMP be developed with and included informal consultation with local, state, and federal agencies having jurisdiction over natural resources in the County. It is anticipated that this level of consultation would ensure consistency with regulatory requirements of applicable State and federal agencies. The County has explored and will continue to explore resource planning options including development of a HCP, NCCP, or a combination HCP/NCCP. The US Fish and Wildlife Service has suggested that the INRMP could be a key part of an HCP (see Comment 238-9). The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on the duration of time needed to complete a resource management plan and basis for that plan, are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 253-45 (EIR): The County will continue to use existing data sources such as those listed by the commenter and to coordinate with CDFG and USFWS on pertinent resource planning efforts. The suggestions regarding the use of specific, existing map projections and other applicable elements used in resource planning by CDFG and USFWS are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 253-46 (EIR): The staff concurs with the commenter's concern regarding interim resource protection. Please refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 253-47 (EIR): As noted on page 5.12-60 of the EIR, as part of the Important Habitat Mitigation Program, the County would adopt standards that ensure a reduction in direct and cumulative impacts of proposed development on important habitat to less-than-significant levels, in accordance with CEQA thresholds. The resource assessment standards identified by the commenter are routinely used during biological assessments currently produced for projects in the County. The commenter's suggestion that the County continue to use such standards is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 253-48 (EIR): State and federal statutory requirements protecting biological resources were considered when developing the list of important habitat listed on page 5.12-56 under Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(d). The determination of the presence of important habitat will be consistent with these requirements. In addition, the County has the option of expanding the definition of important habitats beyond those listed on page 5.12-56.

Response to Comment 253-49 (EIR): The basis for the determination of percent canopy refers to a percentage of the parcel acreage. Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(f), as proposed in the DEIR, only applies to parcels with at least 10 percent canopy cover. The standards have been revised to apply to parcels with less than 10 percent cover on parcels greater than one acre. For a discussion of this issue, please see Master Response 18.

Woodland replacement as described under Option A on page 5.12-61 of Volume 2 of the EIR would not be based solely on acreage affected but would be based on a formula, developed by the County, that accounts for the number of trees and acreage affected. The EIR does not specify how woodland habitat would be replaced; it would be at the County's discretion to require tree planting, preservation of existing woodland by contribution to the INRMP, or a combination of both. It is acknowledged that replacement is not equivalent to avoidance, and that temporal loss of functioning and potential failure would reduce the efficacy of this form of mitigation. These shortcomings are discussed in the EIR. However, replacement can be a valuable tool as part of an overall woodland protection strategy. The 1:1 replacement ratio under Option A is in addition to canopy retention standards that require significant retention of onsite woodland canopy.

The intent of Option B is to require preservation of existing woodlands at a 2:1 ratio where retention is not required or feasible. The measure has been revised to clarify this intent. Please see Master Response 18 for additional discussion of issues regarding the oak canopy policy.

The primary goal of the INRMP is to preserve and manage important habitat in the County. One of the major components of the INRMP listed on page 5.12-58 is habitat acquisition. Therefore, although not specified in the EIR, it is anticipated that a large percentage of the conservation funds will be allocated for habitat acquisition. However, as described under New Policy 7.4.2.8, the INRMP will have several other components including a habitat management component, which will include habitat restoration.

As noted on page 5.12-61, the cost associated with acquisition, management, and of habitat protected would be included in the mitigation fee.

Response to Comment 253-50 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 253-51 (EIR): Planting 15-gallon oak trees can be successful when proper site preparation, planting methods, and maintenance activities are employed.

However, it is acknowledged that these considerations will not always be applied and that some mortality can be expected. To provide greater flexibility to the County when determining appropriate size of replacement trees the 15-gallon size requirement described on page 5.12-62 of the EIR has been deleted. See Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for changes. The comment regarding an oak woodland restoration fund is apparently in reference to a fee that could be paid in lieu of planting replacement trees in which case the County's INRMP conservation fund could be applied to meet goals outlined by the commenter. While the INRMP conservation fund would help to preserve some of the largest and most unfragmented woodlands, it is also important to encourage the protection, planting, restoration, and regeneration of native trees in new developments and within existing development (Draft No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, Policy 7.4.4.2). The Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance as described on page 5.12-62 of the EIR would help the County meet these objectives.

Response to Comment 253-52 (EIR): The County will develop specific criteria for exemptions from the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance prior to approval of the ordinance. Because the County will not begin to draft the ordinance until after the General Plan is approved, it is not possible to speculate what exemptions will be included in the approved ordinance. The oak tree ordinance proposal and other mitigation measures related to oak tree protection have been developed in part to serve as incentives for landowners to maintained existing oaks on their property. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may consider additional incentive programs for landowners, including the cost and feasibility of such programs, during their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 253-53 (EIR): As used in the EIR, the word “mining” differs from “surface mining” in that “mining” could also include subsurface mining.

Response to Comment 253-54 (EIR): The commenter appears to be referring to Table 3-4 on page 3-27 in Volume 1 of the EIR. This table and Table 5.12-5 are intended to provide two different types of information. The purpose of Table 3-4 does not include information on special-status species.

Land use density does not equate to land use intensity as described in Section 5.12. As noted on page 5.12-35 of Volume 2 of the EIR, areas of low intensity land use are expected to continue to function as undisturbed habitats. Given this, significant impacts to special-status species in jurisdictional low intensity land use areas are not anticipated. Please refer also to Response to Comment 253-41.

Low intensity land uses (lands with a designation of NR or OS, page 5.12-35 of Volume 1 of the EIR) are presumed to be compatible with habitat conservation, and that is why Table 5.12-5 focuses only on medium and high intensity lands.

Response to Comment 253-55 (EIR): The staff concurs with the comment. The purpose of the paragraph to which the commenter is referring (page 5.12-77 of the EIR) is to

describe concerns with General Plan Policy 7.4.1.5 as it relates to protection of special-status species. Impacts to special-status species are considered significant and unavoidable for all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The revised and new policies proposed as mitigation in the EIR would provide substantially more protection for threatened and endangered species than that provided by Policy 7.4.1.5.

Response to Comment 253-56 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 20.

Response to Comment 253-57 (EIR): The alternatives analysis consists of four project alternatives evaluated at an equal level of detail throughout the EIR; several hundred pages of analysis are devoted to each of these alternatives. These alternatives represent a full range of General Plan development scenarios. Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the EIR considers eight additional alternatives, of which two were eliminated from further consideration because they were deemed infeasible. The remaining six alternatives are evaluated on an issue-by-issue basis and compared to the No Project Alternative. Additionally, a table (Table 6-1) is provided in Volume 2 of the EIR comparing the relative level of impact of each of the feasible alternatives (including the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives) to the No Project Alternative. This level of evaluation fully meets requirements of CEQA. The comment does not specifically state why the alternatives are not sufficiently described and no further response can, therefore, be provided.

Response to Comment 253-58 (EIR): The commenter's agreement with the analysis of Alternative #12: Compact Development is noted. Alternative #12 is consistent with many of the concepts of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, but because it would cluster development, it would likely result in less environmental impact to biological resources than the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the other alternatives. Regarding the request to develop a full Land Use Diagram for Alternative #12, the County would be required to dedicate substantial additional financial resources toward this task; this level of detail is not required for an alternatives analysis in an EIR. Rather, an EIR is required to provide sufficient information to "...allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project" (Section 15126.6(d) of the CEQA Guidelines) and the description on page 6-31 of Volume 2 of the EIR allows for the analysis on pages 6-32 through 6-35, which consider this alternative. The comments requesting development of a land use map based on Alternative #12 are noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for consideration in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 254: JACQUELINE BALL, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION, GOLD FIELDS DISTRICT

Response to Comment 254-1: It is acknowledged that the comments provided on the General Plan and DEIR relate to three park units managed by the Department: Folsom Lake State Recreation Area, Auburn State Recreation Area and Marshall Gold State Historic Park.

Response to Comment 254-2 (GP): The concerns regarding the compatibility of proposed land use designations adjacent to, within the viewshed, or otherwise affecting State Park units are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Adjacent land uses vary by alternative and by park unit. The sensitivity of State Park lands is recognized and measures are proposed to address incompatibility issues (Mitigation Measures 5.1-3(a) and 5.1-3(b)).

Response to Comment 254-3 (GP): For the most part, those parcels bearing the High-Density Residential (HDR) and Medium-Density Residential (MDR) land use designations in the vicinity of the Marshall Gold Discovery State Historic Park are currently developed at HDR and MDR levels. There are few vacant parcels in the Coloma and Lotus Rural Centers that would allow a substantial increase in development adjacent to the park site. Mitigation proposed under Impact 5.13-1 is expected to reduce potential cultural resource impacts associated with all development, including that which is ministerial, to a less-than-significant level. Furthermore, the DPR would participate in the review of and could suggest mitigation for potential impacts associated with discretionary projects adjacent to the park site. The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment stating that high and medium-density land use designations in and around the Marshall Gold Discovery SHP are inappropriate; that the Environmentally Constrained Alternative seems to provide the most favorable designations for preservation of the park; and recommending that the County consider the Open Space designation within this area; are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Because of restrictions associated with the Open Space land use designation, it is not an appropriate designation for privately owned parcels that are not part of an established open space plan.

Response to Comment 254-4 (GP): In development of the General Plan Alternatives, existing development patterns were reflected in the land use designations assigned to the areas around the State Recreation Area. The lands referenced in the comment, lying between the North and South Forks of the American River range from all designated Rural Residential on the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, a mix of Natural Resources and Rural Residential on the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, and Natural Resources and Agriculture on the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The commenter's support for the land use designations in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and for application of the Open Space land use designation on

lands within the viewshed of the Folsom Lake SRA is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 254-5 (GP): It is acknowledged that the commenter supports the policy which would preclude development in high or very high wildland fire hazard areas unless the hazard is reduced to a moderate or better level. Implementation Measure HS-B in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires the County to work with the local Fire Safe councils, fire protection districts, U.S. Forest Service, and California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to develop and implement a countywide Wildfire Safety Plan. See Master Response 5 and Response to Comment 265-3.

Response to Comment 254-6 (GP): Currently, the State Fire Safe standards apply to all wildland areas within the County and a 30-foot setback would be required. A lesser setback would be allowed with approval by the appropriate fire marshal, if certain architectural features are incorporated into the structure to provide the same comparable effect as the setback.

Response to Comment 254-7 (GP): Implementation Measure HS-B requires the County to work with local Fire Safe Councils and fire departments to develop a Wildfire Safety Plan. A requirement for shaded fuel breaks and other risk reduction measures on public lands as part of the total cost of providing fire protection could be considered when developing this Plan. In addition, development projects within areas of high or very high fire hazard would be required to submit a Fire Management Plan for open space areas.

Response to Comment 254-8 (EIR): The commenter's support for the mitigation measures for cultural resource impacts are acknowledged. Included in these mitigation measures is the requirement to prepare a Cultural Resources Ordinance. Establishing precise processes and procedures would be more properly done during the actual development of the ordinance, which will occur subsequent to General Plan adoption. This ordinance would also include project review guidelines and would address conducting surveys in areas with potential, but no known resources. Please refer also to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 254-9 (GP): As proposed, the policies and implementation measures directing the preparation of Historic Design Control Districts do not contain detail regarding specific communities or sites. Design control for areas outside of the historic community, but within its viewshed, are not likely to be subject to historic design control. However, Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) would require General Plan conformity review for all projects. This would provide an opportunity for assessment of compliance with the County's visual resource policies, which include scenic corridor considerations. The commenter's support for building and structure design controls within the viewshed of Marshall Gold State Historic Park and interest in working with the County on development of such guidelines and controls are noted for the record and will be considered by the

Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Development of the Historic Design Control Districts will be part of the Zoning Ordinance update, which will follow adoption of the General Plan. The rural center of Coloma, along with other Gold Rush era towns, is a likely candidate for this zone.

Response to Comment 254-10 (EIR): According to the *Transportation Concept Report, SR 49*, Caltrans District 3, September 2000, Caltrans has determined that the best improvement option for State Route 49 through Coloma is to leave the roadway in its current alignment. This determination is based on the consideration of constraints such as, but not limited to, funding, topography, and historical landmarks.

Response to Comment 254-11 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 254-3 and 254-4. Policy LU-6b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative would restrict the placement of roads or structures on or along ridgelines if that development would be visible from publicly-accessed lands such as parks. Implementation Measure LU-A contained in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires the County to establish ridgeline protection standards within the Zoning Ordinance. The No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives do not contain direction on ridgeline development. The commenter's concerns regarding ridgeline development are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 255: ANONYMOUS

Response to Comment 255-1 (GP): The commenter provides a summary of the General Plan process and support for adopting a Plan that returns land use authority to the Board of Supervisors. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 255-2 (GP): The commenter expresses support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 256: BARRY WASSERMAN, MEASURE Y COMMITTEE

Response to Comment 256-1 (EIR): Funding issues related to roadway improvements are discussed in Impact 5.4-3 of the EIR. That discussion explains that the concurrency policies of the various General Plan alternatives will preclude major development projects from proceeding in advance of roadway improvements but that LOS standards could be exceeded by traffic generated by projects not subject to those concurrency policies. Section 5.4 of Volume 1 of the EIR also describes funding shortfalls that could limit the County's ability to pay for future roadway improvement costs. Please refer also to Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 256-2 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 256-1. If funding shortfalls remain and the contemplated roadway improvements are not constructed, the concurrency policies of the General Plan alternatives would preclude approval of major development projects until the improvements are funded. As discussed in Impact 5.4-3, however, these policies would not stop all development and the development that is allowed to proceed could result in traffic levels that exceed the established level of service standards until funding for roadway improvements becomes available.

Response to Comment 256-3 (EIR): The EIR evaluated the impacts of the proposed General Plan alternatives, three of which included an eight-lane U.S. Highway 50 and one of which included a six-lane U.S. Highway 50. The EIR also evaluated the impacts that could occur if development proceeds in advance of transportation improvements. Please refer to Response to Comment 256-2.

Response to Comment 256-4 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 256-1. The commenter's opinion is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 256-5 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 256-2.

Response to Comment 256-6 (EIR): The issues associated with the feasibility of widening U.S. Highway 50 to eight lanes are discussed in Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 256-7 (EIR): The General Plan alternatives were developed in a process that analyzed the proposed land use plans of each alternative and identified the roadway improvements necessary to accommodate the land use plan within the LOS policies established under each General Plan alternative. The outcome of this analysis process was a list of needed roadway improvements, which are proposed to be constructed (except in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative) as part of the General Plan and include the widening of U.S. Highway 50 to include eight mainline lanes for some segments (three mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction). All four equal-weight General Plan alternatives include enough land use development to generate

peak hour traffic volumes on U.S. Highway 50 that create the need for eight lanes given the LOS policies of each alternative. Despite this level of demand, the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative constrains U.S. Highway 50 to six lanes.

CEQA requires the County to evaluate the impacts of the alternatives proposed. In this case that involved analyzing an eight-lane U.S. Highway 50 for three of the alternatives and a six-lane U.S. Highway 50 for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative. The latter analysis demonstrates the impacts that could occur if U.S. Highway 50 is not widened and limited development (i.e., no subdivisions of five units or more) is allowed to proceed. If more extensive development were allowed and the concurrency policies in the alternatives were not applied, the levels of service on U.S. Highway 50 would be worse than projected for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative. Please refer also to Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 256-8 (EIR): Master Response 14 addresses the individual points raised in this comment with the exception of the point raised about the potential obstacle of air quality conformity affecting the widening of U.S. Highway 50 and current political opposition, which is addressed in this response. Also, this response elaborates on the issue of funding specifically for widening U.S. Highway 50.

Federal air quality conformity requirements can affect a region’s ability to build transportation improvements, especially mixed-flow freeway lanes if an area is designated as nonattainment. If El Dorado County pursues the widening of U.S. Highway 50 to eight lanes, then the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) will have to incorporate this improvement and be tested for air quality conformity. Air quality conformity is conducted for federally-funded projects prior to approval of federal fund allocation. Until this action occurs, it would be premature to draw any conclusions about whether including a U.S. Highway 50 widening project into the MTP would be positive or negative in terms of air quality conformity.

With regard to funding for U.S. Highway 50, Impact 5.4-3 and Master Response 13 provide a direct response to the potential uncertainty associated with providing complete funding for all roadway improvements included in the circulation diagrams of the General Plan alternatives. However, it should be recognized that widening U.S. Highway 50 to eight lanes could be the sole responsibility of new development. The concurrency policies in each of the General Plan alternatives require that new development pay the full cost of improvements necessary to mitigate their impacts. This requirement is also consistent with the legal limitations of impact fee nexus requirements. Therefore, funding specifically for U.S. Highway 50 improvements could be considered more certain than the overall roadway improvement funding picture that includes issues associated with existing deficiencies and concurrency.

Regarding political opposition within the Sacramento Region, it is acknowledged that there is currently some opposition to the additional freeway lanes in Sacramento County. While

this is a current view, it is speculative to assume such opposition will remain over the life of the General Plan, or if it alone would halt any plans for widening, should they be proposed.

Response to Comment 256-9 (EIR): The EIR recognizes the uncertainty of mitigation for roadway LOS impacts as discussed in Impacts 5.4-1 and 5.4-3 and their associated mitigation measures. The recommended policy options are discussed in the responses below.

“Option #1—New Policy” recommended by the commenter can be considered by the Board of Supervisors for inclusion in the General Plan. It would have a similar effect as Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(b) in the EIR (requiring a General Plan conformity review for ministerial projects). As noted by the commenter, it would not necessarily reduce the LOS impacts to less than significant because of the level of development that would be allowed to proceed in the absence of the required finding and may result in secondary impacts resulting from development occurring in more remote areas to avoid LOS impacts. This result could cause an increase in trip lengths and vehicle miles of travel, which may cause higher air pollution emissions.

Response to Comment 256-10 (EIR): This policy option is similar in approach to Policy TC-1i in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative that requires that prior to issuance of building permits for a project that will worsen traffic, the developer must either construct the necessary roadway improvements or ensure that funding is encumbered and the projects are programmed. Policy TC-1i would be applied on a project-by-project basis based on the specific improvements needed to avoid a substandard LOS arising from that project. The proposed policy option would take a broader approach and require that funding be available and the improvements programmed for the entire circulation system prior to approval of any project of five units or more. The policy would also require that the circulation system be consistent with the regional plans as listed in the MTP. Because of the current funding situation this policy would preclude approval of any project of five units or more until the funding implementation measures in the General Plan have been implemented. Until this funding is in place, approval of projects of five units or more would be prohibited even where there is remaining existing capacity sufficient to accommodate those projects. As noted by the commenter this policy would not avoid significant impacts to LOS attributable to projects of fewer than five units and nonresidential development.

Response to Comment 256-11 (EIR): The comment suggests that if the proposed Policy Option 1 were adopted as part of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative, major subdivisions could be permitted following adoption of a fully funded and regionally consistent road system. Because that alternative contemplates maintaining U.S. Highway 50 at no more than six lanes, however, major subdivisions could not be allowed. Traffic expected to be generated under this alternative, even with Policy LU-1b (allowing creation of no more than four parcels from any existing parcels in the County) would lead to Levels of Service below E on U.S. Highway 50.

Because this approach still allows sufficient development to cause a need for eight lanes on U.S. Highway 50, the County's only options in this situation are to modify the LOS policies to allow the LOS F conditions or to apply an even more restrictive growth control policy such as that contained in Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) of the EIR. Please refer also to Master Responses 13, 14, and 15.

If the proposed policy were added to a General Plan alternative other than the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, it would have the effect of constraining development in a manner similar to that alternative until such time as funding for widening of U.S. Highway 50 and other roadway improvement projects has been identified and the improvements included in the MTP and other relevant planning documents.

Response to Comments 256-12 (EIR): As noted by the commenter, Policy Option #2 is more restrictive than Policy Option 1. It would preclude all discretionary development until the specified conditions are satisfied. If Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) (proposing a General Plan conformity review for ministerial projects) is adopted, it would limit all residential development. As with Policy Option 1, it would have the effect of precluding some development for which adequate capacity likely exists. Please refer to Response to Comment 256-10 for additional information.

Response to Comment 256-13 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 256-11 and 256-12.

Response to Comment 256-14 (EIR): All of the circulation diagram improvements for each alternative are shown in Exhibits 3-5, 3-7, 3-9, and 3-10 and listed in Tables 3-9, 3-10, 3-11, and 3-12 in Volume 1 of the EIR. The listed improvements in each table can be compared to the detailed project list in Appendix E of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) to determine which projects are not currently included in the MTP. The following tables provide that information in tabular format:

| No Project Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Not Shown In The SACOG MTP For 2025 | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Roadway | Segment | Included Lanes | Lanes Required by 2025 | Improvement Type |
| COUNTY ROADWAYS | | | | |
| Bass Lake Road | U.S. Highway 50 to Country Club Drive | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| | Country Club Drive to Bass Lake | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| New Bass Lake Road | Bass Lake to Green Valley Road | 0 | 2 | Construct new road |
| Francisco Drive | El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Green Valley Road | Greenstone Road to Missouri Flat Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Latrobe Road | Investment Boulevard to Carson Creek | 4 | 6 | Widen |

No Project Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Not Shown In The SACOG MTP For 2025

| Roadway | Segment | Included Lanes | Lanes Required by 2025 | Improvement Type |
|---|--|----------------|------------------------|------------------|
| Missouri Flat Road | Carson Creek to White Rock Road | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | Headington Road to U.S. Highway 50 | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive | 3 | 4 | Widen |
| Missouri Flat - Pleasant Valley Connector | China Garden Road to SR 49 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| | Missouri Flat Road to Pleasant Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Silva Valley Parkway | Serrano Parkway to U.S. Highway 50 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| White Rock Road | Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Parkway | 4 | 6 | Widen |

STATE HIGHWAYS

| | | | | |
|-----------------|---|----|----|--------------------------------------|
| SR 49 | Crystal Boulevard to China Hill Road | 2 | 2 | Upgrade to arterial |
| | Pleasant Valley Road to Placerville City Limits | 2 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| | Rattlesnake Bar Road to SR 193 | 2 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| U.S. Highway 50 | County Line to Cambridge Road - westbound | 3 | 4 | Widen (add one mixed-flow lane) |
| | County Line to Cambridge Road - eastbound | 3 | 4 | Widen (add one mixed-flow lane) |
| | Sly Park Road to Fresh Pond | 3 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| | Bass Lake Road Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cambridge Road Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cameron Park Drive Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |

Source: Fehr & Peers 2003 and the Sacramento Area Council Of Governments (SACOG)

Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Not Shown In The SACOG MTP For 2025

| Roadway | Segment | Included Lanes | Lanes Required by 2025 | Improvement Type |
|------------------------|--|----------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| COUNTY ROADWAYS | | | | |
| Bass Lake Road | U.S. Highway 50 to Country Club Drive | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| New Bass Lake Road | Bass Lake to Green Valley Road | 0 | 2 | Construct new road |
| Francisco Drive | El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Latrobe Road | Investment Blvd to Carson Creek | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | Carson Creek to White Rock Road | 4 | 6 | Widen |

Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Not Shown In The SACOG MTP For 2025

| Roadway | Segment | Included Lanes | Lanes Required by 2025 | Improvement Type |
|--|--|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Missouri Flat Road | Headington Road to U.S. Highway 50 | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive | 3 | 4 | Widen |
| | China Garden Road to SR 49 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Missouri Flat - Pleasant Valley Connector | Missouri Flat Road to Pleasant Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Silva Valley Parkway | Serrano Parkway to U.S. Highway 50 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| White Rock Road | Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Parkway | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| STATE HIGHWAYS | | | | |
| U.S. Highway 50 | Bass Lake Road Interchange | | | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cambridge Road Interchange | | | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cameron Park Drive Interchange | | | Reconstruct interchange |
| Source: Fehr & Peers 2003 and the Sacramento Area Council Of Governments (SACOG) | | | | |

Environmentally Constrained Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Not Shown In The SACOG MTP For 2025

| Roadway | Segment | Included Lanes | Lanes Required by 2025 | Improvement Type |
|---|--|----------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| COUNTY ROADWAYS | | | | |
| Bass Lake Road | U.S. Highway 50 to Country Club Drive | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| | Country Club Drive to Bass Lake | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| New Bass Lake Road | Bass Lake to Green Valley Road | 0 | 2 | Construct new road |
| Francisco Drive | El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Latrobe Road | Investment Blvd to Carson Creek | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | Carson Creek to White Rock Road | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| Missouri Flat Road | U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive | 3 | 4 | Widen |
| | China Garden Road to SR 49 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Missouri Flat - Pleasant Valley Connector | Missouri Flat Road to Pleasant Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Silva Valley Parkway | Serrano Parkway to U.S. Highway 50 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| White Rock Road | Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Parkway | 4 | 6 | Widen |

Environmentally Constrained Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Not Shown In The SACOG MTP For 2025

| Roadway | Segment | Included Lanes | Lanes Required by 2025 | Improvement Type |
|-----------------------|---|----------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| STATE HIGHWAYS | | | | |
| U.S. Highway 50 | County Line to Cameron Park Drive - westbound | 3 | 4 | Widen (add one mixed-flow lane) |
| | County Line to Cameron Park Drive - eastbound | 3 | 4 | Widen (add one mixed-flow lane) |
| | Newtown Road to Carson Road (west) | 4 | 4 | Upgrade to freeway |
| | Sly Park Road to Fresh Pond | 3 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| | Bass Lake Road Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cambridge Road Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cameron Park Drive Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |

Source: Fehr & Peers 2003 and the Sacramento Area Council Of Governments (SACOG)

1996 General Plan Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Not Shown In The SACOG MTP For 2025

| Roadway | Segment | Included Lanes | Lanes Required by 2025 | Improvement Type |
|------------------------|--|----------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| COUNTY ROADWAYS | | | | |
| Bass Lake Road | U.S. Highway 50 to Country Club Drive | 2 | 6 | Widen |
| | Country Club Drive to Bass Lake | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| New Bass Lake Road | Bass Lake to Green Valley Road | 0 | 2 | Construct new road |
| Francisco Drive | El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Green Valley Road | Salmon Falls Road to Deer Valley Road (W) | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | Greenstone Road to Missouri Flat Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Latrobe Road | Investment Drive to Carson Creek | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | Carson Creek to White Rock Road | 4 | 6 | Widen |

| | | | | |
|--|---|----|----|--------------------------------------|
| Missouri Flat Road | Headington Road to U.S. Highway 50 | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive | 3 | 4 | Widen |
| | China Garden Road to SR 49 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Missouri Flat - Pleasant Valley Connector | Missouri Flat Road to Pleasant Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Ponderosa Road | U.S. Highway 50 to N Shingle Road | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| Silva Valley Parkway | Serrano Parkway to U.S. Highway 50 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| White Rock Road | Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Parkway | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| STATE HIGHWAYS | | | | |
| SR 49 | Crystal Boulevard to China Hill Road | 2 | 2 | Upgrade to arterial |
| | Pleasant Valley Road to Placerville City Limits | 2 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| | Marshall Road to Rattlesnake Bar Road | 2 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| | Rattlesnake Bar Road to SR 193 | 2 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| SR 193 | SR 49 to Greenwood Road | 2 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| U.S. Highway 50 | County Line to Cameron Park Drive - westbound | 3 | 4 | Widen (add one mixed-flow lane) |
| | County Line to Cameron Park Drive - eastbound | 3 | 4 | Widen (add one mixed-flow lane) |
| | Ponderosa Road to Shingle Springs Drive - westbound | 2 | 3 | Widen (add one auxiliary lane) |
| | Newtown Road to Carson Road (west) | 4 | 4 | Upgrade to freeway |
| | Sly Park Road to Fresh Pond | 3 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| | Bass Lake Road Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cambridge Road Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cameron Park Drive Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |
| Source: Fehr & Peers 2003 and the Sacramento Area Council Of Governments (SACOG) | | | | |

Response to Comment 256-15 (EIR): The fourth paragraph on page 5.4-13 of Volume 1 of the EIR has been modified in response to this comment. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. The modifications do not alter the conclusions in the EIR.

Response to Comment 256-16 (EIR): The last sentence in the fourth paragraph on page 5.4-13 of Volume 1 of the EIR will be modified in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comment document in response to this comment.

If the County adopts a General Plan that includes the widening of U.S. Highway 50 to eight lanes, the County (or Caltrans) would request that this project be included in a future update of the MTP. The Sacramento Council of Governments (SACOG) and the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) were contacted to verify the update process. SACOG and EDCTC have a memorandum of understanding (MOU) that requires SACOG to consider for inclusion all regionally significant projects in the MTP that are proposed by the EDCTC. SACOG also stated that Caltrans projects are accepted directly. Therefore, either the EDCTC or Caltrans could submit the project for inclusion in the MTP and SACOG would consider it for inclusion in the MTP. The ultimate improvement concept for U.S. Highway 50 is three mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane from Folsom to just west of Placerville according to the *State Route 50 Transportation Concept Report* (Caltrans, 1998). Caltrans verified this recommendation in their June 11, 2003 comment letter on the El Dorado County General Plan DEIR (Comment Letter 97). Caltrans' decision to add this project to the MTP will likely be driven by need regardless of the General Plan alternatives. Therefore, the potential widening of U.S. Highway 50 could be proposed independently by Caltrans as soon as the next MTP update, which could occur especially if this improvement is necessary for maintaining the safety and operation of the U.S. Highway 50 mainline.

For specific responses to funding and air quality issues related to widening U.S. Highway 50, please refer to Response to Comment 256-8 and Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 256-17 (EIR): The number of roadway segments affected by Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) under each alternative is identified in the discussion of that mitigation measure in the EIR (see pages, 5.4-46, 48, 49 and 51 of Volume 1). The summary table has been revised to include the inadvertently omitted text.

Response to Comment 256-18 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 15 and Response to Comment 188-8. If the Board of Supervisors elects to pursue Mitigation Measure 5.1-4(c) in lieu of the other options available and if Measure Y is determined to be of continuing force and effect, then a vote of the people would be required to adopt the policy changes proposed by Mitigation Measure 5.1-4(c). No change would be required to the voter approval policies referenced in the comment.

Response to Comment 256-19 (EIR): The comment regarding the level of detail in the Executive Summary is noted. Page 2-7 of the Volume 1 of the EIR refers the reader to Chapter 5.0 (Volumes 1 and 2) for a complete analysis of impacts. As noted by the comment, the EIR discloses that Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) would have the effect of allowing six roadway segments (three of them on U.S. Highway 50) to operate at level of Service F.

Response to Comment 256-20 (EIR): To avoid LOS F conditions on U.S. Highway 50 during a.m. and p.m. peak hour conditions in 2025 under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative (i.e., U.S. Highway 50 limited to six lanes), the County would have to substantially reduce peak hour travel demand. One of the most effective means for reducing travel demand short of pricing controls would be to reduce the projected amount of future development, which is the source of traffic generation. Given that a number of residential parcels are protected by development agreements, the County would need to reduce potential development on existing legal residential parcels that do not have development agreements. This alternative seeks to limit development by prohibiting subdivision of any parcel into more than four parcels. As noted by the commenter and the EIR analysis, however, this limitation is insufficient to avoid LOS F conditions on U.S. Highway 50. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may consider further restrictions on land use to allow improved levels of service during their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comments 256-21 (EIR): Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative, Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) proposes adding to the list of roadways allowed to operate below LOS E all roadway segments projected to operate at LOS F notwithstanding the alternative’s limits on further subdivision. These include segments of White Rock Road and Latrobe Road, as well as three segments of U.S. Highway 50. The proposed revision would remove the segments of U.S. Highway 50 from that list. This would likely result in traffic levels that exceed the LOS standards of that General Plan alternative. To avoid that result, the County would need to adopt one or more of the other mitigation measures identified to reduce traffic volumes on U.S. Highway 50 to a level that would not violate the LOS policies of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative. Please refer to Response to Comment 256-20 for additional information.

Response to Comment 256-22 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 256-21.

Response to Comment 256-23 (EIR): The specific language proposed for Mitigation Measures 5.4-3(a) and 5.4-3(b) is presented in the text of the EIR beginning on page 5.4-62. For a discussion of the relationship of Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a) and Measure Y, please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 256-24 (EIR): If the revised policies and implementation measure contained in Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a) were adopted, then the problem cited with regard to the El Dorado Hills Boulevard interchange would be avoided. The new implementation measure specifically requires the County to adopt additional funding mechanisms to ensure that improvements in the fee programs can be implemented concurrently with new development, as defined by the modified version of Policy 3.2.1.4. The County does not currently have a requirement to ensure that sufficient funding exists to guarantee a delivery date for roadway improvement projects. Uncertainty associated with the County’s ability to adopt additional funding mechanisms is acknowledged in this

mitigation measure on page 5.4-63 and is responsible for the impact remaining significant and unavoidable. Please refer also to Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 256-25 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comments 256-26 (EIR): The proposed change in Policy 3.2.2.5 in Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a) is suggested to provide the County with greater flexibility in funding roadway improvements by allowing the County to use tax revenue for roadways serving new development projects either for later reimbursement or to reduce the overall development costs (e.g., to reduce the fee burden on developments oriented towards providing affordable housing). Presumably these programs would be funded only after existing roadway deficiencies have been improved. As currently worded, Policy 3.2.2.5 does not allow the County to use tax revenue for anything other than existing deficiencies without voter approval. At some point during the planning horizon, the existing deficiencies are expected to be eliminated, which will raise the question of whether to use the County's dedicated share of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds or other tax revenue to pay for transportation improvements that serve future development. To facilitate long range planning, the proposed change in Policy 3.2.2.5 would give the Board of Supervisors the discretion over decisions regarding use of tax revenues and provide greater flexibility in updating traffic impact fee or other transportation financing programs. In the absence of this change the County would need to seek voter approval for tax expenditures either on a project-by-project basis or through some other means. Please refer also to Master Responses 13 and 15.

Response to Comment 256-27 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 256-26.

Response to Comment 256-28 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.4-3 for the 1996 General Plan Alternative on page 5.4-65 in Volume 1 of the EIR has been revised to clarify that both measures (a) and (b) are proposed for adoption, as presented in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 256-29 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.4-3 for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative on page 5.4-64 of Volume 1 of the EIR references Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a) for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and 5.4-3(b) for the No Project Alternative to maintain consistency with policy references in these two alternatives. Both alternatives contain Policy TC-1h, which is being modified by Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a). The DEIR should have stated that both measures (a) and (b) are proposed for adoption. This change has been made as shown in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 256-30 (EIR): Although the No Project Alternative does not include Implementation Measure TC-B, Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a) under the No Project Alternative adds this measure using almost identical language (except for policy

references) found in Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a) under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative. Please refer also to Master Response 15 regarding Measure Y.

Response to Comment 256-31 (EIR): The commenter’s suggestion that the mitigation measures be applied to projects subject to development agreements is noted for the record. This lies beyond the scope of the General Plan process; however, because the issue of whether a particular policy adopted in the new General Plan may be applied to a project being developed pursuant to a development agreement will depend on the specific terms of the agreement in question. As a general matter, because the development agreements typically vest the landowner’s rights to proceed with development in accordance with the project conditions and the County plans and policies in effect at the time the development agreement was approved, the County’s ability to apply new policies based on the new General Plan would be subject to legal constraints.

Response to Comment 256-32 (EIR): The commenter’s view that applying Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(b) to new development and not to the development agreements would have less environmental value is noted. Because the EIR considers primarily impacts associated with development pursuant the General Plan alternatives, it is appropriate to propose mitigation for development that could be authorized by the General Plan alternatives. If that mitigation is not applied to projects approved before adoption of the General Plan, it will not detract from the mitigation measure’s efficacy in reducing impacts attributable to the policies before the County at this time.

Response to Comment 256-33 (EIR): Measure Y complicates the future funding picture of El Dorado County by restricting tax revenue to fix existing deficiencies only. This requires a more precise allocation of improvement costs between those attributable to new development and those that can be characterized as exclusively existing deficiencies. Most of the County’s existing fee programs pre-date Measure Y and are based on the premise that tax revenue through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP); (this funding comes from gas tax revenues paid by purchasers of fuel in El Dorado County) would be used to cover the full cost of existing deficiencies and that a surplus of STIP funding would be available to help offset costs for roadway improvements required to accommodate new development. As a result, the traffic impact fees are lower than they would be if it had been anticipated that new development had to cover its full fair cost of new roadway improvement costs. The commenter’s view that that fee programs should have been revised following adoption of Measure Y is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

The availability of tax revenues to offset roadway improvement costs becomes an important issue with regard to the fee programs because the County’s traffic impact fees are already the highest in the Sacramento region and could affect affordable housing development in the County. Requiring new development to pay their full fair share cost of mitigation would result in higher impact fees, which may cause a reduction in projected

development levels due to affordability or economic feasibility issues. Development levels could change enough that the future roadway infrastructure needs of the County could also change.

Response to Comment 256-34 (EIR): Policy 3.2.2.5 does allow exceptions to the restriction of tax dollars exclusively for existing deficiencies, if approved by voters.

Response to Comment 256-35 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 129-4.

Response to Comment 256-36 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 256-37 (EIR): The volume-to-capacity (VC) ratios requested by the commenter are provided in Appendix E.3 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 256-38 (EIR): The Measure Y policy numbers for each alternative are listed below.

| Measure Y Policy Number | No Project | 1996 General Plan | Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" | Environmentally Constrained |
|-------------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 3.2.1.5 | 3.2.1.5 | 3.2.1.5 | TC-1e | TC-1e |
| 3.2.2.4 | 3.2.2.4 | 3.2.2.4 | TC-1g | TC-1g |
| 3.2.2.5 | 3.2.2.5 | 3.2.2.5 | TC-1h | TC-1h |
| 3.5.1.6.1 | 3.5.1.6.1 | 3.5.1.6.1 | TC-1d | TC-1d |
| 3.5.1.6.2 | 3.5.1.6.2 | 3.5.1.6.2 | TC-1f | TC-1f |

Please refer also to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 256-39 (EIR): Impact 5.4-3 of the EIR raises potential policy inconsistencies for each of the General Plan alternatives. Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 15 for additional information.

Response to Comment 256-40 (EIR): In evaluating a plan’s internal consistency no one policy of a general plan controls over all other policies. The plan should be interpreted as an integrated whole. The fact that one policy may restrict certain development in order to avoid adverse impacts when that development might be allowed to proceed unconstrained under another policy considered in isolation does not necessarily render a general plan invalid. Although there is no internal inconsistency apparent on the face of the alternatives, Impact 5.4-1 in the EIR notes a potential lack of correlation between the Land Use Element and the Traffic and Circulation Element in each of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The EIR projections indicate that the amount of development allowed by the alternatives has the potential to exceed the proposed level of service standards and there are no reasonable roadway expansion solutions available to accommodate the estimated increases in traffic. The EIR proposes several alternative approaches to addressing this issue and a variant on those approaches is discussed in Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 256-41 (EIR): Please see Response to Comment 256-41. The EIR proposes various measures to address the inconsistencies identified in the EIR and, as noted by the commenter, these measures will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 256-42 (EIR): The commenter's opinion on the best approach to setting residential development fees is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. As proposed, the implementation programs for the various alternatives would allow the County to set fees in the manner proposed by the commenter assuming that research conducted in connection with the fee program demonstrates that trip generation differs by house size. A telephone survey was conducted of El Dorado County residents for the Interim U.S. Highway 50 Variable Impact Mitigation Fee Program to determine if the use of U.S. Highway 50 differed or varied by house size. The survey results showed that house size was correlated with use of U.S. Highway 50 to a degree that would allow that fee to vary. This relationship has not been evaluated for the use of any other roadways in the County and a travel survey would be necessary to collect the pertinent information to perform the evaluation. It should be noted that house size in general is not considered to be a strong variable in explaining trip generation for households. The number of persons or workers in a household along with income and number of automobiles available are better at explaining trip generation.

Response to Comment 256-43 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 5. Implementation plans for each alternative, including proposed mitigation measures, are provided in Appendix B of this Response to Comments document. The EIR contains mitigation options that would reduce the lag between development occurring and the construction of roadway improvements. Please refer also to Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b) and Mitigation Measure 5.4-3 (b).

LETTER 257: BARRY WASSERMAN, MEASURE Y COMMITTEE

Response to Comment 257-1 (GP): The commenter's support of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative with modifications is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in deliberating the General Plan. Please also refer to responses to the commenter's remaining comments, below.

Response to Comment 257-2 (GP): The commenter refers to the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative as having a weakness because it anticipates more growth than the roadway plan can accommodate. The EIR includes mitigation for this alternative that would further reduce the development potential of this alternative through measures such as making building permits discretionary. Even under these conditions, the Alternative is expected to allow more development than could be accommodated by a six-lane U.S. Highway 50. Refer to Master Responses 13 and 15 for additional information.

Response to Comment 257-3 (GP): The EIR identifies impacts associated with the uncertainty of funding and constructing roadway improvements contained in the circulation diagrams of each General Plan alternative (refer to Impacts 5.4-1 and 5.4-3). Despite the differences in the alternatives, the EIR recommends mitigation options that would allow each alternative to meet the legal requirements for adoption. Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 15 for additional information.

Response to Comment 257-4 (GP): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 15.

Response to Comment 257-5 (GP): The commenter's views regarding the effects of Measure Y are noted. Please refer to Master Responses 13, 14, and 15.

Response to Comment 257-6 (GP): The commenter's preference is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in deliberating the General Plan. The Board of Supervisors can adopt one of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives "as is" or with a variety of modifications as recommended in the EIR mitigation measures. They can also consider additional modifications as suggested in DEIR comments or even adopt an entirely different alternative. Depending on which approach they take, additional environmental review may be necessary.

Response to Comment 257-7 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-6.

Response to Comment 257-8 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-6.

Response to Comment 257-9 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-6. Please also refer to Response to Comment 256-11.

Response to Comment 257-10 (GP): Without new discretionary approvals of land use development projects, the County could accommodate enough land use development to

cause major roadways to operate worse than the County's LOS thresholds by 2025 as established by the policies of each General Plan alternative. Therefore, Policy LU-1b and other growth restrictive policies of the General Plan alternatives are tied directly to roadway capacity.

Response to Comment 257-11 (GP): For the Sacramento region, inclusion of a project in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) comes as a result of a local agency decision to approve the project and advance it to a stage of implementation that requires inclusion in the MTP. The proposed policy would change this process and instead require El Dorado County to plan for land use changes based on whether the roadway improvements necessary to accommodate the land use change are in the MTP. The Board of Supervisors has the authority to require this type of policy change; however, the County has already approved more development potential than is currently supported by the improvements contained in the MTP. Adopting a General Plan alternative with this recommended policy may create an inconsistency between the Land Use and Circulation Elements because of this problem. Correlation between the Land Use and Circulation Elements should be achieved before additional policy restrictions are added. Please refer also to Master Responses 13 and 14.

Response to Comment 257-12 (GP): The basis for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is to restrict development potential based on the desire to maintain U.S. Highway 50 at six lanes. The recommended policy change by the commenter is in direct conflict with this basic concept. The commenter's view will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in deliberating the General Plan.

Response to Comment 257-13 (GP): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 14.

Response to Comment 257-14 (GP): The Measure Y policies are contained in each General Plan alternative. Please refer to Response to Comment 256-38 for specific policy numbering. Also refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 257-15 (GP): The wording of Policy TC-1d is intended to provide direction as to the scenario under which the traffic impact analysis should be conducted in relation to this policy. No modification to the policy is required.

Response to Comment 257-16 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 257-17 (GP): The recommended policy change is not required to achieve the stated intent. Policies TC-1d and TC-1i would not be applied independently and without regard to each other.

Response to Comment 257-18 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-14.

Response to Comment 257-19 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-14.

Response to Comment 257-20 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-14.

Response to Comment 257-21 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-14.

Response to Comment 257-22 (GP): The County will apply the policies of the General Plan alternatives to the fullest extent possible. Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) is one option for expanding the applicability of the General Plan concurrency policies.

Response to Comment 257-23 (GP): The recommended policy change is not required to achieve the stated intent. Policies TC-1d, TC-1e, and TC-1i would not be applied independently and without regard to each other.

Response to Comment 257-24 (GP): Policy TC-1i would apply to all development projects that are not exempt from its application. Specifying the types of projects that it would apply to is not necessary.

Response to Comment 257-25 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-22.

Response to Comment 257-26 (GP): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 15.

Response to Comment 257-27 (GP): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 15.

Response to Comment 257-28 (GP): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 15.

Response to Comment 257-29 (GP): The commenter agrees with the inclusion of Policy TC-1o. No response is required.

Response to Comment 257-30 (GP): The vacant land survey is a gross summary of land that could be used to accommodate the County's regional housing needs allocation, based on current zoning and before application of identified constraints to the development of housing. A vacant lands inventory using the proposed General Plan alternative land use proposals was not prepared because any of those proposals could be changed by the decisionmakers and State housing law directs jurisdictions to base their inventories on zoning. Based on the results of Economic and Planning Systems, Inc.'s (EPS's) land use forecasts for the General Plan alternatives, it is anticipated that the County could supply the necessary raw vacant land under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus", Environmentally Constrained, and 1996 General Plan Alternatives through 2008. The EPS numbers could not be definitively used in the Housing Element because they project to 2025; the Housing Element is intended to apply only through 2008. Once the Zoning Ordinance is updated for consistency with the adopted General Plan, it is anticipated that the County may need to revise the Housing Element, including the vacant lands inventory.

Response to Comment 257-31 (GP): It is not possible to predict enforcement actions that may be taken by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) or other parties should the Housing Element be found to be inadequate. Note that if the Housing Element is certified by HCD, there is a rebuttable presumption that the element is adequate (Government Code Section 65589.3). The Government Code specifies general remedies to be applied where a General Plan or element of a General Plan is found to be inadequate. Those remedies typically involve suspension of the invalid plan and an order to develop a plan that satisfies the requirements of the law. (See e.g., Government Code Section 65754.) It is not clear whether a judicial remedy would apply to projects that are the subject of development agreements approved pursuant to the 1996 General Plan. The Government Code provides that a court may not enjoin a specific housing development if: (1) the Board of Supervisors has approved the project and found it consistent with the General Plan; (2) the Board of Supervisors has approved a CEQA document for the project that has not been challenged; (3) the owner has irrevocably committed more than one million dollars to public infrastructure in reliance on the Board's approval; and (4) the project can be developed without having an impact on the County's ability to adopt an adequate Housing Element (Government Code Section 65754.5).

It should be noted that the recent legal challenges against the City of Folsom's Housing Element were not advanced by HCD. In this case, the subject lawsuit was brought by Legal Services of Northern California, a private organization.

Response to Comment 257-32 (GP): The commenter thanks the County for the opportunity to comment. No response is required.

LETTER 258: DAVID R. CROSARIOL, COOPER, THORNE, & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Response to Comment 258-1 (GP): The commenter is requesting a split General Plan land use designation for his client's parcels (APNs 108-530-39 and 108-540-26) of High Density Residential (HDR) and Open Space (OS). Such split designations would be consistent with the proposed zoning as presented in the letter. This configuration was not included in any of the General Plan alternatives because the open space parcels were created as mitigation for air quality and noise impacts for the adjacent subdivision and to buffer the approved residential use from U.S. Highway 50. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 259: CLARENCE DILTS

Response to Comment 259-1 (EIR): The objectives are listed on pages 3 through 13 of Volume 1 and 6-1 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Please also refer to Response to Comment 228-2.

Response to Comment 259-2 (EIR): The commenter expresses support for Comparative Alternative #12, Compact Development. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 260: CONNIE DOLAN, EL DORADO BUILDERS' EXCHANGE

Response to Comment 260-1 (GP): The commenter expresses support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 260-2 (GP): The commenter expresses opposition to the No Project Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 260-3 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 9 regarding property values and Master Response 8 regarding development of the alternatives.

If any of the proposed General Plan alternatives were adopted, the subsequent required Zoning Ordinance update could potentially result in the rezoning of a number of parcels. This is true of the 1996 General Plan Alternative, as well as the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. The Zoning Ordinance update process was never completed following adoption of the General Plan in 1996, thus the potential effects of rezoning were never realized.

The General Plan alternatives are intentionally different from one another so that the decisionmakers may have choices regarding issues such as future subdivision and Community Region boundaries. For example, the restriction on subdivision under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is a defining feature of that option, as articulated in Policy LU-1b. The Community Region boundaries shown on the Land Use Diagrams of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives are based on policy direction, such as Policy LU-1b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, proposed land use designation distribution, and the overall approaches of those alternatives, which are different from that of the 1996 General Plan Alternative. The commenter's concerns regarding the potential effects of rezoning, subdivision restrictions, and community region boundaries are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan.

The commenter correctly states that the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives limit future commercial growth outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. The intent of this approach was to concentrate commercial growth in those areas supporting higher residential growth and more likely to have the infrastructure necessary to support extensive commercial development. Again, this provides a different approach for the decisionmakers to consider as they deliberate the General Plan. The commenter's concerns regarding this limitation on commercial growth are also noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan.

Response to Comment 260-4 (GP): Estimated labor needs and costs for implementation of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are provided in Appendix B of this Response to Comment document. The concerns of the commenter regarding the costs of implementation of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 260-5 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 260-1.

Response to Comment 260-6 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 260-1.

LETTER 261: DAMON POLK, ET AL THE EL DORADO BUSINESS ALLIANCE

Response to Comment 261-1 (GP): The commenter expresses support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 261-2 (GP): The efforts of this and all the commenters are appreciated. All comments received during the comment period have received individual responses in this document.

Response to Comment 261-3 (GP): The comment documents how the Letter is organized. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment 261-4 (GP): The six member organizations are noted. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment 261-5 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 261-1 and 261-4.

Response to Comment 261-6 (GP): The comment provides a comprehensive summary of why the 1996 General Plan Alternative is supported by the Business Alliance. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Estimated labor needs and costs for implementation of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are provided in Appendix B of this Response to Comment document.

Please refer to Master Response 8 regarding public review of the alternatives.

Response to Comment 261-7 (GP): The commenter's opposition to the mixing of alternatives is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 8. The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted.

Response to Comment 261-8 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 67-1 and Master Response 8. A history of the process of identifying General Plan alternatives is provided in Volume 1 of the EIR, commencing on page 3-9.

Response to Comment 261-9 (GP): This comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 8 regarding public involvement during preparation of the General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 261-10 (GP): The comment in opposition to the examination of all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives and in favor of one “preferred” alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Responses 2 and 4.

Response to Comment 261-11 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 4. Analysis of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives was discussed before the Board of Supervisors on June 25, 2002 with the first report of the then-new General Plan Project Manager. It was subsequently discussed in reports to the Board provided on July 16, 2002, October 22, 2002, January 28, 2003, March 25, 2003, April 29, 2003, and May 20, 2003. There is no record of any comments received at these meetings from any party opposed to the approach of undertaking more comprehensive analysis of the various alternatives.

Response to Comment 261-12 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 261-13 (GP): The commenter’s support for adopting the General Plan and the reliance on such adoption to procure water supplies is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 261-14 (GP): Please see Master Response 11. In addition, the commenter’s request that the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors consider the possible incorporation of El Dorado Hills to “ensure that incorporation can be accomplished in a reasonable manner without major future revisions to the General Plan” has been noted and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers.

Response to Comment 261-15 (GP): The staff does not concur that there has been any deprivation to the public by not making the Writ of Mandate available electronically. Paper copies have been available upon request. The staff agrees that this would be a convenience that is merited. Therefore, the Writ of Mandate has been scanned and is available on the County’s website as of November 1, 2003. Please refer also to Response to Comment 217-7.

Response to Comment 261-16 (GP): This comment introduces the rest of the commenter’s letter. Further response is not necessary.

Response to Comment 261-17 (GP): The commenter’s support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative based on how it addresses Community Regions and Rural Centers is noted. The Community Regions and Rural Centers shown on the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives Land Use Diagrams also feature historic communities. The identification of Community Regions and Rural Centers in the General Plan alternatives serves to identify those areas where the staff believes specific land use policies should apply (or not apply). There are no General Plan policies

that would preclude historic communities not identified as Community Regions or Rural Centers from retaining a sense of identity.

The list of Community Regions in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative differs from the list in the 1996 General Plan Alternative in only one way: the Tahoe Basin Community Regions were eliminated because the entire basin is identified as Adopted Plan in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, thus negating the need to identify specific communities. The list of Rural Centers in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative differs in that it includes three communities that were not identified in the 1996 General Plan Alternative (Camino Heights, Omo Ranch and Sierra Springs) and excludes one community, Nashville (Nashville was eliminated because, after application of Policy LU-1b, there were no parcels having densities allowed in Rural Centers). The size of Community Regions and Rural Centers in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative differ from those in the 1996 General Plan Alternative due to the proposed changes in land use patterns and accompanying allowable land use designations within Community Regions and Rural Centers.

One of the intents of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is to reduce density in the more rural areas and to concentrate development in existing, larger community areas while maintaining adequate community separation. Accordingly, the list of Community Regions in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is smaller than both the 1996 General Plan Alternative and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, including only those communities that currently have the most extensive infrastructure. Two communities that are considered Community Regions in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, Camino/Pollock Pines and Georgetown, are considered Rural Centers in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative because infrastructure is currently at levels below that of the identified Community Regions (e.g., public sewer service is not available). The list of Rural Centers in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is also smaller with the intent of limiting expansion of more intensive residential development in some of the more rural areas of the County. As noted, the staff recognizes that there may indeed be historic communities in some areas where Rural Centers are not identified. However, in keeping with the intent of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the staff did not identify extensive or numerous areas for future high intensity development associated with those historic communities.

Response to Comment 261-18 (GP): Policy LU-1a of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives directs new medium-density, multifamily, commercial and industrial development to the Community Regions and Rural Centers, and is intended to limit that type of development outside of those areas. It does not prohibit all commercial development in the Rural Regions. Nothing in this policy precludes appropriate support services for agriculture and forestry, as provided in the Ranch Marketing Ordinance and TPZ zone. The policy has been revised, however, to more clearly articulate the intent, which was to direct higher intensity development to Community Regions and Rural Centers and prohibit the stated land use *designations*

(emphasis added) in the Rural Regions. Revised policy text is contained in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 261-19 (GP): The commenter's opposition to the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is noted.

Response to Comment 261-20 (GP): Although the 1996 General Plan Alternative contains policies related to Planned Communities, there are no longer any lands within the County so designated. The reason for this is that of the three specific development proposals that were identified in the final version of the 1996 General Plan (Carson Creek, The Promontory, and Pilot Hill Ranch), two have been approved and are now designated AP, Adopted Plan, and the third has been abandoned due to irresolvable issues (the property subsequently sold). A fourth planned community designation was applied as an overlay to the Missouri Flat area. That designation is no longer necessary due to the adoption of the Master Circulation and Financing Plan by the Board of Supervisors. The policies relating to planned communities were inadvertently retained in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives (Objective 2.1.4 and the policies under that Objective and Policy 2.2.2.6) and have been removed as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the maintenance of planning flexibility are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. It should be noted, however, that all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives encourage and provide for the utilization of planned developments, clustering, and mixed uses, and contain policies promoting tourism.

Response to Comment 261-21 (GP): The commenters' support of the 1996 General Plan Alternative Circulation Element is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 261-22 (GP): The commenters' preference for the Circulation Plan included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The General Plan Alternative documents and the EIR provide for circulation systems that are compatible with the proposed land uses associated with each alternative. In some cases, traffic impacts are significant and unavoidable. This is true of all the alternatives, including the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

Response to Comment 261-23 (GP): The County has not adopted a single set of circulation goals and objectives. Rather, each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives has Circulation Element goals and policies. Many of the same policies occur in each alternative (e.g., the Measure Y policies, the limited number of roads allowed to operate at LOS F), but there are some fundamental differences in the policy sets as well.

As noted by the commenter, one such difference is in the timing of roadway infrastructure improvements required as a result of new development. While all of the alternatives require the funding of such improvements concurrent with growth, the required timing of actual infrastructure installation differs. Under the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, actual construction does not have to occur before construction of the development project that is resulting in the need for the improvement (under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, building permits for development projects cannot be issued until the infrastructure improvement is in place).

Response to Comment 261-24 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is premised on a County position that U.S. Highway 50 should remain at six-lanes, however Caltrans ultimately controls this facility. Goal TC-0 and Policy TC-Oa recognize U.S. Highway 50 is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and that the County cannot limit the expansion of the Highway if Caltrans should undertake to widen it beyond the six lanes.

The commenter is correct that limiting U.S. Highway 50 to only six lanes will increase congestion and delays. This was identified in the EIR as a significant impact – Impact 5.4-1. Also, please refer to Responses to Comments 97-2 and 97-7.

Response to Comment 261-25 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and the Environmentally Constrained Alternatives do not restrict roadway improvements. Please refer to Response to Comment 261-22. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, U.S. Highway 50 is assumed to remain at six-lanes, however Caltrans ultimately controls this facility (please refer to Response to Comment 261-24). All the General Plan alternatives address the need to make road safety improvements in those locations needing such improvements.

Additionally, all the General Plan alternatives call for revisions to the County's Design and Improvements Manual and Standard Plans and enforcement of revised roadway standards, including those related to roadway safety. Please see Implementation Measure TC-C in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. It is also implied in the policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives under Objective 3.1.2 and Policy 3.1.2.1.

Response to Comment 261-26 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and the Environmentally Constrained Alternatives include a policy that directs the "fair" distribution of housing to serve all income groups throughout the County. Ultimately what is determined to be "fair" may not necessarily be "equal". All four equal-weight General Plan alternatives contain approximately the same forecasted housing levels in the western portion of the County for 2025. This fact is recognized, however, additional housing for all income groups may be constructed in other areas. Please refer also to Response to Comment 261-33.

LETTER 255: ANONYMOUS

Response to Comment 255-1 (GP): The commenter provides a summary of the General Plan process and support for adopting a Plan that returns land use authority to the Board of Supervisors. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 255-2 (GP): The commenter expresses support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 256: BARRY WASSERMAN, MEASURE Y COMMITTEE

Response to Comment 256-1 (EIR): Funding issues related to roadway improvements are discussed in Impact 5.4-3 of the EIR. That discussion explains that the concurrency policies of the various General Plan alternatives will preclude major development projects from proceeding in advance of roadway improvements but that LOS standards could be exceeded by traffic generated by projects not subject to those concurrency policies. Section 5.4 of Volume 1 of the EIR also describes funding shortfalls that could limit the County's ability to pay for future roadway improvement costs. Please refer also to Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 256-2 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 256-1. If funding shortfalls remain and the contemplated roadway improvements are not constructed, the concurrency policies of the General Plan alternatives would preclude approval of major development projects until the improvements are funded. As discussed in Impact 5.4-3, however, these policies would not stop all development and the development that is allowed to proceed could result in traffic levels that exceed the established level of service standards until funding for roadway improvements becomes available.

Response to Comment 256-3 (EIR): The EIR evaluated the impacts of the proposed General Plan alternatives, three of which included an eight-lane U.S. Highway 50 and one of which included a six-lane U.S. Highway 50. The EIR also evaluated the impacts that could occur if development proceeds in advance of transportation improvements. Please refer to Response to Comment 256-2.

Response to Comment 256-4 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 256-1. The commenter's opinion is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 256-5 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 256-2.

Response to Comment 256-6 (EIR): The issues associated with the feasibility of widening U.S. Highway 50 to eight lanes are discussed in Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 256-7 (EIR): The General Plan alternatives were developed in a process that analyzed the proposed land use plans of each alternative and identified the roadway improvements necessary to accommodate the land use plan within the LOS policies established under each General Plan alternative. The outcome of this analysis process was a list of needed roadway improvements, which are proposed to be constructed (except in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative) as part of the General Plan and include the widening of U.S. Highway 50 to include eight mainline lanes for some segments (three mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction). All four equal-weight General Plan alternatives include enough land use development to generate

peak hour traffic volumes on U.S. Highway 50 that create the need for eight lanes given the LOS policies of each alternative. Despite this level of demand, the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative constrains U.S. Highway 50 to six lanes.

CEQA requires the County to evaluate the impacts of the alternatives proposed. In this case that involved analyzing an eight-lane U.S. Highway 50 for three of the alternatives and a six-lane U.S. Highway 50 for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative. The latter analysis demonstrates the impacts that could occur if U.S. Highway 50 is not widened and limited development (i.e., no subdivisions of five units or more) is allowed to proceed. If more extensive development were allowed and the concurrency policies in the alternatives were not applied, the levels of service on U.S. Highway 50 would be worse than projected for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative. Please refer also to Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 256-8 (EIR): Master Response 14 addresses the individual points raised in this comment with the exception of the point raised about the potential obstacle of air quality conformity affecting the widening of U.S. Highway 50 and current political opposition, which is addressed in this response. Also, this response elaborates on the issue of funding specifically for widening U.S. Highway 50.

Federal air quality conformity requirements can affect a region’s ability to build transportation improvements, especially mixed-flow freeway lanes if an area is designated as nonattainment. If El Dorado County pursues the widening of U.S. Highway 50 to eight lanes, then the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) will have to incorporate this improvement and be tested for air quality conformity. Air quality conformity is conducted for federally-funded projects prior to approval of federal fund allocation. Until this action occurs, it would be premature to draw any conclusions about whether including a U.S. Highway 50 widening project into the MTP would be positive or negative in terms of air quality conformity.

With regard to funding for U.S. Highway 50, Impact 5.4-3 and Master Response 13 provide a direct response to the potential uncertainty associated with providing complete funding for all roadway improvements included in the circulation diagrams of the General Plan alternatives. However, it should be recognized that widening U.S. Highway 50 to eight lanes could be the sole responsibility of new development. The concurrency policies in each of the General Plan alternatives require that new development pay the full cost of improvements necessary to mitigate their impacts. This requirement is also consistent with the legal limitations of impact fee nexus requirements. Therefore, funding specifically for U.S. Highway 50 improvements could be considered more certain than the overall roadway improvement funding picture that includes issues associated with existing deficiencies and concurrency.

Regarding political opposition within the Sacramento Region, it is acknowledged that there is currently some opposition to the additional freeway lanes in Sacramento County. While

this is a current view, it is speculative to assume such opposition will remain over the life of the General Plan, or if it alone would halt any plans for widening, should they be proposed.

Response to Comment 256-9 (EIR): The EIR recognizes the uncertainty of mitigation for roadway LOS impacts as discussed in Impacts 5.4-1 and 5.4-3 and their associated mitigation measures. The recommended policy options are discussed in the responses below.

“Option #1—New Policy” recommended by the commenter can be considered by the Board of Supervisors for inclusion in the General Plan. It would have a similar effect as Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(b) in the EIR (requiring a General Plan conformity review for ministerial projects). As noted by the commenter, it would not necessarily reduce the LOS impacts to less than significant because of the level of development that would be allowed to proceed in the absence of the required finding and may result in secondary impacts resulting from development occurring in more remote areas to avoid LOS impacts. This result could cause an increase in trip lengths and vehicle miles of travel, which may cause higher air pollution emissions.

Response to Comment 256-10 (EIR): This policy option is similar in approach to Policy TC-1i in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative that requires that prior to issuance of building permits for a project that will worsen traffic, the developer must either construct the necessary roadway improvements or ensure that funding is encumbered and the projects are programmed. Policy TC-1i would be applied on a project-by-project basis based on the specific improvements needed to avoid a substandard LOS arising from that project. The proposed policy option would take a broader approach and require that funding be available and the improvements programmed for the entire circulation system prior to approval of any project of five units or more. The policy would also require that the circulation system be consistent with the regional plans as listed in the MTP. Because of the current funding situation this policy would preclude approval of any project of five units or more until the funding implementation measures in the General Plan have been implemented. Until this funding is in place, approval of projects of five units or more would be prohibited even where there is remaining existing capacity sufficient to accommodate those projects. As noted by the commenter this policy would not avoid significant impacts to LOS attributable to projects of fewer than five units and nonresidential development.

Response to Comment 256-11 (EIR): The comment suggests that if the proposed Policy Option 1 were adopted as part of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative, major subdivisions could be permitted following adoption of a fully funded and regionally consistent road system. Because that alternative contemplates maintaining U.S. Highway 50 at no more than six lanes, however, major subdivisions could not be allowed. Traffic expected to be generated under this alternative, even with Policy LU-1b (allowing creation of no more than four parcels from any existing parcels in the County) would lead to Levels of Service below E on U.S. Highway 50.

Because this approach still allows sufficient development to cause a need for eight lanes on U.S. Highway 50, the County’s only options in this situation are to modify the LOS policies to allow the LOS F conditions or to apply an even more restrictive growth control policy such as that contained in Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) of the EIR. Please refer also to Master Responses 13, 14, and 15.

If the proposed policy were added to a General Plan alternative other than the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative, it would have the effect of constraining development in a manner similar to that alternative until such time as funding for widening of U.S. Highway 50 and other roadway improvement projects has been identified and the improvements included in the MTP and other relevant planning documents.

Response to Comments 256-12 (EIR): As noted by the commenter, Policy Option #2 is more restrictive than Policy Option 1. It would preclude all discretionary development until the specified conditions are satisfied. If Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) (proposing a General Plan conformity review for ministerial projects) is adopted, it would limit all residential development. As with Policy Option 1, it would have the effect of precluding some development for which adequate capacity likely exists. Please refer to Response to Comment 256-10 for additional information.

Response to Comment 256-13 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 256-11 and 256-12.

Response to Comment 256-14 (EIR): All of the circulation diagram improvements for each alternative are shown in Exhibits 3-5, 3-7, 3-9, and 3-10 and listed in Tables 3-9, 3-10, 3-11, and 3-12 in Volume 1 of the EIR. The listed improvements in each table can be compared to the detailed project list in Appendix E of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) to determine which projects are not currently included in the MTP. The following tables provide that information in tabular format:

| No Project Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Not Shown In The SACOG MTP For 2025 | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Roadway | Segment | Included Lanes | Lanes Required by 2025 | Improvement Type |
| COUNTY ROADWAYS | | | | |
| Bass Lake Road | U.S. Highway 50 to Country Club Drive | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| | Country Club Drive to Bass Lake | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| New Bass Lake Road | Bass Lake to Green Valley Road | 0 | 2 | Construct new road |
| Francisco Drive | El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Green Valley Road | Greenstone Road to Missouri Flat Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Latrobe Road | Investment Boulevard to Carson Creek | 4 | 6 | Widen |

No Project Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Not Shown In The SACOG MTP For 2025

| Roadway | Segment | Included Lanes | Lanes Required by 2025 | Improvement Type |
|---|--|----------------|------------------------|------------------|
| Missouri Flat Road | Carson Creek to White Rock Road | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | Headington Road to U.S. Highway 50 | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive | 3 | 4 | Widen |
| Missouri Flat - Pleasant Valley Connector | China Garden Road to SR 49 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| | Missouri Flat Road to Pleasant Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Silva Valley Parkway | Serrano Parkway to U.S. Highway 50 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| White Rock Road | Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Parkway | 4 | 6 | Widen |

STATE HIGHWAYS

| | | | | |
|-----------------|---|----|----|--------------------------------------|
| SR 49 | Crystal Boulevard to China Hill Road | 2 | 2 | Upgrade to arterial |
| | Pleasant Valley Road to Placerville City Limits | 2 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| | Rattlesnake Bar Road to SR 193 | 2 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| U.S. Highway 50 | County Line to Cambridge Road - westbound | 3 | 4 | Widen (add one mixed-flow lane) |
| | County Line to Cambridge Road - eastbound | 3 | 4 | Widen (add one mixed-flow lane) |
| | Sly Park Road to Fresh Pond | 3 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| | Bass Lake Road Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cambridge Road Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cameron Park Drive Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |

Source: Fehr & Peers 2003 and the Sacramento Area Council Of Governments (SACOG)

Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Not Shown In The SACOG MTP For 2025

| Roadway | Segment | Included Lanes | Lanes Required by 2025 | Improvement Type |
|------------------------|--|----------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| COUNTY ROADWAYS | | | | |
| Bass Lake Road | U.S. Highway 50 to Country Club Drive | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| New Bass Lake Road | Bass Lake to Green Valley Road | 0 | 2 | Construct new road |
| Francisco Drive | El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Latrobe Road | Investment Blvd to Carson Creek | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | Carson Creek to White Rock Road | 4 | 6 | Widen |

Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Not Shown In The SACOG MTP For 2025

| Roadway | Segment | Included Lanes | Lanes Required by 2025 | Improvement Type |
|--|--|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Missouri Flat Road | Headington Road to U.S. Highway 50 | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive | 3 | 4 | Widen |
| | China Garden Road to SR 49 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Missouri Flat - Pleasant Valley Connector | Missouri Flat Road to Pleasant Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Silva Valley Parkway | Serrano Parkway to U.S. Highway 50 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| White Rock Road | Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Parkway | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| STATE HIGHWAYS | | | | |
| U.S. Highway 50 | Bass Lake Road Interchange | | | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cambridge Road Interchange | | | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cameron Park Drive Interchange | | | Reconstruct interchange |
| Source: Fehr & Peers 2003 and the Sacramento Area Council Of Governments (SACOG) | | | | |

Environmentally Constrained Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Not Shown In The SACOG MTP For 2025

| Roadway | Segment | Included Lanes | Lanes Required by 2025 | Improvement Type |
|---|--|----------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| COUNTY ROADWAYS | | | | |
| Bass Lake Road | U.S. Highway 50 to Country Club Drive | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| | Country Club Drive to Bass Lake | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| New Bass Lake Road | Bass Lake to Green Valley Road | 0 | 2 | Construct new road |
| Francisco Drive | El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Latrobe Road | Investment Blvd to Carson Creek | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | Carson Creek to White Rock Road | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| Missouri Flat Road | U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive | 3 | 4 | Widen |
| | China Garden Road to SR 49 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Missouri Flat - Pleasant Valley Connector | Missouri Flat Road to Pleasant Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Silva Valley Parkway | Serrano Parkway to U.S. Highway 50 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| White Rock Road | Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Parkway | 4 | 6 | Widen |

Environmentally Constrained Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Not Shown In The SACOG MTP For 2025

| Roadway | Segment | Included Lanes | Lanes Required by 2025 | Improvement Type |
|-----------------------|---|----------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| STATE HIGHWAYS | | | | |
| U.S. Highway 50 | County Line to Cameron Park Drive - westbound | 3 | 4 | Widen (add one mixed-flow lane) |
| | County Line to Cameron Park Drive - eastbound | 3 | 4 | Widen (add one mixed-flow lane) |
| | Newtown Road to Carson Road (west) | 4 | 4 | Upgrade to freeway |
| | Sly Park Road to Fresh Pond | 3 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| | Bass Lake Road Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cambridge Road Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cameron Park Drive Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |

Source: Fehr & Peers 2003 and the Sacramento Area Council Of Governments (SACOG)

1996 General Plan Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Not Shown In The SACOG MTP For 2025

| Roadway | Segment | Included Lanes | Lanes Required by 2025 | Improvement Type |
|------------------------|--|----------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| COUNTY ROADWAYS | | | | |
| Bass Lake Road | U.S. Highway 50 to Country Club Drive | 2 | 6 | Widen |
| | Country Club Drive to Bass Lake | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| New Bass Lake Road | Bass Lake to Green Valley Road | 0 | 2 | Construct new road |
| Francisco Drive | El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Green Valley Road | Salmon Falls Road to Deer Valley Road (W) | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | Greenstone Road to Missouri Flat Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Latrobe Road | Investment Drive to Carson Creek | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | Carson Creek to White Rock Road | 4 | 6 | Widen |

| | | | | |
|--|---|----|----|--------------------------------------|
| Missouri Flat Road | Headington Road to U.S. Highway 50 | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| | U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive | 3 | 4 | Widen |
| | China Garden Road to SR 49 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Missouri Flat - Pleasant Valley Connector | Missouri Flat Road to Pleasant Valley Road | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| Ponderosa Road | U.S. Highway 50 to N Shingle Road | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| Silva Valley Parkway | Serrano Parkway to U.S. Highway 50 | 2 | 4 | Widen |
| White Rock Road | Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Parkway | 4 | 6 | Widen |
| STATE HIGHWAYS | | | | |
| SR 49 | Crystal Boulevard to China Hill Road | 2 | 2 | Upgrade to arterial |
| | Pleasant Valley Road to Placerville City Limits | 2 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| | Marshall Road to Rattlesnake Bar Road | 2 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| | Rattlesnake Bar Road to SR 193 | 2 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| SR 193 | SR 49 to Greenwood Road | 2 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| U.S. Highway 50 | County Line to Cameron Park Drive - westbound | 3 | 4 | Widen (add one mixed-flow lane) |
| | County Line to Cameron Park Drive - eastbound | 3 | 4 | Widen (add one mixed-flow lane) |
| | Ponderosa Road to Shingle Springs Drive - westbound | 2 | 3 | Widen (add one auxiliary lane) |
| | Newtown Road to Carson Road (west) | 4 | 4 | Upgrade to freeway |
| | Sly Park Road to Fresh Pond | 3 | 4 | Widen and upgrade to divided highway |
| | Bass Lake Road Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cambridge Road Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |
| | Cameron Park Drive Interchange | NA | NA | Reconstruct interchange |
| Source: Fehr & Peers 2003 and the Sacramento Area Council Of Governments (SACOG) | | | | |

Response to Comment 256-15 (EIR): The fourth paragraph on page 5.4-13 of Volume 1 of the EIR has been modified in response to this comment. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. The modifications do not alter the conclusions in the EIR.

Response to Comment 256-16 (EIR): The last sentence in the fourth paragraph on page 5.4-13 of Volume 1 of the EIR will be modified in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comment document in response to this comment.

If the County adopts a General Plan that includes the widening of U.S. Highway 50 to eight lanes, the County (or Caltrans) would request that this project be included in a future update of the MTP. The Sacramento Council of Governments (SACOG) and the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) were contacted to verify the update process. SACOG and EDCTC have a memorandum of understanding (MOU) that requires SACOG to consider for inclusion all regionally significant projects in the MTP that are proposed by the EDCTC. SACOG also stated that Caltrans projects are accepted directly. Therefore, either the EDCTC or Caltrans could submit the project for inclusion in the MTP and SACOG would consider it for inclusion in the MTP. The ultimate improvement concept for U.S. Highway 50 is three mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane from Folsom to just west of Placerville according to the *State Route 50 Transportation Concept Report* (Caltrans, 1998). Caltrans verified this recommendation in their June 11, 2003 comment letter on the El Dorado County General Plan DEIR (Comment Letter 97). Caltrans' decision to add this project to the MTP will likely be driven by need regardless of the General Plan alternatives. Therefore, the potential widening of U.S. Highway 50 could be proposed independently by Caltrans as soon as the next MTP update, which could occur especially if this improvement is necessary for maintaining the safety and operation of the U.S. Highway 50 mainline.

For specific responses to funding and air quality issues related to widening U.S. Highway 50, please refer to Response to Comment 256-8 and Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 256-17 (EIR): The number of roadway segments affected by Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) under each alternative is identified in the discussion of that mitigation measure in the EIR (see pages, 5.4-46, 48, 49 and 51 of Volume 1). The summary table has been revised to include the inadvertently omitted text.

Response to Comment 256-18 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 15 and Response to Comment 188-8. If the Board of Supervisors elects to pursue Mitigation Measure 5.1-4(c) in lieu of the other options available and if Measure Y is determined to be of continuing force and effect, then a vote of the people would be required to adopt the policy changes proposed by Mitigation Measure 5.1-4(c). No change would be required to the voter approval policies referenced in the comment.

Response to Comment 256-19 (EIR): The comment regarding the level of detail in the Executive Summary is noted. Page 2-7 of the Volume 1 of the EIR refers the reader to Chapter 5.0 (Volumes 1 and 2) for a complete analysis of impacts. As noted by the comment, the EIR discloses that Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) would have the effect of allowing six roadway segments (three of them on U.S. Highway 50) to operate at level of Service F.

Response to Comment 256-20 (EIR): To avoid LOS F conditions on U.S. Highway 50 during a.m. and p.m. peak hour conditions in 2025 under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative (i.e., U.S. Highway 50 limited to six lanes), the County would have to substantially reduce peak hour travel demand. One of the most effective means for reducing travel demand short of pricing controls would be to reduce the projected amount of future development, which is the source of traffic generation. Given that a number of residential parcels are protected by development agreements, the County would need to reduce potential development on existing legal residential parcels that do not have development agreements. This alternative seeks to limit development by prohibiting subdivision of any parcel into more than four parcels. As noted by the commenter and the EIR analysis, however, this limitation is insufficient to avoid LOS F conditions on U.S. Highway 50. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may consider further restrictions on land use to allow improved levels of service during their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comments 256-21 (EIR): Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative, Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) proposes adding to the list of roadways allowed to operate below LOS E all roadway segments projected to operate at LOS F notwithstanding the alternative’s limits on further subdivision. These include segments of White Rock Road and Latrobe Road, as well as three segments of U.S. Highway 50. The proposed revision would remove the segments of U.S. Highway 50 from that list. This would likely result in traffic levels that exceed the LOS standards of that General Plan alternative. To avoid that result, the County would need to adopt one or more of the other mitigation measures identified to reduce traffic volumes on U.S. Highway 50 to a level that would not violate the LOS policies of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative. Please refer to Response to Comment 256-20 for additional information.

Response to Comment 256-22 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 256-21.

Response to Comment 256-23 (EIR): The specific language proposed for Mitigation Measures 5.4-3(a) and 5.4-3(b) is presented in the text of the EIR beginning on page 5.4-62. For a discussion of the relationship of Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a) and Measure Y, please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 256-24 (EIR): If the revised policies and implementation measure contained in Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a) were adopted, then the problem cited with regard to the El Dorado Hills Boulevard interchange would be avoided. The new implementation measure specifically requires the County to adopt additional funding mechanisms to ensure that improvements in the fee programs can be implemented concurrently with new development, as defined by the modified version of Policy 3.2.1.4. The County does not currently have a requirement to ensure that sufficient funding exists to guarantee a delivery date for roadway improvement projects. Uncertainty associated with the County’s ability to adopt additional funding mechanisms is acknowledged in this

mitigation measure on page 5.4-63 and is responsible for the impact remaining significant and unavoidable. Please refer also to Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 256-25 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comments 256-26 (EIR): The proposed change in Policy 3.2.2.5 in Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a) is suggested to provide the County with greater flexibility in funding roadway improvements by allowing the County to use tax revenue for roadways serving new development projects either for later reimbursement or to reduce the overall development costs (e.g., to reduce the fee burden on developments oriented towards providing affordable housing). Presumably these programs would be funded only after existing roadway deficiencies have been improved. As currently worded, Policy 3.2.2.5 does not allow the County to use tax revenue for anything other than existing deficiencies without voter approval. At some point during the planning horizon, the existing deficiencies are expected to be eliminated, which will raise the question of whether to use the County's dedicated share of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds or other tax revenue to pay for transportation improvements that serve future development. To facilitate long range planning, the proposed change in Policy 3.2.2.5 would give the Board of Supervisors the discretion over decisions regarding use of tax revenues and provide greater flexibility in updating traffic impact fee or other transportation financing programs. In the absence of this change the County would need to seek voter approval for tax expenditures either on a project-by-project basis or through some other means. Please refer also to Master Responses 13 and 15.

Response to Comment 256-27 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 256-26.

Response to Comment 256-28 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.4-3 for the 1996 General Plan Alternative on page 5.4-65 in Volume 1 of the EIR has been revised to clarify that both measures (a) and (b) are proposed for adoption, as presented in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 256-29 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.4-3 for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative on page 5.4-64 of Volume 1 of the EIR references Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a) for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and 5.4-3(b) for the No Project Alternative to maintain consistency with policy references in these two alternatives. Both alternatives contain Policy TC-1h, which is being modified by Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a). The DEIR should have stated that both measures (a) and (b) are proposed for adoption. This change has been made as shown in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 256-30 (EIR): Although the No Project Alternative does not include Implementation Measure TC-B, Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a) under the No Project Alternative adds this measure using almost identical language (except for policy

references) found in Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a) under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative. Please refer also to Master Response 15 regarding Measure Y.

Response to Comment 256-31 (EIR): The commenter’s suggestion that the mitigation measures be applied to projects subject to development agreements is noted for the record. This lies beyond the scope of the General Plan process; however, because the issue of whether a particular policy adopted in the new General Plan may be applied to a project being developed pursuant to a development agreement will depend on the specific terms of the agreement in question. As a general matter, because the development agreements typically vest the landowner’s rights to proceed with development in accordance with the project conditions and the County plans and policies in effect at the time the development agreement was approved, the County’s ability to apply new policies based on the new General Plan would be subject to legal constraints.

Response to Comment 256-32 (EIR): The commenter’s view that applying Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(b) to new development and not to the development agreements would have less environmental value is noted. Because the EIR considers primarily impacts associated with development pursuant the General Plan alternatives, it is appropriate to propose mitigation for development that could be authorized by the General Plan alternatives. If that mitigation is not applied to projects approved before adoption of the General Plan, it will not detract from the mitigation measure’s efficacy in reducing impacts attributable to the policies before the County at this time.

Response to Comment 256-33 (EIR): Measure Y complicates the future funding picture of El Dorado County by restricting tax revenue to fix existing deficiencies only. This requires a more precise allocation of improvement costs between those attributable to new development and those that can be characterized as exclusively existing deficiencies. Most of the County’s existing fee programs pre-date Measure Y and are based on the premise that tax revenue through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP); (this funding comes from gas tax revenues paid by purchasers of fuel in El Dorado County) would be used to cover the full cost of existing deficiencies and that a surplus of STIP funding would be available to help offset costs for roadway improvements required to accommodate new development. As a result, the traffic impact fees are lower than they would be if it had been anticipated that new development had to cover its full fair cost of new roadway improvement costs. The commenter’s view that that fee programs should have been revised following adoption of Measure Y is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

The availability of tax revenues to offset roadway improvement costs becomes an important issue with regard to the fee programs because the County’s traffic impact fees are already the highest in the Sacramento region and could affect affordable housing development in the County. Requiring new development to pay their full fair share cost of mitigation would result in higher impact fees, which may cause a reduction in projected

development levels due to affordability or economic feasibility issues. Development levels could change enough that the future roadway infrastructure needs of the County could also change.

Response to Comment 256-34 (EIR): Policy 3.2.2.5 does allow exceptions to the restriction of tax dollars exclusively for existing deficiencies, if approved by voters.

Response to Comment 256-35 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 129-4.

Response to Comment 256-36 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 14.

Response to Comment 256-37 (EIR): The volume-to-capacity (VC) ratios requested by the commenter are provided in Appendix E.3 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 256-38 (EIR): The Measure Y policy numbers for each alternative are listed below.

| Measure Y Policy Number | No Project | 1996 General Plan | Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" | Environmentally Constrained |
|-------------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 3.2.1.5 | 3.2.1.5 | 3.2.1.5 | TC-1e | TC-1e |
| 3.2.2.4 | 3.2.2.4 | 3.2.2.4 | TC-1g | TC-1g |
| 3.2.2.5 | 3.2.2.5 | 3.2.2.5 | TC-1h | TC-1h |
| 3.5.1.6.1 | 3.5.1.6.1 | 3.5.1.6.1 | TC-1d | TC-1d |
| 3.5.1.6.2 | 3.5.1.6.2 | 3.5.1.6.2 | TC-1f | TC-1f |

Please refer also to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 256-39 (EIR): Impact 5.4-3 of the EIR raises potential policy inconsistencies for each of the General Plan alternatives. Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 15 for additional information.

Response to Comment 256-40 (EIR): In evaluating a plan’s internal consistency no one policy of a general plan controls over all other policies. The plan should be interpreted as an integrated whole. The fact that one policy may restrict certain development in order to avoid adverse impacts when that development might be allowed to proceed unconstrained under another policy considered in isolation does not necessarily render a general plan invalid. Although there is no internal inconsistency apparent on the face of the alternatives, Impact 5.4-1 in the EIR notes a potential lack of correlation between the Land Use Element and the Traffic and Circulation Element in each of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The EIR projections indicate that the amount of development allowed by the alternatives has the potential to exceed the proposed level of service standards and there are no reasonable roadway expansion solutions available to accommodate the estimated increases in traffic. The EIR proposes several alternative approaches to addressing this issue and a variant on those approaches is discussed in Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 256-41 (EIR): Please see Response to Comment 256-41. The EIR proposes various measures to address the inconsistencies identified in the EIR and, as noted by the commenter, these measures will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 256-42 (EIR): The commenter's opinion on the best approach to setting residential development fees is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. As proposed, the implementation programs for the various alternatives would allow the County to set fees in the manner proposed by the commenter assuming that research conducted in connection with the fee program demonstrates that trip generation differs by house size. A telephone survey was conducted of El Dorado County residents for the Interim U.S. Highway 50 Variable Impact Mitigation Fee Program to determine if the use of U.S. Highway 50 differed or varied by house size. The survey results showed that house size was correlated with use of U.S. Highway 50 to a degree that would allow that fee to vary. This relationship has not been evaluated for the use of any other roadways in the County and a travel survey would be necessary to collect the pertinent information to perform the evaluation. It should be noted that house size in general is not considered to be a strong variable in explaining trip generation for households. The number of persons or workers in a household along with income and number of automobiles available are better at explaining trip generation.

Response to Comment 256-43 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 5. Implementation plans for each alternative, including proposed mitigation measures, are provided in Appendix B of this Response to Comments document. The EIR contains mitigation options that would reduce the lag between development occurring and the construction of roadway improvements. Please refer also to Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b) and Mitigation Measure 5.4-3 (b).

LETTER 257: BARRY WASSERMAN, MEASURE Y COMMITTEE

Response to Comment 257-1 (GP): The commenter's support of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative with modifications is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in deliberating the General Plan. Please also refer to responses to the commenter's remaining comments, below.

Response to Comment 257-2 (GP): The commenter refers to the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative as having a weakness because it anticipates more growth than the roadway plan can accommodate. The EIR includes mitigation for this alternative that would further reduce the development potential of this alternative through measures such as making building permits discretionary. Even under these conditions, the Alternative is expected to allow more development than could be accommodated by a six-lane U.S. Highway 50. Refer to Master Responses 13 and 15 for additional information.

Response to Comment 257-3 (GP): The EIR identifies impacts associated with the uncertainty of funding and constructing roadway improvements contained in the circulation diagrams of each General Plan alternative (refer to Impacts 5.4-1 and 5.4-3). Despite the differences in the alternatives, the EIR recommends mitigation options that would allow each alternative to meet the legal requirements for adoption. Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 15 for additional information.

Response to Comment 257-4 (GP): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 15.

Response to Comment 257-5 (GP): The commenter's views regarding the effects of Measure Y are noted. Please refer to Master Responses 13, 14, and 15.

Response to Comment 257-6 (GP): The commenter's preference is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in deliberating the General Plan. The Board of Supervisors can adopt one of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives "as is" or with a variety of modifications as recommended in the EIR mitigation measures. They can also consider additional modifications as suggested in DEIR comments or even adopt an entirely different alternative. Depending on which approach they take, additional environmental review may be necessary.

Response to Comment 257-7 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-6.

Response to Comment 257-8 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-6.

Response to Comment 257-9 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-6. Please also refer to Response to Comment 256-11.

Response to Comment 257-10 (GP): Without new discretionary approvals of land use development projects, the County could accommodate enough land use development to

cause major roadways to operate worse than the County's LOS thresholds by 2025 as established by the policies of each General Plan alternative. Therefore, Policy LU-1b and other growth restrictive policies of the General Plan alternatives are tied directly to roadway capacity.

Response to Comment 257-11 (GP): For the Sacramento region, inclusion of a project in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) comes as a result of a local agency decision to approve the project and advance it to a stage of implementation that requires inclusion in the MTP. The proposed policy would change this process and instead require El Dorado County to plan for land use changes based on whether the roadway improvements necessary to accommodate the land use change are in the MTP. The Board of Supervisors has the authority to require this type of policy change; however, the County has already approved more development potential than is currently supported by the improvements contained in the MTP. Adopting a General Plan alternative with this recommended policy may create an inconsistency between the Land Use and Circulation Elements because of this problem. Correlation between the Land Use and Circulation Elements should be achieved before additional policy restrictions are added. Please refer also to Master Responses 13 and 14.

Response to Comment 257-12 (GP): The basis for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is to restrict development potential based on the desire to maintain U.S. Highway 50 at six lanes. The recommended policy change by the commenter is in direct conflict with this basic concept. The commenter's view will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in deliberating the General Plan.

Response to Comment 257-13 (GP): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 14.

Response to Comment 257-14 (GP): The Measure Y policies are contained in each General Plan alternative. Please refer to Response to Comment 256-38 for specific policy numbering. Also refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 257-15 (GP): The wording of Policy TC-1d is intended to provide direction as to the scenario under which the traffic impact analysis should be conducted in relation to this policy. No modification to the policy is required.

Response to Comment 257-16 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 257-17 (GP): The recommended policy change is not required to achieve the stated intent. Policies TC-1d and TC-1i would not be applied independently and without regard to each other.

Response to Comment 257-18 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-14.

Response to Comment 257-19 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-14.

Response to Comment 257-20 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-14.

Response to Comment 257-21 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-14.

Response to Comment 257-22 (GP): The County will apply the policies of the General Plan alternatives to the fullest extent possible. Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) is one option for expanding the applicability of the General Plan concurrency policies.

Response to Comment 257-23 (GP): The recommended policy change is not required to achieve the stated intent. Policies TC-1d, TC-1e, and TC-1i would not be applied independently and without regard to each other.

Response to Comment 257-24 (GP): Policy TC-1i would apply to all development projects that are not exempt from its application. Specifying the types of projects that it would apply to is not necessary.

Response to Comment 257-25 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 257-22.

Response to Comment 257-26 (GP): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 15.

Response to Comment 257-27 (GP): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 15.

Response to Comment 257-28 (GP): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 15.

Response to Comment 257-29 (GP): The commenter agrees with the inclusion of Policy TC-1o. No response is required.

Response to Comment 257-30 (GP): The vacant land survey is a gross summary of land that could be used to accommodate the County's regional housing needs allocation, based on current zoning and before application of identified constraints to the development of housing. A vacant lands inventory using the proposed General Plan alternative land use proposals was not prepared because any of those proposals could be changed by the decisionmakers and State housing law directs jurisdictions to base their inventories on zoning. Based on the results of Economic and Planning Systems, Inc.'s (EPS's) land use forecasts for the General Plan alternatives, it is anticipated that the County could supply the necessary raw vacant land under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus", Environmentally Constrained, and 1996 General Plan Alternatives through 2008. The EPS numbers could not be definitively used in the Housing Element because they project to 2025; the Housing Element is intended to apply only through 2008. Once the Zoning Ordinance is updated for consistency with the adopted General Plan, it is anticipated that the County may need to revise the Housing Element, including the vacant lands inventory.

Response to Comment 257-31 (GP): It is not possible to predict enforcement actions that may be taken by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) or other parties should the Housing Element be found to be inadequate. Note that if the Housing Element is certified by HCD, there is a rebuttable presumption that the element is adequate (Government Code Section 65589.3). The Government Code specifies general remedies to be applied where a General Plan or element of a General Plan is found to be inadequate. Those remedies typically involve suspension of the invalid plan and an order to develop a plan that satisfies the requirements of the law. (See e.g., Government Code Section 65754.) It is not clear whether a judicial remedy would apply to projects that are the subject of development agreements approved pursuant to the 1996 General Plan. The Government Code provides that a court may not enjoin a specific housing development if: (1) the Board of Supervisors has approved the project and found it consistent with the General Plan; (2) the Board of Supervisors has approved a CEQA document for the project that has not been challenged; (3) the owner has irrevocably committed more than one million dollars to public infrastructure in reliance on the Board's approval; and (4) the project can be developed without having an impact on the County's ability to adopt an adequate Housing Element (Government Code Section 65754.5).

It should be noted that the recent legal challenges against the City of Folsom's Housing Element were not advanced by HCD. In this case, the subject lawsuit was brought by Legal Services of Northern California, a private organization.

Response to Comment 257-32 (GP): The commenter thanks the County for the opportunity to comment. No response is required.

LETTER 258: DAVID R. CROSARIOL, COOPER, THORNE, & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Response to Comment 258-1 (GP): The commenter is requesting a split General Plan land use designation for his client's parcels (APNs 108-530-39 and 108-540-26) of High Density Residential (HDR) and Open Space (OS). Such split designations would be consistent with the proposed zoning as presented in the letter. This configuration was not included in any of the General Plan alternatives because the open space parcels were created as mitigation for air quality and noise impacts for the adjacent subdivision and to buffer the approved residential use from U.S. Highway 50. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 259: CLARENCE DILTS

Response to Comment 259-1 (EIR): The objectives are listed on pages 3 through 13 of Volume 1 and 6-1 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Please also refer to Response to Comment 228-2.

Response to Comment 259-2 (EIR): The commenter expresses support for Comparative Alternative #12, Compact Development. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 260: CONNIE DOLAN, EL DORADO BUILDERS' EXCHANGE

Response to Comment 260-1 (GP): The commenter expresses support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 260-2 (GP): The commenter expresses opposition to the No Project Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 260-3 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 9 regarding property values and Master Response 8 regarding development of the alternatives.

If any of the proposed General Plan alternatives were adopted, the subsequent required Zoning Ordinance update could potentially result in the rezoning of a number of parcels. This is true of the 1996 General Plan Alternative, as well as the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. The Zoning Ordinance update process was never completed following adoption of the General Plan in 1996, thus the potential effects of rezoning were never realized.

The General Plan alternatives are intentionally different from one another so that the decisionmakers may have choices regarding issues such as future subdivision and Community Region boundaries. For example, the restriction on subdivision under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is a defining feature of that option, as articulated in Policy LU-1b. The Community Region boundaries shown on the Land Use Diagrams of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives are based on policy direction, such as Policy LU-1b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, proposed land use designation distribution, and the overall approaches of those alternatives, which are different from that of the 1996 General Plan Alternative. The commenter's concerns regarding the potential effects of rezoning, subdivision restrictions, and community region boundaries are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan.

The commenter correctly states that the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives limit future commercial growth outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. The intent of this approach was to concentrate commercial growth in those areas supporting higher residential growth and more likely to have the infrastructure necessary to support extensive commercial development. Again, this provides a different approach for the decisionmakers to consider as they deliberate the General Plan. The commenter's concerns regarding this limitation on commercial growth are also noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan.

Response to Comment 260-4 (GP): Estimated labor needs and costs for implementation of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are provided in Appendix B of this Response to Comment document. The concerns of the commenter regarding the costs of implementation of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 260-5 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 260-1.

Response to Comment 260-6 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 260-1.

LETTER 261: DAMON POLK, ET AL THE EL DORADO BUSINESS ALLIANCE

Response to Comment 261-1 (GP): The commenter expresses support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 261-2 (GP): The efforts of this and all the commenters are appreciated. All comments received during the comment period have received individual responses in this document.

Response to Comment 261-3 (GP): The comment documents how the Letter is organized. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment 261-4 (GP): The six member organizations are noted. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment 261-5 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 261-1 and 261-4.

Response to Comment 261-6 (GP): The comment provides a comprehensive summary of why the 1996 General Plan Alternative is supported by the Business Alliance. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Estimated labor needs and costs for implementation of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are provided in Appendix B of this Response to Comment document.

Please refer to Master Response 8 regarding public review of the alternatives.

Response to Comment 261-7 (GP): The commenter's opposition to the mixing of alternatives is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 8. The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted.

Response to Comment 261-8 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 67-1 and Master Response 8. A history of the process of identifying General Plan alternatives is provided in Volume 1 of the EIR, commencing on page 3-9.

Response to Comment 261-9 (GP): This comment is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 8 regarding public involvement during preparation of the General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 261-10 (GP): The comment in opposition to the examination of all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives and in favor of one “preferred” alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Responses 2 and 4.

Response to Comment 261-11 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 4. Analysis of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives was discussed before the Board of Supervisors on June 25, 2002 with the first report of the then-new General Plan Project Manager. It was subsequently discussed in reports to the Board provided on July 16, 2002, October 22, 2002, January 28, 2003, March 25, 2003, April 29, 2003, and May 20, 2003. There is no record of any comments received at these meetings from any party opposed to the approach of undertaking more comprehensive analysis of the various alternatives.

Response to Comment 261-12 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 261-13 (GP): The commenter’s support for adopting the General Plan and the reliance on such adoption to procure water supplies is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 261-14 (GP): Please see Master Response 11. In addition, the commenter’s request that the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors consider the possible incorporation of El Dorado Hills to “ensure that incorporation can be accomplished in a reasonable manner without major future revisions to the General Plan” has been noted and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers.

Response to Comment 261-15 (GP): The staff does not concur that there has been any deprivation to the public by not making the Writ of Mandate available electronically. Paper copies have been available upon request. The staff agrees that this would be a convenience that is merited. Therefore, the Writ of Mandate has been scanned and is available on the County’s website as of November 1, 2003. Please refer also to Response to Comment 217-7.

Response to Comment 261-16 (GP): This comment introduces the rest of the commenter’s letter. Further response is not necessary.

Response to Comment 261-17 (GP): The commenter’s support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative based on how it addresses Community Regions and Rural Centers is noted. The Community Regions and Rural Centers shown on the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives Land Use Diagrams also feature historic communities. The identification of Community Regions and Rural Centers in the General Plan alternatives serves to identify those areas where the staff believes specific land use policies should apply (or not apply). There are no General Plan policies

that would preclude historic communities not identified as Community Regions or Rural Centers from retaining a sense of identity.

The list of Community Regions in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative differs from the list in the 1996 General Plan Alternative in only one way: the Tahoe Basin Community Regions were eliminated because the entire basin is identified as Adopted Plan in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, thus negating the need to identify specific communities. The list of Rural Centers in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative differs in that it includes three communities that were not identified in the 1996 General Plan Alternative (Camino Heights, Omo Ranch and Sierra Springs) and excludes one community, Nashville (Nashville was eliminated because, after application of Policy LU-1b, there were no parcels having densities allowed in Rural Centers). The size of Community Regions and Rural Centers in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative differ from those in the 1996 General Plan Alternative due to the proposed changes in land use patterns and accompanying allowable land use designations within Community Regions and Rural Centers.

One of the intents of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is to reduce density in the more rural areas and to concentrate development in existing, larger community areas while maintaining adequate community separation. Accordingly, the list of Community Regions in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is smaller than both the 1996 General Plan Alternative and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, including only those communities that currently have the most extensive infrastructure. Two communities that are considered Community Regions in the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, Camino/Pollock Pines and Georgetown, are considered Rural Centers in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative because infrastructure is currently at levels below that of the identified Community Regions (e.g., public sewer service is not available). The list of Rural Centers in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is also smaller with the intent of limiting expansion of more intensive residential development in some of the more rural areas of the County. As noted, the staff recognizes that there may indeed be historic communities in some areas where Rural Centers are not identified. However, in keeping with the intent of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the staff did not identify extensive or numerous areas for future high intensity development associated with those historic communities.

Response to Comment 261-18 (GP): Policy LU-1a of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives directs new medium-density, multifamily, commercial and industrial development to the Community Regions and Rural Centers, and is intended to limit that type of development outside of those areas. It does not prohibit all commercial development in the Rural Regions. Nothing in this policy precludes appropriate support services for agriculture and forestry, as provided in the Ranch Marketing Ordinance and TPZ zone. The policy has been revised, however, to more clearly articulate the intent, which was to direct higher intensity development to Community Regions and Rural Centers and prohibit the stated land use *designations*

(emphasis added) in the Rural Regions. Revised policy text is contained in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 261-19 (GP): The commenter's opposition to the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is noted.

Response to Comment 261-20 (GP): Although the 1996 General Plan Alternative contains policies related to Planned Communities, there are no longer any lands within the County so designated. The reason for this is that of the three specific development proposals that were identified in the final version of the 1996 General Plan (Carson Creek, The Promontory, and Pilot Hill Ranch), two have been approved and are now designated AP, Adopted Plan, and the third has been abandoned due to irresolvable issues (the property subsequently sold). A fourth planned community designation was applied as an overlay to the Missouri Flat area. That designation is no longer necessary due to the adoption of the Master Circulation and Financing Plan by the Board of Supervisors. The policies relating to planned communities were inadvertently retained in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives (Objective 2.1.4 and the policies under that Objective and Policy 2.2.2.6) and have been removed as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the maintenance of planning flexibility are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. It should be noted, however, that all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives encourage and provide for the utilization of planned developments, clustering, and mixed uses, and contain policies promoting tourism.

Response to Comment 261-21 (GP): The commenters' support of the 1996 General Plan Alternative Circulation Element is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 261-22 (GP): The commenters' preference for the Circulation Plan included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The General Plan Alternative documents and the EIR provide for circulation systems that are compatible with the proposed land uses associated with each alternative. In some cases, traffic impacts are significant and unavoidable. This is true of all the alternatives, including the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

Response to Comment 261-23 (GP): The County has not adopted a single set of circulation goals and objectives. Rather, each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives has Circulation Element goals and policies. Many of the same policies occur in each alternative (e.g., the Measure Y policies, the limited number of roads allowed to operate at LOS F), but there are some fundamental differences in the policy sets as well.

As noted by the commenter, one such difference is in the timing of roadway infrastructure improvements required as a result of new development. While all of the alternatives require the funding of such improvements concurrent with growth, the required timing of actual infrastructure installation differs. Under the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, actual construction does not have to occur before construction of the development project that is resulting in the need for the improvement (under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, building permits for development projects cannot be issued until the infrastructure improvement is in place).

Response to Comment 261-24 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is premised on a County position that U.S. Highway 50 should remain at six-lanes, however Caltrans ultimately controls this facility. Goal TC-0 and Policy TC-Oa recognize U.S. Highway 50 is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and that the County cannot limit the expansion of the Highway if Caltrans should undertake to widen it beyond the six lanes.

The commenter is correct that limiting U.S. Highway 50 to only six lanes will increase congestion and delays. This was identified in the EIR as a significant impact – Impact 5.4-1. Also, please refer to Responses to Comments 97-2 and 97-7.

Response to Comment 261-25 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and the Environmentally Constrained Alternatives do not restrict roadway improvements. Please refer to Response to Comment 261-22. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, U.S. Highway 50 is assumed to remain at six-lanes, however Caltrans ultimately controls this facility (please refer to Response to Comment 261-24). All the General Plan alternatives address the need to make road safety improvements in those locations needing such improvements.

Additionally, all the General Plan alternatives call for revisions to the County's Design and Improvements Manual and Standard Plans and enforcement of revised roadway standards, including those related to roadway safety. Please see Implementation Measure TC-C in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. It is also implied in the policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives under Objective 3.1.2 and Policy 3.1.2.1.

Response to Comment 261-26 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and the Environmentally Constrained Alternatives include a policy that directs the "fair" distribution of housing to serve all income groups throughout the County. Ultimately what is determined to be "fair" may not necessarily be "equal". All four equal-weight General Plan alternatives contain approximately the same forecasted housing levels in the western portion of the County for 2025. This fact is recognized, however, additional housing for all income groups may be constructed in other areas. Please refer also to Response to Comment 261-33.

Response to Comment 261-27 (GP): The staff is aware that “latent demand” is a locally-defined term. The range of definitions is addressed in the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives (e.g., compare Policy TC-1i in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives). Ultimately, a decision regarding the General Plan will resolve this issue.

Response to Comment 261-28 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter’s position on “latent demand” issues in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. However, the commenter makes several statements regarding project staging, increased costs, and damage to the environment. These statements may be true or not, but the documentation supporting the commenter’s conclusions has not been provided.

Response to Comment 261-29 (GP): There is no evidence that restrictions on ridgeline development will adversely affect agriculture and/or the provision of housing. Development may still occur on hillsides as long as potential impacts are fully mitigated. Agricultural lands are protected for future agricultural use through application of Agricultural Districts or the Agricultural land use designation. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the prohibition of ridgeline development and potential effects upon agricultural lands and housing needs are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 261-30 (GP): It was not the intent, nor is there specific language in either the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative or the Environmentally Constrained Alternative to suggest that mass transit can or will provide a near-term solution to the County’s transportation needs. Mass transit is only one part of a fully integrated transportation system for the County. The automobile is anticipated to be the transportation mode of choice for the near-term and likely for the life of the General Plan. However, the concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter’s position on mass transit discussions and policies in these two alternatives, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 261-31 (GP): The commenter’s support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as it relates to supporting homes for families is noted, as is the commenter’s opposition to the No Project, Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus", and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. This view will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

The draft Housing Element contains a number of measures that address the issue of fee requirements and the construction of affordable housing. Fee deferral and/or fee waivers for such development are included in Measures HO-E, HO-I, and HO-O. Additionally, a

number of measures address streamlining current processes or propose actions that could change or relax development standards, which could result in cost savings to developers of affordable housing. Please review Policies HO-1j, HO-1p, HO-1q, HO-1r, and HO-1t and Measures HO-G, HO-J, HO-K, HO-M, HO-N, HO-R, HO-U, and HO-V.

Response to Comment 261-32 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 251-5 and 251-10. The commenter's opposition to inclusionary housing requirements is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 261-33 (GP): Many types of housing can be constructed in the Rural Regions, including housing that is affordable to very low, lower, and moderate income families. Consistent with the Land Use designations and policies in the Land Use Element, densities would by necessity be lower in the Rural Regions. Lower density, however, does not mean that housing affordable to very low, lower, and moderate income families cannot be constructed in the County's more rural areas.

Policy LU-8b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives includes the words "*fairly* distributed throughout El Dorado County" [*emphasis added*] in recognition that some areas of the County are more suitable for the construction of housing. For example, the staff recognizes the challenges of constructing substantial amounts of any type of housing in the upper American River Canyon area (e.g., Kyburz, Phillips) and would not encourage rates of housing development that may be similar to those in more populated and accessible areas.

Response to Comment 261-34 (GP): The commenter's opinion regarding the potential effect of land use overlays on the goals of the Housing Element is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. It should be noted that the land inventory included in the draft Housing Element was based on current zoning. The Housing Element recognizes that the document must be updated subsequent to General Plan adoption and revision of the Zoning Ordinance in order to maintain consistency. Any potential inconsistencies associated with land use overlays will be reviewed and addressed as appropriate at that time.

Response to Comment 261-35 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 251-1.

Response to Comment 261-36 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 251-1. The commenter's opinion that the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives would severely impair the County's ability to meet State and federal housing requirements is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 261-37 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as related to the acquisition of water rights is noted.

Response to Comment 261-38 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as related to infrastructure planning for water, power, waste management, and communications is noted.

Response to Comment 261-39 (GP): The commenter's opposition to the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative as related to the provision of public services and utilities in the County's rural areas is noted.

Response to Comment 261-40 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as related to the Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element is noted.

Response to Comment 261-41 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as related to nonjurisdictional lands is noted. Please note that the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives recognize nonjurisdictional lands but do not show them on the Land Use Diagram. Please see page 3-35 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 261-42 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as related to protection for rare and endangered plants is noted.

Response to Comment 261-43 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as related to conservation and open space and the preservation of property rights is noted.

Response to Comment 261-44 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as related to geologic features is noted.

Response to Comment 261-45 (GP): The commenter's opposition to the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative as related to the economic impacts of Natural Resources, Agricultural, and Biological Corridors is noted. Please refer also to Master Response 8 regarding the development of General Plan alternatives, including the boundaries of Community Regions and Rural Centers.

Response to Comment 261-46 (GP): Land use designations shown on the Land Use Diagrams for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives are based on the overall focus of those alternatives. Please refer also to Master Response 8. In addition to the public hearings and meetings that have already been held, there are 12 public hearings planned prior to adoption of the General Plan. Please refer to Response to Comment 67-13.

Response to Comment 261-47 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as related to the separate and distinct industries of agriculture and forestry is noted.

Response to Comment 261-48 (GP): All four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives employ overlay designations that can affect development. These include Ecological Preserve (-EP); Agricultural District (-A) (No Project, 1996 General Plan, and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives only); and Mineral Resources (-MR). The No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives also include the Non-Jurisdictional (-NJ) and Platted Lands (-PL) overlays. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative also contains the Important Biological Corridor (-IBC) overlay and, instead of the Agricultural District, utilizes an Agricultural Lands designation to identify and protect lands most suitable for agricultural production. Acreages contained in the overlays vary between alternatives, but conditions or restrictions on development are contained within the policies of all of the alternatives.

The commenter is correct in that GIS-based data are utilized to identify agricultural soils, rare plant habitat, and areas containing state-designated important mineral resources. These data were derived from known sources, such as the Natural Resources Conservation Service, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and State Department of Conservation.

The Agricultural District and Agricultural Lands designation are intended not only to identify those lands currently under production, but also those that contain choice agricultural soils as defined in the Agriculture and Forestry Element of each alternative; are currently included in a Williamson Act Contract; and are currently or historically have been utilized primarily for grazing. The fact that water may not be currently available does not preclude the possibility of agricultural production in the future. Through the use of the Agricultural District overlay or Agricultural Lands designation, those areas most suitable for agricultural production are identified. This does not mean that the lands cannot be used.

Response to Comment 261-49 (GP): It is recognized that the federal government has jurisdiction over National Forest lands. Please see page 5.1-4 of Volume 1 of the EIR. The commenter's opposition to the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative as related to regulation of use of lands in and adjacent to National Forests is noted.

Response to Comment 261-50 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as related to the acquisition and development of new parks and recreation facilities is noted.

Response to Comment 261-51 (GP): This comment summarizes policies of the 1996 General Plan related to the fairgrounds. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment 261-52 (GP): This comment summarizes the position of the 1996 General Plan Alternative on recreational tourism. No response is necessary. Please note that the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives also address tourism in the Economic Development Element and the Parks and Recreation Element.

Response to Comment 261-53 (GP): The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives do not restrict current use of recreational land. Both alternatives contain policies focused on increasing and enhancing recreational opportunities. The commenter's concern regarding treatment of recreational land in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is noted.

Response to Comment 261-54 (GP): The commenter's concerns regarding funding for trails and bikeways in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative are noted. Please note that the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives also include requirements for the funding of new trails and recreational facilities.

Response to Comment 261-55 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as related economic development and land use authority is noted.

Response to Comment 261-56 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as related to economic development is noted.

Response to Comment 261-57 (GP): The Economic Development Element of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives was developed in coordination with the County's Economic Development Office. The commenter's concerns and opinions regarding goals and policies in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative are noted. The draft Implementation Plans for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives are provided in Appendix B of this Response to Comments document. The prioritization of implementation tasks is entirely within the discretion of the Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 261-58 (GP): The commenter's opinion that the 1996 General Plan Alternative acknowledges the importance of utilizing local business expertise is noted. The staff concurs that public/private partnerships are important to economic development. Implementation of policies and measures in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives will also require such partnerships.

Response to Comment 261-59 (GP): The County currently has an Office of Economic Development. Currently, that office is staffed by one individual, as referenced by the

commenter. The commenter's support for a fully staffed and funded economic development department is noted.

Response to Comment 261-60 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as related to Lake Tahoe is noted. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative do address Lake Tahoe through the Land Use Element. Please see page 3-17 of Volume 1 of the EIR and the Land Use Elements of those two alternatives.

Response to Comment 261-61 (GP): The Housing Element in each of the General Plan alternatives notes that fees imposed by the County and other public agencies can operate as a constraint to housing development in the County. Many of the fees contributing to the overall fee requirements in the County are administered by agencies other than the County. With respect to County-imposed fees, the General Plan proposes developing a fee waiver or reduction ordinance for residential development projects meeting certain affordability requirements.

Table HO-27 in each of the General Plan alternatives lists existing development-related fees in the County. None of these fees exceeds the cost of providing the service or mitigation program for which the fee is charged. The commenter identifies specific fees that have been proposed to help mitigate the impacts associated with new growth. These fees would also operate as a constraint on at least some types of housing as identified in the Housing Element. For each fee, the Board of Supervisors will need to weigh the need for the program that would be funded by the fee as well as the cost of the program.

The EIR proposes funding various mitigation programs by requiring payment of fees based on a theory that new development should be required to pay for the costs of the programs required to mitigate the impacts of that development. If the County determines that these costs should not be borne by new development, the Board could elect to fund some or all of the programs through tax revenues, special assessments, or other funding mechanisms. In some cases, the Board may decide that a particular program is not feasible due to factors such as costs required to implement the program and/or the degree of benefit that the program would provide. CEQA does not require a analysis of the economic impact of development fees but the Board will consider all evidence that is submitted to it in that regard.

The rationale for the fee programs referenced by this comment is discussed in Response to Comment 296-17.

Response to Comment 261-62 (GP): In each instance where a new fee is proposed, there would need to be a follow-up process of analyzing the cost of providing the service and examining the implications of adopting such a fee. The fee itself would have to be established by resolution or ordinance. This required process will ensure that the public has a chance to address each fee separately and participate in public hearings on the fee.

Response to Comment 261-63 (GP): It is not accurate to state that the cost of implementation of the General Plan has been “ignored”. Rather, the documents released to date have not addressed it. Estimated labor needs and costs for implementation of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are provided in Appendix B of this Response to Comment document. Please also refer to Master Response 6.

Response to Comment 261-64 (GP): The commenter’s strong opposition to discretionary building permits is noted.

Response to Comment 261-65 (GP): Table 3-5 in Volume 1 of the EIR compares the distribution of land use designation by market area and by alternative. It shows that there is a total of 49,161 acres of land with the Agricultural District overlay in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and 49,511 acres in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative. The main difference is the reduction in the size of some of the Rural Centers and Community Regions with a resultant increase where those boundaries abut the Agricultural Districts. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative utilizes an Agricultural land use designation in lieu of the Agricultural District. The total acreage under the Agricultural designation is 59,344.

The methodology used for designating land Agricultural was identifying those parcels that met one of the following criteria: 1) lands with more than 50 percent of the soil type being classified as “choice” as defined in the Agricultural Element of each alternative; 2) lands under active Williamson Act contract; and 3) lands under production as identified by the Agricultural Department. Individual parcels that did not meet the criteria but were surrounded by those that did were included in the Agricultural designation to make cohesive boundaries, as some isolated parcels that met the criteria but were surrounded by higher intensity uses were given other land use designations.

A comment on page 5.2-27 of Volume 1 of the EIR indicated there is an effort to expand the Agricultural Districts. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the potential effects of expansion of the Agricultural Districts are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 261-66 (GP): The definition of Community Region, Rural Center, and Rural Region are identical for each alternative (see page 3-18 of Volume 1 of the EIR). The boundaries of these areas do indeed vary among the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives and that is described commencing on page 3-36 of Volume 1 of the EIR. The Planning staff determined the boundaries of these areas in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative, based on the overall focus of those two plans.

The point of the last sentence of this comment regarding public disclosure and the various General Plan Land Use Diagrams is unclear. The General Plan (including all the Land Use Diagrams) has been made available in hard copy (for purchase or review), in the libraries, electronically, on the Internet. Public noticing has been extensive including both mailed and e-mailed notices. Media coverage has been extensive. Please refer to Response to Comment 67-13 and Master Response 8.

The General Plan Land Use Diagrams are available in reduced scale in the documents, and large-scale for separate purchase. They are available electronically and on the internet as well, including an interactive link that allows someone to enter a parcel number and retrieve the land use designation for that parcel under any of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 261-67 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 217-2 and Master Response 8, which describes development of the alternatives. Planning staff developed the Land Use Diagrams based on the overall goals of each alternative as well as input received at public workshops and hearings.

Response to Comment 261-68 (GP): The numbers quoted by the commenter are slightly off. Please see Table 3-2 on page 3-24 of Volume 1 of the EIR. Items #1 and 2 of the comment are addressed on the Land Use Diagrams for each alternative, which identify proposed land uses for each. The employment projections are based on the land use projections developed for the General Plan. This is further explained in Chapter 4.0 of Volume 1 of the EIR and in the EPS studies (Appendix B of Volume 3 of the EIR).

Response to Comment 261-69 (GP): The commenter's position in favor of "flexible" zoning is noted. All four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives provide for mixed uses. Applicable provisions are Policies LU-3a, LU-3h, HO-1h and Implementation Measure LU-A in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, and Policies 2.1.1.3, 2.1.2.5, and HO-1h in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. Please refer to Response to Comment 2-32.

Response to Comment 261-70 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on bicycle paths and the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Bicycle and pedestrian use constitute 2.5 percent of daily trips from home (2000 Census). Although this may be lower than more urbanized jurisdictions, it is still necessary to plan for this mode of travel.

Response to Comment 261-71 (GP): Hiking and equestrian trails are addressed in the Parks and Recreation Element of each alternative. Please refer to Objective 9.1.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Goal PR-3 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. The

Circulation Elements focus on nonmotorized transportation routes, which may also be used for recreation.

Response to Comment 261-72 (GP): Technology such as electric and low-emission vehicles can contribute to the State's goals of improving air quality. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on electric vehicles and the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The EIR proposed modifications to this approach, calling for the encouragement of alternative fuel vehicles (see pages 5.11-26 through 5.11-38 of Volume 2). Please refer also to Response to Comment 150-17.

Response to Comment 261-73 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 15. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on time horizon issues for the Measure Y policies and the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 261-74 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 2-9. It should be noted that funding information and sources are not normally included in a General Plan document because they rarely remain static for the life of the document.

Response to Comment 261-75 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 2-11.

Response to Comment 261-76 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 251-1.

Response to Comment 261-77 (GP): The Land Use Element of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives include an implementation measure directing the County to develop a transfer of development rights ordinance, as suggested by the commenter. Please see Measure LU-I of those alternatives.

Response to Comment 261-78 (GP): The Housing Element contains a discussion of fees, which would include fees required to mitigate project impacts, as required by the Measure Y policies. Please refer also to Response to Comment 94-16.

Response to Comment 261-79 (GP): The Housing Element does not include a specific analysis of the "move up" market or on the effect of building and development fees on those individuals that own undeveloped property in the County. The Housing Element recognizes that the fees associated with new housing construction are a significant challenge for builders. It should be noted that many of the required fees are not under the control of the County. Please refer to Response to Comment 94-15.

Response to Comment 261-80 (GP): The commenter’s assumption that 67 percent of all housing will require subsidies is incorrect. It appears that the commenter believes that any very low, lower, or moderate income housing cannot and/or will not be constructed without subsidies and that the Regional Housing Needs Plan (RHNP) allocation assigned to El Dorado County requires the actual construction of units as outlined in Housing Element Table HO-1. While developers often rely on subsidies to construct affordable housing, subsidies may not be necessary if, for example, a jurisdiction has other incentives available (such as density bonuses).

The RHNP allocation represents a five-year target for construction by income (affordability) category in the unincorporated areas of the County. While the County must develop a plan to achieve the target (the Housing Element), it is not obligated to actually construct every unit included in the allocation.

The possible effects of “subsidized” housing development associated with implementation of the proposed Housing Element programs, on overall housing affordability, is not known. Much of the outcome will depend upon how the programs are developed and how successful they are.

The Planning Department has, in the past, waived some fees. The experience of that department has been that the amount waived was such a small amount of the total fees collected annually that the “difference” was negligible. However, if developers substantially increase the use of fee waivers/deferrals, a strategy to recover those fees those fees will be necessary to protect the General Fund. These details can be worked into the Housing Element programs as they are developed.

Response to Comment 261-81 (GP): As noted in Response to Comment 261-79, it is recognized that the fees associated with new housing construction are a significant challenge for builders. Please refer to the “Development Processing Procedures, Fees, and Improvement Requirements” discussion in the draft Housing Element and to proposed revisions to that discussion included in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comment document. Please also refer to Response to Comment 94-15.

The County has not conducted studies on the number of mobile and modular homes present countywide in comparison to other counties. Manufactured homes have historically been one means of providing affordable housing in the County and nationwide. There is nothing about the County’s policy framework for manufactured homes that would cause the County to differ from other similar areas in this regard. The County has not conducted detailed studies regarding the relationship of fee increases and housing type construction.

Response to Comment 261-82 (GP): The commenter does not explain the basis for his conclusion that the Housing Element creates two classes of property owners. The Housing Element provides a broad range of policies and programs in the form of mandates and incentives to meet the housing needs of all economic segments of the County’s population.

Response to Comment 261-83 (GP): Between 1990 and 2001, the County issued an average of 59 temporary mobile home permits (also called “hardship” mobile home permits). The yearly number has not changed dramatically over that period (the year with the highest number—80—was 1991 and the year with the lowest number—47—was 1996). Temporary mobile homes do not require a building permit and are not considered permanent residences. Accordingly, they are not considered in analyses that project future permanent residences.

Response to Comment 261-84 (GP): The County’s Housing Element will not be certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) before the December 31, 2003, deadline for State housing law compliance. As the commenter points out, there is a schedule discrepancy in the State requirement and the current projections for General Plan adoption. Because the County cannot adopt a Housing Element separate from the remainder of the General Plan, it must delay completion of the state-mandated certification process. HCD is aware of the County’s dilemma and the County understands that the delay may result in the loss of some housing program funding.

As with other General Plan implementation tasks, the County may begin preparing for implementation prior to adoption of the plan for those items it knows must be completed regardless of which alternative is adopted (e.g., the Zoning Ordinance update). State housing law does not prevent the County from applying housing units constructed during the time it is “out of compliance” to its housing goals for the Housing Element planning period.

Response to Comment 261-85 (GP): According to best available data, approximately 700 residential parcels currently have two legal dwelling units in the unincorporated areas of El Dorado County. As noted by Economic and Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS), in their land use forecasts for the General Plan, the rate of permits for second unit construction as a portion of total building permits since 1995 has averaged 3.6 percent. EPS assumed that this rate of second unit development would continue. The County has not conducted detailed studies on potential increases in second unit development as a result of future land use restrictions. Under the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the two alternatives through which the projected 2025 housing unit demand could be fully accommodated, the rate of second unit development is not likely to increase. Whether the rate of second unit development would increase under the No Project and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives is unknown for a variety of reasons, including the desire, capability, and needs that may be associated with the construction of such units (e.g., landowners may not want a second household on their properties, properties may not be configured in a manner that could accommodate a second unit).

Response to Comment 261-86 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 261-77.

Response to Comment 261-87 (GP): As noted in Response to Comment 261-85, EPS included second units in its land use forecasting. Because the EPS forecasts were used in the environmental analysis, second units were considered in the EIR. Because of the nature of the analysis, second units were considered along with other types of dwelling units, not separate from them.

Response to Comment 261-88 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 94-15 and 261-81.

Response to Comment 261-89 (GP): Please see Response to Comment 2-27.

Response to Comment 261-90 (GP): The General Plan alternatives, development forecasts based on those alternatives and the analysis in the EIR all take into account the fact that the supply of land is finite and that much of the future development will take place on land assemblages that are small in comparison to areas covered by previously-approved specific plans.

Large subdivision developments often are not completed for single parcels, but for a number of parcels that are considered collectively. The County has received a number of letters from individuals having either a single large parcel or a collection of parcels that they feel would be suitable for future subdivision. Whether these parcels are ultimately developed in this manner will depend on which General Plan alternative is selected by the Board and actions by the property owners. The policies in the General Plan alternatives have been designed to be applicable to development projects of all sizes.

Response to Comment 261-91 (GP): The development of effective incentives for the construction of certain types of housing could greatly increase success in providing for a more balanced housing distribution. The Housing Element contains a number of implementation measures addressing incentives. It should be recognized, however, that incentives alone or actions solely by the County cannot accomplish the task and that many entities will need to continue to work together to address the issue. The Housing Element recognizes this as well.

Implementation Measure HO-T of the Housing Element requires amendment of the Planned Development combining zone district to provide incentives to encourage inclusion of a variety of housing types for all income levels. This would be incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance revision, which is scheduled to be completed within one year after adoption of the General Plan.

Response to Comment 261-92 (GP): The County has not completed an analysis of the potential financial implications of Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a). The Board of Supervisors will consider evidence presented regarding the cost of mitigations as it deliberates on the General Plan. The commenter's concern with such implications is noted for the record and

will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 261-93 (GP): Although there are many policies in the Public Services and Utilities Element of each alternative that address the maintenance of existing levels of service for water, sewage disposal, power, and other public services and utilities, they do not specifically address improvement of those services. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 261-94 (GP): Policy PS-2f of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives direct the County to work with the water providers to develop drought-preparedness plans. Policy 5.2.1.7 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives directs the County to allocate water to affordable housing projects during "water shortage emergencies", but otherwise there are no policies in the latter alternatives dealing with drought situations.

Response to Comment 261-95 (GP): Each of the alternatives identifies the site of the potential Texas Hill Reservoir, which is the only potential future reservoir on land under County jurisdiction.

Response to Comment 261-96 (GP): The County requested information from all of the water, wastewater treatment, and utility providers in the County related to existing lands dedicated to public utility uses. Where existing or known proposed facilities were identified, those lands were designated as Public Facilities. However, there are some potential facilities that may not have been identified by the utility or service provider, or are not presently owned by the utility, service provider, or public agency, that could be developed as a public facility in the future, but were not shown because it would be too speculative at this time. Please refer also to the responses to Comment Letter 210.

Response to Comment 261-97 (GP): The OS, Open Space, land use designation is used for a variety of purposes, but primarily to identify lands committed to recreation or resource protection (such as the Pine Hill Preserve system acquired for the protection of the rare plants found on Gabbro soils.) While other lands, particularly those under federal ownership (e.g., USFS), have an open space component to them, the majority of those lands have a resource extraction or production use as well as open space, and the NR, Natural Resources, designation has been applied. Please refer to Responses to Comments 107-2, 107-5 and 107-9.

Response to Comment 261-98 (GP): The amount of nonjurisdictional land in the County is just under 50 percent. This is discussed on page 3-5 of Volume 1 of the EIR. It is identified on page 263 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, and page 266 of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. This fact was a consideration in the

development of the Conservation and Open Space Elements of the various alternatives. Please refer also to Response to Comment 2-20.

Response to Comment 261-99 (GP): The commenter's opposition to the designation of more wilderness areas in the County is noted. Please refer also to Response to Comment 2-21.

Response to Comment 261-100 (GP): The commenter recites points regarding the strength of the agricultural economy in the County. No response is required.

Response to Comment 261-101 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 2-14. The vision of the commenter is noted.

Response to Comment 261-102 (GP): The commenter's support for protection of prime agricultural soils under specified circumstances is noted. All of the policies proposed in the General Plan have been and will continue to be subject to a public hearing process. Please refer also to Master Response 8. This includes the policies on agriculture. The staff disagrees with the commenter. The General Plan is precisely the place to establish the framework for an agricultural preservation program. Subsequent implementation of such an effort, if approved, would be then be guided by the General Plan framework.

Response to Comment 261-103 (GP): The opinions expressed in the comment regarding agricultural tourism are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Response to Comment 173-9 and the new policy proposed for the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. Other policies related to agricultural tourism are LU-4h and Implementation Measure ED-E in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, and 2.2.2.2(C), 2.2.5.10, 8.2.4.3, 10.1.5.4, and 10.1.6.1 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 261-104 (GP): The commenter's support for property rights is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 261-105 (GP): The Housing Element addresses the housing needs of migrant farmworkers (please refer to the "Farmworkers" discussion in the draft Housing Element and in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document). Such housing is also regulated by the state, and, depending upon the type of project being proposed, developers of such housing may choose to go through the State's process rather than the County's.

Response to Comment 261-106 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 2-18.

Response to Comment 261-107 (GP): The commenter’s concerns regarding the Economic Development Element are noted. The commenter provides six suggestions for specific performance standards for economic development success in the County that may be included in the implementation of Measure ED-A.

Response to Comment 261-108 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 2-34.

Response to Comment 261-109 (GP): This is embodied in Goal ED-1, Policy ED-3a of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative (page 305) and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative (page 303), and Objectives 10.1.5 and 10.1.7 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 261-110 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 2-36.

Response to Comment 261-111 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 2-37.

Response to Comment 261-112 (GP): The commenter suggests that the County designate and protect an adequate amount of industrial land in order to provide for high-paying jobs and to assist in addressing jobs/housing imbalance issues. The General Plan Land Use Diagrams identify 3,280 acres of Industrial and Research and Development land in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, 2,947 acres in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, and 2,482 acres in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, as shown on Table 3-5 in Volume 1 of the EIR. As described in El Dorado County Land Use Forecasts for Draft General Plan, prepared by EPS in March 2002 (Appendix B of Volume 3 of the EIR), job growth is a function of population growth (page 41-42 of Appendix B of Volume 3). Because EPS considered all of the nonresidential lands capable of supporting job growth collectively (Commercial, Industrial, and Research and Development), it is not possible to determine if the available Industrial and Research and Development lands alone could support the projected population growth. However, as noted in the March 2002 and subsequent October 2002 EPS reports, job growth between the base year and 2025 is expected at the following rates under the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives (buildout capacity is also shown for comparative purposes):

| Alternative | NEW JOBS | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| | Job Type | | | Total New Jobs |
| | Retail | Service | Other | |
| No Project Alternative | | | | |
| 2025 | 8,150 | 15,701 | 10,563 | 34,414 |
| <i>Buildout Capacity</i> | <i>22,494</i> | <i>38,176</i> | <i>26,528</i> | <i>87,198</i> |
| Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative | | | | |
| 2025 | 8,515 | 15,423 | 10,517 | 34,455 |

| | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| <i>Buildout Capacity</i> | 23,027 | 37,748 | 25,913 | 86,688 |
| Environmentally Constrained Alternative | | | | |
| 2025 | 11,384 | 18,886 | 12,411 | 42,681 |
| <i>Buildout Capacity</i> | 18,384 | 29,311 | 20,014 | 67,709 |
| 1996 General Plan Alternative | | | | |
| 2025 | 10,589 | 18,785 | 12,828 | 42,202 |
| <i>Buildout Capacity</i> | 23,832 | 38,382 | 27,136 | 89,350 |

Response to Comment 261-113 (GP): The commenter’s suggestion that the General Plan include policies to attract higher education facilities is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Policy 5.8.2.3 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives directs the County to explore the potential for attracting a four-year college or university to the County.

Response to Comment 261-114 (GP): There is nothing in the General Plan policies to preclude such a project, and a senior project is contemplated in the Carson Creek Specific Plan.

Response to Comment 261-115 (GP): The opinions expressed in the comment regarding becoming a tourist destination are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives contain several objectives in the Parks and Recreation Element (Objectives 9.3.1, 9.3.2, 9.3.3, and 9.3.7) although there are no supporting policies under those objectives. In addition, policies under Objective 10.1.6 also encourage the development of the tourist industry. In the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives Policies PR-6a-c, ED-5a, and Implementation Measures PR-C, PR-G, and ED-E apply.

Response to Comment 261-116 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the encouragement of developing “niche economics” are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 262: GERALD M. GARVIN, EL DORADO COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Response to Comment 262-1 (GP): The comment is an introduction by the author. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment 262-2 (GP): The commenter expresses support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 262-3 (GP): The commenter proposes “an aggressive Economic Development Program” to start immediately. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 262-4 (GP): The commenter provides a summary of the elements of and process for their proposed economic development program. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 262-5 (GP): The commenter identifies four key issues to be addressed in the proposed Economic Development Plan: advisory committee; guiding principles; staffing; and redevelopment zones. The commenter recommends immediate action. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 263: NORMAN A. KRIZL, EL DORADO COUNTY FARM BUREAU

Response to Comment 263-1 (GP/EIR): The time taken by the Farm Bureau to comment on the General Plan and the EIR is appreciated. Responses have been provided below to the comments on the NOP and the previously released draft plan documents, as well as the DEIR.

Response to Comment 263-2 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding an "Agriculture-Constrained Alternative" are noted for the record. Each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives includes substantial policies and protections related to agriculture. It is not possible to discern from this comment how an agriculture-constrained alternative would be configured and how it would differ from the alternatives already included.

Response to Comment 263-3 (GP): It is recognized that reviewing four alternatives and an EIR that analyzes each in an equal-weight manner is complex. While the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives contain a number of policies with specific details, the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives defer many of those details to the implementing ordinances, with general direction and guidance provided in the policy language. These implementing ordinances will be developed with public input and be provided with the "daylight" recommended in the comment.

Response to Comment 263-4 (GP): A deed restriction provision of the Right to Farm Ordinance is included in each of the alternatives, as Policy 8.1.3.3 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and in Implementation Measure AF-A in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 263-5 (GP): The establishment of the Agricultural Districts and Agricultural land use designation are based on several criteria, including existing agricultural use and future potential use (Policy 8.1.1.2 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policy AF-1a in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives).

Response to Comment 263-6 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 248-5.

Response to Comment 263-7 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 248-6.

Response to Comment 263-8 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 248-7.

Response to Comment 263-9 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 248-8.

Response to Comment 263-10 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 248-9.

Response to Comment 263-11 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the need for support of agricultural land protection and development of future water supplies are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-12 (GP): Agriculture is reflected in the vision statements on page 8 of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 263-13 (GP): While no one specific vision statement addresses all of the suggested language reflecting the importance of agriculture, several of the statements in each of the alternatives (see pages 8 and 9 of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, and pages 3-8 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives) reflect these concerns.

Response to Comment 263-14 (GP): The commenter's opinion that agricultural operations enhance the County's scenic beauty is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-15 (GP): The text labeled "plan strategies " is only found in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives (page 6). These strategies were not changed from what was adopted as part of the General Plan in 1996. While not specific, the retention of natural resources includes agricultural lands. Numerous policies in each of the alternatives further this vision, with the strategy implicit in the concentration of new development in Community Regions and Rural Centers (Policies 2.1.1.2, 2.1.2.2, 2.2.2.2, 8.1.1.1 and all policies under Objective 8.1.3 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and Policies LU-1a, LU-2a, LU-2b, LU-2c, LU-4a, LU-4d, LU-4f [4e and 4g in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative] and AF-1e in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives).

Response to Comment 263-16 (GP): The commenter's suggestion that the Agriculture and Forestry Principle be modified to recognize the resource-based economy is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-17 (GP): The commenter's suggestion that Goal 8.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives be modified is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-18 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding prioritizing agricultural uses and activities are noted for the record and

will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-19 (GP): While the California Department of Fish and Game has jurisdiction over management of fish and wildlife resources, activities approved or carried out by the County can have a significant impact on those resources. That is the reason there are goals and policies included in the Conservation and Open Space Element of each alternative addressing fish and wildlife habitat.

Response to Comment 263-20 (GP): The future Road Improvement Capital Improvement Program (CIP) will be based on a variety of factors including, but not limited to, the number of people served by the improvements. Other factors will include the need to provide safe roads, access to all users, emergency access needs, funding availability, etc. The CIP, and its future revisions, will be adopted by the Board of Supervisors based on the priorities established in a public process.

Response to Comment 263-21 (GP): The phrase "topographical and other features" was removed from the prior draft of Policy AF-1a of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 263-22 (GP): Policy AF-1a of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives no longer contains the reference to the Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 263-23 (GP): The disclosure requirement as provided in the Right to Farm Ordinance has been moved to Implementation Measure AF-A in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 263-24 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding a threshold of significance for loss of agricultural land (now Implementation Measure AF-F in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives) are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-25 (GP): The discussion of water resources in the Public Services and Utilities Element of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives (page 210 and 208 respectively) indicate that 25 percent of EID's water went to irrigation and 70.5 percent of GDPUD's water was delivered to agricultural users. Additional data are available in the Draft Water Resources Development and Management Plan (Eco:Logic for the El Dorado County Water Agency, June 2003).

Response to Comment 263-26 (GP): The policy referenced in this comment has been deleted from the alternatives.

Response to Comment 263-27 (GP): The reference to mining activities in policies in the Agriculture and Forestry Element has been removed from the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 263-28 (GP): Chapter 17.44 of the El Dorado County Code is entitled the "Timberland *Preserve* Zone (TPZ) District" (emphasis added). When the revised Zoning Ordinance, pursuant to Implementation Measure LU-A, AF-A, and AF-H of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives is prepared, modification of the district from preserve to production is appropriate.

Response to Comment 263-29 (GP): The policy referenced in this comment was not carried into the draft Environmentally Constrained or Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 263-30 (GP): The policy referenced in this comment was not carried into the draft Environmentally Constrained or Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 263-31 (GP): The policy referenced in this comment was not carried into the draft Environmentally Constrained or Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. However, Policy 8.3.1.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives references specific soil types suitable for the production of timber.

Response to Comment 263-32 (GP): The 3000-foot elevation threshold is provided as a general rule that certain lands above that elevation and otherwise meeting the qualifications as timberland for special setbacks and minimum parcel sizes in order to protect productive timberland (Policy 8.3.1.3 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives). That threshold was lowered to the 2500 foot elevation in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives (Implementation Measure AF-a). This change is consistent with providing choices to the decisionmakers.

Response to Comment 263-33 (GP): The General Plan alternatives contain a number of policies protective of forestry (see the Agriculture and Forestry Element of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives). The EIR evaluated potential threats to forestry and concluded that the impact was less than significant. Operationally, agriculture and forestry share similar features, but the frequency of harvest is significantly different.

Response to Comment 263-34 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 263-32.

Response to Comment 263-35 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 248-5.

Response to Comment 263-36 (GP): Subsequent to General Plan adoption, the Zoning Ordinance must be revised so that it is consistent with the adopted General Plan. Please see the Implementation Plans contained in Appendix B of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 263-37 (GP): Drought preparedness is addressed in the Public Services and Utilities Element under the heading of Water Supply in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, but is not addressed explicitly in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. Fire protection is addressed in the Health, Safety, and Noise Element of all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 263-38 (GP): Fire protection policies of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives have been revised and renumbered, and are now under Goal HS-2. Implementation Measure HS-B directs the County to work with the Fire Safe Council and fire protection agencies to develop a wildfire safety plan.

Response to Comment 263-39 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding encouragement of fire fuel reduction programs are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. This is covered under Policy HS-3a and Implementation Measure HS-B in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 263-40 (GP): Soils are a geological resource and it is appropriate to reference this in the Conservation and Open Space Element (Policy CO-1a) as well as the Agriculture and Forestry Element.

Response to Comment 263-41 (GP): Please refer to Policy CO-1d in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives as released in April 2003. Policy CO-1d would only affect disturbance of slopes greater than 30 percent where hazards can not be reduced to acceptable levels. In the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, disturbance of slopes greater than 30 percent is prohibited in the -IBC overlay except under limited circumstances (Policy CO-1e), in order to protect sensitive biological resources. The commenter's opposition to these policies is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations. Please refer to Response to Comment 280-107 for further discussion.

Response to Comment 263-42 (GP): Water supply issues were moved from the Conservation and Open Space Element to the Public Services and Utilities Element in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. It is acknowledged that many agricultural operators are utilizing irrigation management systems and other water conservation techniques. Policy PS-3a is intended to encourage others to adopt similar efforts.

Response to Comment 263-43 (GP): Rivers have been recognized as an important County feature under Goal CO-3 of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives. Drought protection is discussed in the Public Services and Utilities Element and fire protection in the Health, Safety, and Noise Element.

Response to Comment 263-44 (GP): The creation of guidelines, as set forth in Implementation Measure CO-B of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, will necessitate the creation of definitions and thresholds for the types of water features that will be protected by buffers and other measures.

Response to Comment 263-45 (GP): By their very nature aesthetic concerns are somewhat subjective. Please see the policies as they were revised in the public release drafts dated April 2003.

Response to Comment 263-46 (GP): Most standards contain a minimum or maximum requirement (i.e. minimum setback or maximum coverage). If a project exceeds the minimum replacement requirement, such as 1.2:1, it would still be in compliance with the "minimum" standard. Specific replacement requirements have been removed from the Conservation and Open Space Element of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives; however, they are contained in several Mitigation Measures in the EIR [5.12-1(e) and 5.12-1(f)].

Response to Comment 263-47 (GP): Implementation Measure CO-I directs the County to develop an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan. This replaces the previous draft's requirements for a habitat conservation plan. The development of that plan will be a public process including final adoption by the Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 263-48 (GP): Policy CO-5e is the current policy in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives that addresses special status species. The phrase "suspected to support special status species" was only contained in earlier drafts of the policies and revised in the final draft dated April 2003 to "areas known or having the potential to support special status species".

Response to Comment 263-49 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 263-47.

Response to Comment 263-50 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 263-47.

Response to Comment 263-51 (GP): The prior policy from earlier drafts has been amended and is no longer a part of either the Environmentally Constrained or the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 263-52 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 263-47.

Response to Comment 263-53 (GP): The commenter is correct that invasive plant eradication and management programs exist and are run by the Agricultural Department.

Response to Comment 263-54 (GP): The Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives have dropped objectives under each goal and added implementation programs to each element.

Response to Comment 263-55 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 248-5.

Response to Comment 263-56 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 248-5.

Response to Comment 263-57 (GP): Visual appeal is, by its nature, subjective and therefore subject to interpretation by those making the determination. Final determination of any visual resources pursuant to the policies under Goal LU-6 and Implementation Measure LU-F in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives and Objective 7.5.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives will be made by the Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 263-58 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 248-5.

Response to Comment 263-59 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 248-8.

Response to Comment 263-60 (GP): The draft plan documents that have resulted in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives have been modified since this comment was written, to provide the general vision and guidance suggested in the comment. The list of implementation measures provides a roadmap for the County to follow to develop the detailed ordinances and standards to implement any of the alternatives selected by the County as its General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-61 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding inclusion of agriculture in the vision statements are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-62 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding agriculturalists as land stewards are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-63 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the need for farmworker housing and how the specified policies in the Housing Element are consistent with meeting this need are noted for the record and will be

considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-64 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment expressing support for Agricultural districts and the Right to Farm Ordinance are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-65 (GP): The County will be developing a comprehensive update to the Zoning Ordinance, including the zoning map, upon completion of the General Plan adoption process (Implementation Measures LU-A and AF-A. The zoning must conform to the new General Plan land use designations, and an opportunity to change the zoning to more accurately reflect the actual land use and the designations will exist.

Response to Comment 263-66 (GP): The definition of the Agricultural overlay district is to identify the general areas where agriculture is the predominant use (Policy 2.2.2.2 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and page 23 in the Land Use Element of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative). Other uses are recognized, as well as the fact that agricultural activities occur outside of the districts.

Response to Comment 263-67 (GP): The agricultural land protection measures identified in the policies of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives are expanded upon in the Implementation Program of the Agriculture and Forestry Element. The actual establishment of standards and ordinances are deferred to the development of those programs subsequent to the adoption of the plan so that those interested in such programs may participate in the process more directly.

Response to Comment 263-68 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the application of the -IBC overlay district to agricultural land are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-69 (GP): Please refer to the prior responses on the commenter's previous letters, above. Please refer to Responses to Comments 248-2, 248-3, and 263-63.

Response to Comment 263-70 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding agricultural use of nonchoice soils, discouragement of agricultural land conversion, and the need for farm-worker housing are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer to Response to Comment 263-63 regarding farm-worker housing. Policies related to the identification of land suitable for inclusion in the Agricultural Overlay District or the A, Agricultural, land use designation are Policies AF-1a and AF-1b in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus"

Alternatives and Policies 8.1.1.1 through 8.1.1.3 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. Policies discouraging conversion of agricultural land include AF-1f in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives and Policy 8.1.1.5 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 263-71 (GP): The Agricultural (A) land use designation of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative has been applied to broad areas within the County, where the predominant use is agriculture. Many of the parcels are presently not under production, but have the potential for agricultural use as set forth in Policy AF-1a. Policy AF-1b sets forth the methodology for expanding those areas. Additionally, the A designation applies to existing and potential agricultural designations outside of the Agricultural Districts depicted on the other alternatives. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the land use designation and changes in agricultural practices are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-72 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding water for agriculture are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 210-6 and 210-7.

Response to Comment 263-73 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the development of subsequent ordinances and standards after adoption of the General Plan are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-74 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the level of detail of the General Plan, support for TPZ zoning and application of the Right to Farm Ordinance to timberland, and forest management practices are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-75 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding forest management practices and the importance of the timber industry are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-76 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding limited regulation of the timber industry and support for the policies in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-77 (GP): Agricultural development can have impacts on certain natural resources (soil erosion, loss of natural habitat, for example) similar to commercial or residential development. The balancing of these issues will be part of the deliberations and final plan adoption action by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 263-78 (GP): Policy CO-1c in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives provides two policy options relevant to restrictions on grading. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the restrictions on grading during specified times of the year (Policy CO-1c in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-79 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding restrictions on development on slopes greater than 30 percent (Policies CO-1d and CO-1e, Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives) are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. In addition, the EIR proposes Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(b) which limits disturbance of slopes 25 percent or greater outside of Important Biological corridor overlays areas unless it can be demonstrated by a California-registered civil engineer or an engineering geologist that hazards to public safety can be reduced to acceptable levels.

Response to Comment 263-80 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding application of buffers around bodies of water and wetlands are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. While federal and State agencies have jurisdiction over some aspect of streambed and wetland development, the County also plays a role in protecting those resources. Agricultural activities can have an equally detrimental effect on wetlands and riparian resources as other types of development.

Response to Comment 263-81 (GP): The primary pollutant addressed in Policy CO-4b in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives is sedimentation from exposed soils created by clearing for a variety of development activities, including agricultural clearing. However, this policy applies to discretionary development, and at present clearing for new agricultural cropland is not a discretionary activity, and is not regulated by the County. Simple erosion control measures are typically the best management practice for this type of activity.

Response to Comment 263-82 (GP): Policy CO-5e requires that a biologist assess an area as a part of the application process for a discretionary project if the project has the potential to impact special status species. It does not mandate that land be set aside as potential habitat, but instead ensures that the land being developed is not habitat, prior to

approval of the project. For example, land that has been identified as potential habitat for the red-legged frog by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would need to be surveyed to determine if it is actual habitat prior to project approval. Only if it is determined to be important habitat, would other protection measures be applied. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding application of this policy to agricultural land are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-83 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment expressing support for having the details of oak canopy protection provisions in the implementation program rather than the policies are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-84 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment expressing opposition to application of the –IBC, Important Biological Corridor overlay designation in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-85 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment expressing concern about requiring onsite monitors during ground disturbing activities to protect cultural resources are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-86 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding utilizing the Williamson Act for open space protection are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Policy CO-11a in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives specifically identifies the Land Conservation Act (Williamson Act) as a method to provide open space.

Response to Comment 263-87 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding application of viewshed and scenic corridor provisions on agricultural land are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-88 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the importance of agriculture and the impositions of restrictions on the industry are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-89 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding pursuit of water supplies and land use protections for agriculture are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-90 (EIR): The commenter suggests that the mitigation standard for loss of agricultural land required in Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(c) should be developed through an ordinance that involves public review and comment in addition to the public review and comment afforded by this EIR. Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document contains revisions to Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(c) on page 5.2-60 to clarify the involvement of public review in the process.

The commenter also suggests that the mitigation standard could vary based on the value (according to various criteria) of the agricultural land in question. Mitigation Measure 5.2-1 states that the standard shall be based on the California Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) system, which addresses many of the criteria of concern to the commenter. No change to the measure is required to address this concern.

Response to Comment 263-91 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.2-2 would place limitations on the extent of ranch marketing activities, wineries, and other agricultural promotional uses within agricultural designations. The County's Ranch Marketing Ordinance and Winery Ordinance identify these activities as promoting agricultural development, and the discussion in Impact 5.2-2 acknowledges the value of these activities. These ordinances identify minimum acreages of agricultural land that must be in active production to be eligible for promotional activities. However, these acreages are relatively small; as stated in Impact 5.2-2, "To qualify for ranch marketing activities, an owner must show only that five acres of the parcel are in agricultural production, no matter how large the parcel is." In addition, in many zoning districts, ranch marketing uses and some winery uses are allowed by right with no opportunity for County review to ensure compatibility of the intended promotional uses with neighboring land uses.

Mitigation Measure 5.2-2 is intended to fill a gap in these ordinances by requiring a compatibility review and placing limits (based on acreage and percentage of parcel size) on the amount of land that a given landowner can devote to these promotional uses. This measure is intended, in part, to ensure that an inappropriate proportion and a total acreage of an agricultural site is not converted to nonagricultural uses. The measure does not eliminate or substantially restrict the right of landowners to engage in accessory uses on agricultural land, but it does ensure that the promotional uses remain accessory (i.e., secondary) to the agricultural use of the land. The commenter's recommendation to eliminate this mitigation measure is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-92 (EIR): As described in Impact 5.2-3, General Plan policies and the Right to Farm Ordinance protect agricultural operations from conflicts with

or encroachment by surrounding uses. The impact discussion acknowledges that agricultural properties outside the boundaries of Agricultural Districts have a lower level of protection, and to some degree this is inevitable because of the greater amount of surrounding property in other uses. Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(d) has been revised to require compatibility review for all lands zoned for agriculture as well as lands in the Agriculture overlay. See Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 263-93 (GP/EIR): While there are some parcels zoned RE-5 and RE-10 with agricultural uses, the zone district purpose statement sets forth that agricultural uses, while permitted, are intended to be accessory to the residential use and character of the area so zoned. In several cases, an agricultural use has intruded into an otherwise estate residential area, and the provisions of the Right to Farm Ordinance may not be appropriate in such instances. If a landowner wishes to take advantage of the provisions of the Right to Farm Ordinance, it would be appropriate to process a zone change application, so that the public and the County have the ability to discern whether the site and surrounding land is indeed agricultural rather than residential, and the protections afforded by the ordinance are appropriate in that location. However, under the review directed by Implementation Measure AF-A, consideration of expanding the application of the ordinance to the general areas of the Agricultural Districts, as provided in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus", No Project, and 1996 General Plan Alternatives may be appropriate.

Response to Comment 263-94 (GP/EIR): The Right to Farm Ordinance exempts activities normally associated with agricultural operations from nuisance complaints. The scenic corridor protections included in Section 5.3, Visual Resources, are not intended to prohibit all visible changes within a viewing area; standard agricultural activities and changes in cropping patterns would not be subject to limitations discussed in this context. Signage related to agricultural promotional uses is already afforded special treatment in the Ranch Marketing Ordinance and the Zoning Ordinance. In both instances, Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(c) would not apply to agricultural activities. In addition, standard agricultural activities are not considered "development" and so would not be addressed by the measure. No changes to the EIR are necessary in response to the commenter's concerns.

Response to Comment 263-95 (EIR): The Right to Farm Ordinance exempts activities normally associated with agricultural operations from nuisance complaints. New agricultural operations, however, are required to consider the effects of their activities on surrounding land uses. Existing agricultural operations would not be prohibited from using lighting to protect their animals, and new agricultural operations in areas zoned for agricultural use would likely not be subject to Mitigation Measure 5.3-3(b). However, for new agricultural projects, restrictions could limit the direction and brightness of such lighting on surrounding properties. No changes to the EIR are necessary in response to the commenter's concern.

Response to Comment 263-96 (EIR): The commenter expresses concerns about the requirement that development projects demonstrate the availability of water to serve their anticipated needs and requests that agricultural operations be exempted from this requirement. Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) requires a General Plan conformity review for development involving any structure greater than 120 square feet or requiring a grading permit. This review process ensures that the project is in compliance with all applicable General Plan policies, including water supply policies, and is intended to be efficient for agricultural or any other type of development.

Availability of surface water and groundwater is an issue that affects the entire county, and many types of projects rely on adequate water supply to ensure their success. For this reason, all types of development—including agricultural development projects—must be considered for water use. Similarly, broadly applied water conservation and recycling programs (as described in Mitigation Measure 5.5-3) can help to alleviate any anticipated shortages. Because water supply and use affects the entire county, it is County staff's opinion that it would be inappropriate to exempt agriculture from having to comply with the specified mitigation measures, especially given the substantial amount of additional water that could be demanded for agriculture. In particular, please see footnote 2 in Table 5.5-1 on page 5.5-141 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 263-97 (EIR): No mitigation is incorporated into the EIR to address impacts of runoff from agricultural or other lands that may contain nitrogen and pesticides. The summary for Impact 5.5-6 identifies that agricultural runoff is subject to a Conditional Waiver of Agricultural Discharges from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The summary also states that agricultural and other lands are subject to General Plan policies, the County's Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP), and the requirements of a federal permit under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). None of these requirements are mitigation required by the General Plan EIR.

Response to Comment 263-98 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment suggesting that agricultural uses be exempt from restrictions imposed on lands with slopes greater than 25 percent per Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(b) are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. It is noted that agricultural activities can occur on such slopes, just as other development can occur, but that restrictions would reduce the amount of erosion resulting from such use.

Response to Comment 263-99 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(c) requires that a grading permit be obtained for agricultural grading activities that would affect one acre or more of soil. The commenter is correct that grading is a normal agricultural practice that is recognized by the Right to Farm Ordinance; this ordinance, however, does not address environmental impacts associated with agricultural activities. Erosion control measures protect the environment from associated impacts such as unstable slopes, increased

particulate matter in the air, increased sedimentation of water bodies, and loss of productive agricultural topsoil. Agricultural lands are subject to these impacts at the same level as other lands subject to grading.

Response to Comment 263-100 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.10-1(a), which contains the time restrictions identified by the commenter, applies only to construction activities. Agricultural activities would not be affected by this measure. Mitigation Measure 5.10-1(b) involves County review of truck routes and possible rerouting to reduce truck noise at noise-sensitive land uses. This measure could affect trucks traveling to and from agricultural properties but would not interfere with fundamental agricultural practices. Mitigation Measure 5.10-2(a) restricts unacceptable noise levels caused by new transportation noise sources; this relates to new development projects with substantial amounts of new traffic and should have no effect on agricultural operations. None of these mitigation measures would substantially restrict agricultural activities.

Mitigation Measure 5.10-3 establishes guidelines for acceptable stationary noise levels near noise-sensitive land uses. These standards would apply to new development projects, including agricultural activities. The Right to Farm Ordinance protects existing operations from nuisance complaints relating to excessive noise. In agriculturally-zoned areas, minimum 10-acre parcel sizes should provide sufficient noise buffering that the standards established in Mitigation Measure 5.10-3 would not restrict agricultural activities. No changes to the DEIR are necessary in response to the commenter's concerns.

This comment also addresses the General Plan policies and maximum allowable noise exposure standards associated with the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding proposed noise restrictions for agricultural land use designations are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-101 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(b) requires that projects that require earthwork and grading minimize erosion and maximize retention of natural vegetation. Please refer to Response to Comment 263-99 regarding the applicability of erosion control for agricultural activities. By definition, maximizing retention of natural vegetation means retaining as much as possible within the bounds of the project; this requirement should not impede normal agricultural practices. Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(d) establishes the framework for an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, which would apply to all development projects throughout the County. Actively farmed agricultural properties are unlikely to be considered important habitat and would probably not be affected by the plan to an extent that would impede normal agricultural practices; however, conversion of natural lands to agriculture could affect these resources and thus be more restricted. The concerns and opinions expressed by the commenter regarding this issue are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-102 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(e) is intended to mitigate for the loss of important habitat through both conversion to developed uses and fragmentation. Existing, ongoing agricultural activities on land zoned for agricultural use would not fall into the category of “development projects requiring discretionary review” and thus would not be subject to this mitigation measure. For agricultural activities that would fall into that category (i.e., new agricultural development projects), to the extent that those activities exhibit land stewardship through preservation of important habitat or avoidance of habitat fragmentation, they would not result in a significant impact requiring mitigation. If a significant impact would result, the required mitigation would be scaled to the severity of impact; presumably, projects with a less severe impact on habitat would be required to mitigate at the minimum 2:1 ratio rather than a higher ratio. All of these variables allow for consideration of the stewardship value of agricultural land compared to more permanent conversion resulting from other types of development projects. Exempting agricultural projects entirely from the requirement to compensate for effects on habitat, however, weakens the ability of the measure to successfully mitigate for biological impacts.

Response to Comment 263-103 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 164-9 and 268-9 and Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 263-104 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.12-3(b) requires application of an –IBC overlay to lands with high wildlife habitat values. As with all policies in the General Plan, the overlay and the accompanying restrictions would govern new development projects within the overlay area, and would not require changes to operations on properties already developed for agriculture or any other purpose. The commenter is concerned about the possibility that overlay restrictions could cause damage to agricultural operations. The General Plan policies, and revisions to those policies identified in the EIR, attempt to balance the need to protect environmental resources with the valuable contribution of agriculture to the County. No changes to the DEIR are necessary in response to the commenter’s concerns. The concerns and opinions expressed by the commenter regarding this issue are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-105 (EIR): The cultural resources ordinance described in Mitigation Measure 5.13-1(c) would not place restrictions on agricultural activities taking place on private land. The ordinance would apply to new development projects or activities that require County approval or permit. Continuing agricultural operations on private land would not be restricted based on the buffers or setbacks described in the mitigation. No changes to the DEIR are necessary in response to the commenter’s concerns.

Response to Comment 263-106 (EIR): Restrictions on activities adjacent to historic districts and sites apply only to subsequent activities, not to activities that are ongoing before or at the time the property is determined eligible for listing. Although new

agricultural operations adjacent to historic structures could face restrictions, these requirements are established by the California State Office of Historic Preservation and the federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and would apply with or without the County's ordinance. No changes to the DEIR are necessary in response to the commenter's concerns.

Response to Comment 263-107 (GP/EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the importance of updating the Zoning Ordinance and expressing support for the interim conformity review process [Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(c)] are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 263-108 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the level of specificity in the General Plan compared with implementing ordinances and procedures are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 263-109 (GP/EIR): The commenter's preference that thresholds be established in ordinances rather than in the General Plan is noted. A General Plan is an appropriate planning tool for establishing countywide thresholds and standards to ensure consistent environmental review for all projects in the County. No changes to the DEIR are necessary in response to the commenter's concerns.

LETTER 264: DARRELL BRAY, EL DORADO COUNTY FARM TRAILS ASSOCIATION

Response to Comment 264-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment expressing support for the Agricultural Commission's recommendations on the General Plan are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer to the responses to Comment Letter 173, submitted by Bill Snodgrass, El Dorado County Agricultural Commission.

LETTER 265: VICKI D. YORTY, COORDINATOR, EL DORADO COUNTY FIRE SAFETY COUNCIL

Response to Comment 265-1 (GP): The detailed comments submitted, both at this time and with the previous review of the draft policy documents are appreciated. Some of the previous recommendations were incorporated into the final policies included in the draft Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 265-2 (GP): The County has received several letters expressing support for these recommendations, including Letters 26 and 155 (Georgetown Fire Prevention District), 100 (El Dorado County Fire Prevention Officers Association), 169 (California Division of Forestry and Fire Protection), and 237 (U.S. Forest Service, Eldorado National Forest).

Response to Comment 265-3 (GP): The offer of assistance in developing appropriate standards and regulations relating to wildfire safety is appreciated. It is the intent of each of the alternatives to provide general guidance to the County and the public on the importance of wildfire safety, and develop the detailed strategies in the follow-up implementation programs (Implementation Measure HS-B in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.)

Response to Comment 265-4 (GP): The purpose of having different alternatives is to provide the County decisionmakers with a range of options. Significant modifications to the text of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives have not been proposed in order to retain their original text. However, changes have been proposed where errors have been identified.

Response to Comment 265-5 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding integration of the UBC and UFC with the types of fires expected in the County are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Development of the Wildfire Safety Plan, or similar planning efforts as directed by Implementation Measure HS-B in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives can incorporate the integration suggested in this comment. Please refer to the modifications made to this measure, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-6 (GP): The staff agrees. Implementation Measure HS-B in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives require the County to adopt such a plan.

Response to Comment 265-7 (GP): Modifications have been made to the text of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives to incorporate some of the suggested language contained in this comment, as provided in

Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. The remaining detail in the suggested text should be more appropriately included in the fire safety plan required under Implementation Measure HS-B of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 265-8 (GP): The objectives of the proposed goals and policies are addressed in Goal HS-2 and related policies.

Response to Comment 265-9 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position regarding additional language regarding fire safety issues for Goal TC-1 and two policies of the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives of the General Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. These types of specific standards are at a level significantly more detailed than is appropriate for a General Plan. However, it should be noted that these issues with road standards in high fire risk areas will be dealt with in the form of revisions to the County's Design and Improvements Manual and Standard Plans and enforcement of these revised standards. This is an Implementation Measure in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives – Measure TC-C. It is implied in the policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives – Objective 3.1.2 and Policy 3.1.2.1.

The suggested policy has been incorporated into Implementation Measure HS-B, where that level of detail is more appropriate, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-10 (GP): The suggested policy language is already a requirement of law; duplicating it is not necessary.

Response to Comment 265-11 (GP): The policies will be renumbered as necessary in conjunction with adoption of a final General Plan.

Response to Comment 265-12 (GP): The suggested new goal seems somewhat redundant, and is at a level of detail more appropriate in the fire safe plan required in Implementation Measure HS-B. Focusing solely on Rural Regions may actually limit the effectiveness of wildfire safety planning. One of the items to be included in the safety plan is the establishment of standards unique to each type of area in the County. However, Implementation Measure LU-H has been expanded to specifically include wildfire safety as a consideration when updating the *Design and Improvement Standards Manual*, and Policies LU-4c and HS-2b have been revised, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. Please refer also to Response to Comment 265-9.

Response to Comment 265-13 (GP): Revisions have been made to Policy HS-2c in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives in

response to this comment, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. Please refer also to Response to Comment 265-9.

Response to Comment 265-14 (GP): This suggested policy essentially calls for a fire safe plan for all new development in the County on lands that contain some vegetation, even in urbanized areas. Revisions to Implementation Measure HS-B provide the opportunity to specify when fire safe plans will be required. However, in order to better integrate that Implementation Measure into the Health, Safety and Noise Element, a new policy has been proposed, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-15 (GP): The level of detail suggested in unnecessary to enforce this policy.

Response to Comment 265-16 (GP): Goal TC-1 has been revised to include the suggested revision, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-17 (GP): The suggested revision has been incorporated into revisions to Policy HS-2e and Implementation Measure HS-B, rather than in the transportation policy suggested. Please refer also to Response to Comment 265-9, above.

Response to Comment 265-18 (GP): These requirements are already a part of the standards enforced in the County, and are at a level more appropriate in the implementing standards and ordinances.

Response to Comment 265-19 (GP): State Housing Element law requires the identification of the version of the various codes enforced. The dates are necessary in this section of the plan, although the text has been modified slightly to acknowledge that the versions may change.

Response to Comment 265-20 (GP): The suggested policy language is too detailed for the Housing Element policies in a General Plan and instead belongs in subsequent implementing standards or ordinances. However, the general intent has been applied to a new policy in the Health, Safety and Noise Element, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-21 (GP): The suggested policy language is too detailed for the Housing Element policies in a General Plan and instead belongs in subsequent implementing standards or ordinances. However, the general intent has been applied to a new policy in the Health, Safety and Noise Element, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-22 (GP): The suggested policy language is too detailed for the Housing Element policies in a General Plan and instead belongs in subsequent implementing standards or ordinances.

Response to Comment 265-23 (GP): The suggested policy language is too detailed for the Housing Element policies in a General Plan and instead belongs in subsequent implementing standards or ordinances.

Response to Comment 265-24 (GP): The suggested policy language is too detailed for the Housing Element policies in a General Plan and instead belongs in subsequent implementing standards or ordinances.

Response to Comment 265-25 (GP): The suggested policy language is too detailed for the Housing Element policies in a General Plan and instead belongs in subsequent implementing standards or ordinances.

Response to Comment 265-26 (GP): The suggested policy language is too detailed for the Housing Element policies in a General Plan and instead belongs in subsequent implementing standards or ordinances.

Response to Comment 265-27 (GP): Goal PS-2 has been revised, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document, to include emergency use, which would include fire protection.

Response to Comment 265-28 (GP): While not specifically identifying water storage for fire protection purposes, Policy PS-1g requires a finding that there is adequate service and utility infrastructure to serve a project. Section 1275.00 of the El Dorado County Fire Safe Regulations requires that water for wildfire protection be available in specified quantities. Many of the fire districts accept the availability of their water tenders to satisfy this requirement. The level of detail suggested in this comment is more suitable for a revision to the fire safe standards or other implementing ordinance or standards. However, the general intent has been applied to a new policy in the Health, Safety and Noise Element, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-29 (GP): The suggested policy language is too detailed for the General Plan and instead belongs in subsequent implementing standards or ordinances.

Response to Comment 265-30 (GP): Policy PS-7a of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives has been revised in response to this comment, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-31 (GP): There is in several cases in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives Implementation

Programs, some duplication and redundancy due to the fact that there is a lot of overlap between the provisions of the different elements. However, Implementation Measure PS-K has been revised in response to this comment, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-32 (GP): The suggested text has been incorporated into the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-33 (GP): The suggested policy language is already part of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives as Implementation Measure HS-B.

Response to Comment 265-34 (GP): The suggested policy revision is too detailed for the policy, however, it has been incorporated into the revision to Implementation Measure HS-B of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. Please refer also to Response to Comment 265-9.

Response to Comment 265-35 (GP): The difference in the text of Policy HS-2c was purposefully made different between the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative in order to provide the County decisionmakers with options. Development is already "regulated"; therefore, that suggested change would provide nothing in the way of policy direction. To substitute "unless it can be" with "until it has been" presupposes that such a finding can be made, and would seem inappropriate.

Response to Comment 265-36 (GP): The suggested policy revision is already included in the provisions of Implementation Measure HS-B.

Response to Comment 265-37 (GP): The intent of the suggested policy revision has been incorporated into revisions to Implementation Measure HS-B of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-38 (GP): The suggested policy has been added, with some modification, to the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives under Goal HS-2, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 265-14 and 265-28.

Response to Comment 265-39 (GP): The suggested additional text to Policy HS-3a in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives is more detailed than necessary to accomplish the stated goal.

Response to Comment 265-40 (GP): The General Plan regulates fuel management activities only to the extent they pose a significant threat to natural resources such as water quality and sensitive habitat. The General Plan provides sufficient flexibility to allow appropriate fuel management activities to ensure defensible space and address other fire management objectives.

Response to Comment 265-41 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding exemptions for prescribed fire from burn day restrictions are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. For the most part, the declaration of no burn days is beyond the control of the County, and the County has no authority to exempt such activities as a matter of course. Individual prescribed burns may apply to the AQMD for a specific exemption under certain circumstances.

Response to Comment 265-42 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding fire suppression activities are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. There are no policies within the plan alternatives that would encumber such activities.

Response to Comment 265-43 (GP): A new policy has been added to the Conservation and Open Space Element of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives under Goal CO-6 regarding noxious weed management, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-44 (GP): Standards for open space and greenbelts within subdivisions has been added to the list of areas to be addressed under Implementation Measure HS-B, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-45 (GP): The suggested new policy is already a requirement of the County for any building permit, pursuant to the fire safe standards adopted by the County. More stringent standards may result from Implementation Measure HS-B.

Response to Comment 265-46 (GP): References to the applicable new policies have been added to the referenced Implementation Measure, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-47 (GP): Revisions have been made to include low water use and fire resistance in landscaping with native plants, as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 265-48 (GP): The existing timber buffer policies provided in Section 17.06.150, and Implementation Measure AF-A in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, and Policies 8.3.2.2, 8.4.1.1, and

8.4.1.2 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives provide the buffer suggested. Timber harvest and management activities are regulated by the State, as is pesticide and herbicide use (although the latter is managed by the Agriculture Department under the State regulations.)

LETTER 266: JAN MCKINSEY, EL DORADO COUNTY TAXPAYERS FOR QUALITY GROWTH

Response to Comment 266-1 (EIR): The commenter explains that their organization will be submitting several different comment letters. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment 266-2 (EIR): The information requested by the commenter is described in the EDDCWA Draft Water Resources Development and Management Plan that was released in June 2003. The public draft of this report was not available at the time the DEIR was prepared. Please refer to Table 5.5-1 in Volume 1 of the EIR.

Regarding the balance of projected water demand and water supply, Response to Comment 211-3 describes why specific projected water supplies were not described in the EIR. Where available, project yields of specific proposed water supply projects were provided. As shown in Table 5.5-1 and described on page 5.5-35, the No Project Alternative, which would result in the smallest demand for new water of all the alternatives, would result in a potential shortage based on existing surface water supplies. This does not account for unknown groundwater supplies, nor does it consider planned new surface water deliveries. It is noted that, if the planned 17,000 acre-feet per year (afy) from Project 184 and the 7,500 afy (plus) from PL 101-514 (24,500 afy total) is available to meet 2025 demands, it would be potentially sufficient to meet most or all of the EIR-forecasted shortage of between 13,146 to 24,899 afy and could meet the lower end forecasted demand at buildout (range of forecast is 20,139 afy to 33,296 afy). The lower end of the forecasts for all the alternatives show that, if this additional 24,500 afy is available by 2025, water demands could be met. At the higher end of the range for each of the other three alternatives (other than No Project), the 24,500 afy would not be sufficient to, by itself, meet demands. As stated in Section 5.5.1 of the EIR, there is uncertainty over the extent to which these water projects and others will be available to supply water for the County's projected growth, or if sufficient groundwater would be available. A significant impact related to shortage of water supply is identified as Impact 5.5-1.

Response to Comment 266-3 (GP/EIR): The EIR provides a programmatic environmental analysis of the likely impacts that would result from development of the identified future water supply projects based on the best available information. While the potential constraints of developing these additional water supplies were pointed out, these projects may be feasible. The EIR evaluates both impacts of not having sufficient water and impacts of procuring sufficient water. Adoption of mitigation, especially Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) (requiring the availability of water before development occurs), would ensure that development will not outpace water supplies.

Response to Comment 266-4 (GP/EIR): As described on page 3-1 of Volume 1 of the EIR, the purpose of a General Plan is to act as a "constitution" for land use planning and to provide a basis for sound decisions regarding long-term physical development in the County. Please refer to Response to Comment 266-3. Planning for the short-term and

regularly amending the General Plan as water supplies are developed, as proposed by the commenter, is inconsistent with the goal of long-range planning. In addition, failure to plan for future development in the General Plan would make water supply planning impossible, because there would be no basis for investing resources in costly long-range water supply projects. This scenario is, therefore, infeasible.

Response to Comment 266-5 (EIR): The comment is unclear, but will be included in the record for consideration by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations over the General Plan and EIR.

Response to Comment 266-6 (EIR): Water demand forecasting based on population growth estimates and appropriate water demand factors, as described in Appendix E of Volume 3 of the EIR, is a standardized and accepted technique. Whatever method is used, projected demand needs to be compared with supply in order to understand impacts, and the EIR does this.

Response to Comment 266-7 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 266-2 and 266-3. As described, the EIR forecasts the demand for water based on the General Plan Alternatives, identifies current supplies and potential future supplies, demonstrates there is a current and potential (after potential supplies are developed) water shortage to meet future demands, and provides mitigation to assure demands do not exceed supplies.

Response to Comment 266-8 (EIR): The comment accurately reflects methods used in Appendix E of Volume 3 of the EIR for water demand estimation.

Response to Comment 266-9 (EIR): Information presented in Appendix E of Volume 3 of the EIR formed the basis of water demand conditions described in Section 5.5 of Volume 1 the EIR; therefore, both sections are consistent. The staff agrees that the information is complex but it has been summarized as clearly as possible in the EIR. As described in Response to Comment 266-3, the impact analysis used for Section 5.5 was based on best available information for identified future water supply projects. These water supply projects have been tentatively identified by various county, state, and federal resource agencies as being feasible. The term “paper water” in the context used by the commenter would refer to land use approvals made based on water supplies that are not presently available. Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) would require that individual land use approvals demonstrate that water supplies are adequate and available to the project, thereby avoiding reliance on paper water. Also, please refer to Response to Comment 266-2. Plan approval that justifies their need would never be available to the County.

Response to Comment 266-10 (EIR): The comment accurately reflects the description of methods provided in the EIR. The commenter’s skepticism is noted for the record, but County staff believes the analysis is clear, comprehensive, and accurate. The commenter provides no substantial evidence to support his claims.

Response to Comment 266-11 (EIR): The vacancy rate allowance used for water demand analysis is a standard assumption based on existing data. Vacancy rates can go up or down, but this range is negligible in the context of overall housing development and occupancy in the County. “No vacancies” is a virtually unachievable condition, even in highly constrained markets. Thus, vacancy rates are a negligible factor to the overall water supply and demand projections and changes to the vacancy rates would not result in changes to the type of impacts, significance conclusions, or mitigation measures described in Section 5.5 of the EIR, Volume 1.

Response to Comment 266-12 (EIR): The analysis of water demand based on households is a common assumption. Households are occupied residential units. No rationale is given to support the position that “residential units” or “parcels” would be more accurate or why use of households is inaccurate. Further, if an analysis were to be based on parcels, it would need to consider the potential for parcels to be split, resulting in potential residential unit construction and occupancy, thereby arriving at households that result in demand for water. The conclusion is the same.

Response to Comment 266-13 (EIR): Information from EDCWA’s Water Resources Development and Management Plan, which is the report required to be produced annually for compliance with Ordinance 4325, is explained on page 5.5-2 of the EIR Volume 1. Please refer also to Response to Comment 266-12 regarding parcels.

Response to Comment 266-14 (EIR): The commenter is apparently confusing the EDCWA Water Resources Development and Management Plan with EID’s annual Water Supply and Demand Report. EID is currently in the process of preparing the 2003 version of its report. Regarding the suggestion to change the method of estimating water demands, please refer to Response to Comment 266-6. The existing water demand was based on the EPS study referenced in Appendix E of Volume 3 of the EIR; 1999 represents the best available information for the demand estimation method. Further, if a more recent year were to be used, it still would not alter the conclusions with respect to existing and future supplies, existing and forecasted (2025 and buildout) demands, and the impacts of the General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 266-15 (EIR): Regarding the mixing of “supply” and “demand” methods, please refer to Response to Comments 266-2 and 266-3. Regarding the suggestion that the adoption of the General Plan be based on prior securing of available water supplies, Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) specifically implements this concept and requires applicants to demonstrate adequate and available water supplies for the development before the County grants approval. The supplies would have to be sufficient in light of the projected demand associated with both existing and planned development. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 266-3 and 266-4.

Response to Comment 266-16 (EIR): Firm yield for EID identified in Table 5.5-1 refers to EID’s definition described on page 5.5-22 of EIR Volume 1. GFCSD uses the term “safe

yield,” which is defined on page 5.5-27. The terms are essentially the same and are specific to the purveyors. Within this context, droughts need to be considered and planned for, as described on pages 5.5-22, 5.5-26, and 5.5-28 in Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 266-17 (EIR): Table 5.5-1 includes potential demand from all development forecasted to occur under each of the alternatives in 2025 and at buildout, including approved subdivisions, individual parcels, and forecasted future subdivisions. The forecasted future demand associated with approved subdivisions and future subdivisions was not calculated separately. The 2025 and buildout projections of water demand were based on forecasts of population and employment increases for each alternative at these two “points” (2025, buildout). These projections were then distributed accordingly to the major water service providers and other county areas outside of the water purveyor service areas. With a few exceptions described in Appendix E of Volume 3 of the EIR, for the GFSCD and Tahoe Basin area, the analysis was not based on parcels or households. The specific demand information requested by the commenter is not relevant to the General Plan EIR analysis.

Response to Comment 266-18 (GP/EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) requires demonstration of adequate and available water supply for all new final parcel and tentative tract approvals. Thus, upon approval of the General Plan, land use approvals subject to the General Plan and not previously approved would not “go forward” unless adequate and available water supplies were available and therefore would not exacerbate existing cases where there are water shortages. Issues associated with taxation are not environmental issues and are not considered in the EIR.

Response to Comment 266-19 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 266-18.

Response to Comment 266-20 (EIR): Regarding whether the analysis is flawed and based on a “paper water” analysis, please refer to Responses to Comments 266-2, 266-3, 266-6, and 266-9 that describe the role of the General Plan in water planning, the analytical basis of the water demand forecast, the identified future water supply project, and the impact analysis described in the EIR.

Response to Comment 266-21 (EIR): Regarding the complexity of the water demand and supply projections described in the EIR, please refer to Responses to Comments 266-3 and 266-9. County staff acknowledges that this issue is complex and has endeavored to present as clear an analysis as possible given the complexity of the issue.

Response to Comment 266-22 (EIR): The commenter’s support for mitigation to protect existing water supplies will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberation of the General Plan and EIR. Regarding the suggestion for requiring that future approvals be based on a General Plan amendment; please refer to Response to Comment 266-4.

Response to Comment 266-23 (EIR): Habitat conservation plans (HCPs), as generally discussed in this comment, usually refer to plans prescribed under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), which allows for the take of a federally-listed endangered or threatened species but provides for conservation measures for that species (or several listed species).

It is acknowledged that a regional HCP as described in the ESA can be an effective management strategy for preserving threatened and endangered species and their habitat. However, development of an HCP, as described, may not specifically address many of the concerns of the commenter because many of the species and habitats of concern are not listed under the ESA and would potentially not be addressed in the HCP. Though non-listed species can be included in HCPs, sensitive biological resources and important habitat not associated with federally-protected species have a lesser potential to gain in the way of conservation if the County's efforts were limited to development of HCPs as prescribed by law (i.e., addressing only federally-listed species).

The EIR does provide mitigation that would address several of the "key factors" identified by the commenter and provide protection for sensitive resources and important habitat regardless of the presence of federally-protected species. If adopted, the INRMP (Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(d) on page 5.12-56 of Volume 2 of the EIR) would be the primary mechanism for protection of important habitat (e.g., wetlands and riparian habitat, large expanses of native vegetation, etc.) and protection of habitat for special-status species. Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(e) (Adopt a No-Net-Loss Policy and Mitigation Program for Important Habitat) on page 5.12-58 and Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(f) (Require Mitigation for Loss of Woodland Habitat) on page 5.12-60 would also address conservation of the biological resource identified as "key factors" by the commenter. Components identified in these measures and other mitigation measures in the EIR (e.g., Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(g) (Oak Tree Ordinance); Mitigation Measure 5.12-4(b) (important surface water database; riparian setbacks) would provide protection to important biological resources in high-density residential areas as well as rural locations. Please refer also to Master Response 18 and Response to Comment 198-11.

Response to Comment 266-24 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 266-23.

Response to Comment 266-25 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 266-26 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 208-6.

Response to Comment 266-27 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 18 and Responses to Comments 208-8, 208-12, and 198-11.

Response to Comment 266-28 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 20.

Response to Comment 266-29 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 208-11.

Response to Comment 266-30 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 208-12.

Response to Comment 266-31 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 208-13.

LETTER 267: DIANNA HILYER, EL DORADO HILLS COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

Response to Comment 267-1 (GP): The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 267-2 (GP): As the commenter points out, all of the General Plan alternatives include maintaining the rural character of the County in the vision statements. This vision was developed based on public comment received during the previous General Plan adoption process as well as the early stages of the current process. It is recognized that urban development will continue; the vision statements also address balances in the distribution of urban and suburban development and rural lands (page 7 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives; page 4 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives); and in jobs and housing (page 8 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives; and page 4 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives).

Response to Comment 267-3 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Master Response 11. In addition, the commenter's opinion that county population centers should be governed by cities or other local mechanisms such as community services districts is noted and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers.

Response to Comment 267-4 (GP/EIR): The Community Services District's support of the El Dorado Business Alliance (Letter 261) and El Dorado Hills Area Plan Advisory Committee (Letter 174) is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 267-5 (GP): Based on the contents of the letter, the commenter appears to be requesting the Public Facilities designation be applied to APN 113-020-01 (identified by the commenter as 113-020-11) since there is no "Recreational Facilities" General Plan land use designation. The parcel is within the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan area and thus was included in the draft General Plan and EIR as Adopted Plan (AP). The General Plan update is not the appropriate time to address this request. A more appropriate time to address the designation of this parcel as a recreational facility would be during the Zoning Ordinance update, which will take place following General Plan adoption.

Response to Comment 267-6 (GP): APNs 107-020-22 and 23 (previously 107-020-18) were not incorporated into any of the General Plan alternatives as Commercial (C). Changing the land use designation from Public Facilities to a Commercial designation would be inconsistent because the parcel is currently used as a maintenance yard. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 267-7 (GP): Based on the contents of the letter, the commenter appears to be requesting the Public Facilities designation be applied to APN 107-146-29

since there is no “Recreational Facilities” General Plan land use designation. The Community Services District does not own the property. The County has had a request from the owner of the property to designate the parcel as Open Space and High Density Residential (split designation) on file for a number of months. The property owner recognizes the value of the parcel for parkland/open space and it does not appear that the request is in conflict with the request of the commenter. Please refer to Letter 165 for more information on the landowner’s preferences for the parcel. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 268: KATHY KRIZL, EL DORADO WINE GRAPE GROWERS ASSOCIATION

Response to Comment 268-1 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 263-91.

Response to Comment 268-2 (EIR): The mitigation measures identified by the commenter are specifically designed to minimize the impacts of future water supply development. Specifically, Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) (as modified, see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document) would implement a new policy that would require verification of adequate and available water supply before the County's approval of discretionary and ministerial developments. Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(c) would require the County to develop additional water conservation measures, which would not preclude incentives for water conservation. Regarding the suggestion for additional water storage, many of the most likely future water supply projects identified in the EIR and EDCWA's Draft Water Resources Development and Management Plan (June 2003) are storage projects.

Response to Comment 268-3 (EIR): There is no Mitigation Measure 5.5-6 in the EIR. The discussion of Impact 5.5-6 (see Volume 1 of the EIR) concludes that there are no significant impacts from agriculture on water quality and that no mitigation is required. Please refer also to Response to Comment 263-97.

Response to Comment 268-4 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 263-100.

Response to Comment 268-5 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 196-3 and 263-93.

Response to Comment 268-5 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 263-93.

Response to Comment 268-6 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 263-94.

Response to Comment 268-7 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 263-105.

Response to Comment 268-8 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(d) could result in higher costs for certain types of development in the County. However, this measure would not prohibit otherwise allowable development. As noted on page 5.12-57, habitat acquisition would only involve willing sellers. Please refer also to Response to Comment 263-101. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 268-9 (EIR): Please refer also to Response to Comment 263-103.

Response to Comment 268-10 (EIR): The EIR represents an objective analysis. Any predictive discussion of potential impacts in the EIR is based on the best information available. Regarding level of detail, please see Master Response 2.

Response to Comment 268-11 (EIR): The commenter encourages consideration of “the full range of farming and ranching ventures” rather than focusing on specific crops or types of agriculture. The General Plan takes this approach by adopting suitability criteria that are very broad.

Response to Comment 268-12 (EIR): The commenter expresses support for the recommendations in this Letter. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 269: KATHY KRIZL, EL DORADO WINE GRAPE GROWERS ASSOCIATION

Response to Comment 269-1 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 248-8 and 263-5. It has been pointed out that different agricultural uses can be carried out on less than ideal soils and terrain, yet the purpose of the Agricultural Districts and the A, Agricultural designation is to identify those areas most suited for agriculture.

Response to Comment 269-2 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding application of Right to Farm Ordinance provisions to Agricultural Districts are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 269-3 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 196-3 and 263-93.

Response to Comment 269-4 (GP): A zone change, regardless of how small of an area affected by the change, is a legislative act, and must be accomplished by the Board of Supervisors, the legislative body, through a public hearing, pursuant to the provisions of California Government Code Section 65853 et seq.

Response to Comment 269-5 (GP): Please refer also to Response to Comment 263-41.

Response to Comment 269-6 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment recommending that agricultural lands not be included in scenic corridors are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The policy referenced in this comment, Policy CO-11b of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, addresses application of the OS, Open Space designation and identifies those areas most suitable for outdoor recreation. This policy is unrelated to application of scenic corridors on agricultural land.

Response to Comment 269-7 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the level of detail for the General Plan are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 270: JOHN AND GAIL ELDRIDGE

Response to Comment 270-1 (GP): The commenter requests the Low Density Residential (LDR) designation for APN 070-210-37. This request is included in the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. The commenter notes that, under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel could not be subdivided into four new parcels. Policy LU-1b of this Alternative affected the assignment of land use designations. The decisionmakers may choose to address situations such as this at a later date. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 271: NANCY FEGAN

Response to Comment 271-1 (EIR): As described in Appendix E of Volume 3 of the EIR, assumption of no growth in recreational turf within EID's service area is based on an 11-year existing record that shows no trend of increasing demand. The commenter's statement that agricultural demand for water would not increase is not correct; increased demand is forecasted to occur in all of the major water purveyor's service areas and other county areas. Please see Table 5.5-1 in Volume 1 of the EIR. Note that the impact to water supply was determined to be significant and unavoidable (see Impact 5.5-1 in Volume 1 of the EIR).

Response to Comment 271-2 (EIR): The General Plan alternatives do not specifically address water reserves to fight wildfires; the issue of water supply is addressed in Policy 5.2.1.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and in Policy PS-2a of the Roadway Constrained Six-lane "Plus", and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. The issue of fire protection is addressed in the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the "Fire Safety" section of the "Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element" of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and is addressed in the Goals and Policies of the "Fire Safety Policies" section of the "Health Safety and Noise Element" of the Roadway Constrained Six-lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives.

In general, water use for fire fighting cannot be estimated because it depends on many factors, such as the extent and intensity of the fire, the use of chemical retardants, and the use of air tankers (which scoop water from reservoirs and lakes). Because the use is intermittent, temporary, and an emergency, its use is considered incidental and incremental to the long-term support of consumptive use by development within the County, and it would not result in significant additions to the assumed future demand (see Table 5.5-1 of Volume 1 of the EIR). Where piped water systems are not available from public water purveyors, the "County of El Dorado, Design and Improvement Standards Manual" place water storage requirements of between 60,000 and 180,000 gallons, and require fuel modification for discretionary land divisions of five or more parcels. Where piped water systems are available from public purveyors, pipeline sizes, hydrant locations, and water storage requirements are governed by the water purveyor, and the local fire district to make sure that adequate water volume and water pressure are available for fire protection purposes. These requirements are designed to reduce the risk of wild land fires at the developed land/ wildland interface, and to improve the ability to fight those fires and protect life and property should they occur. These requirements are in effect even in drought years; therefore, the ability to defend against these occurrences would not be compromised.

Response to Comment 271-3 (EIR): As described on pages 5.5-62 through 5.5-65, groundwater conditions within the County are unpredictable based on the many wells located within the fractured rock conditions. Therefore, given the site-specific nature of the problem, a review of information and data from other west Sierra slope areas would not

yield useful information. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-153 and 281-154. Also, the impacts described by the commenter are identified and the impacts, significance, and mitigation identified in the EIR are reflective of these potential adverse effects. Please refer to the discussion associated with Impact 5.5-3.

Response to Comment 271-4 (EIR): The El Dorado County Department of Environmental Management has inventoried the location of all existing underground fuel storage tanks within the County, and as of December 22, 1998, all noncompliant tanks had to be removed and replaced with approved double wall tanks, and all discovered soil contamination remediated, or they had to be emptied and sealed off for future removal. This existing program is designed to address the groundwater pollution issue raised by the commenter.

Response to Comment 271-5 (GP): Except in limited situations where the existing groundwater levels are very near the earth's surface (and particularly associated with alluvial groundwater basins), the rate of discharge is not a function of the number of wells in an area, groundwater extraction rates, or changes in groundwater levels. According to the California Department of Water Resources, half of all wells in fractured rock aquifers yield 10 gallons per minute or less due largely to the numbers, connection between, and size of fractures (California Department of Water Resources *Water Facts: Ground Water in Fractured Hard Rock*, April 1991). The EIR contains Mitigation Measure 5.5-3 which addresses the issue to the extent that it can be feasibly addressed by policy. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-153.

LETTER 272: JANISE GEE

Response to Comment 272-1 (EIR): Impacts from the Silva Valley Parkway interchange project were previously identified in the *Final Environmental Impact Report Silva Valley Parkway Interchange with U.S. Highway 50*, El Dorado County Department of Transportation, February 1990 (SCH# 88050215). Due to the age of this document, some of the impact analysis for the interchange will likely need to be updated when the project is proposed for implementation. At a minimum, traffic, noise, and air quality impacts will need to be updated.

Response to Comment 272-2 (EIR): Exhibits 5.10-8 through 5.10-11 of the EIR (Volume 2) show 60-dBA noise for three different scenarios: the base year (2001), the No Project Alternative under 2025 conditions, and the 1996 General Plan Alternative under 2025 conditions. Base-year contours were created using noise measurements gathered during monitoring visits conducted throughout the County and traffic noise modeling. Exhibits 5.10-12 through 5.10-15 in Volume 2 of the EIR show 60-dBA noise contours for the base year and buildout conditions. The decibel standards defined as acceptable for various land uses have been established by the County and are consistent with standards of other jurisdictions for the same land uses. Please also refer to Responses to Comments 281-429 and 281-435.

Response to Comment 272-3 (EIR): Silva Valley Parkway north of Harvard Way to Green Valley Road is planned to be widened to four lanes under any of the General Plan alternatives. This widening is planned to accommodate residential and nonresidential development in El Dorado Hills at acceptable levels of service required by the General Plan policies. The timing for this widening will depend on the pace of development. The current LOS on this section of Silva Valley Parkway is "C" based on 2001 traffic data contained in Appendix D in Volume 3 of the EIR. Widening would not be required until LOS E is reached.

Response to Comment 272-4 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.10-2 proposes specific standards to determine when mitigation for traffic-related noise is necessary. The strategies suggested by the commenter would be used as necessary and appropriate where needed to avoid exceeding the standards proposed by the mitigation measure.

LETTER 273: RAY P. GRIFFITHS

Response to Comment 273-1 (GP): The cost estimates discussed by the commenter are generally similar in magnitude, although somewhat higher, than the cost estimates developed by the County in connection with both the State Traffic Impact Mitigation (State TIM) fee program and the Interim U.S. Highway 50 Variable Traffic Impact Mitigation fee program. Additional work by the County Department of Transportation in connection with the work on the four equal-weight General Plan Alternatives is also consistent with these estimates.

The EIR has not identified specific funding sources for the improvements described by the commenter. However, it should be noted that a significant portion of the funding for them is currently included in the two impact mitigation fee programs listed above and has been since their inception. Additionally, all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives contain policies providing direction to the County, in concert with other agencies and developers of new growth in the County, to meet the funding requirements for these and other necessary road improvements.

Response to Comment 273-2 (GP/EIR): The EIR does not state that the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor Draft Master Plan is “the relevant document for consideration of the railroad corridor”. It is listed as an existing transportation policy document that would apply to the General Plan Circulation Element. It is only one of many sources of information for the future of the corridor. The commenter is correct that the Master Plan did not include commuter rail as an option and hence it was not analyzed in the EIR for that Plan. However, the General Plan EIR is not tiering off that EIR and is analyzing the transportation impacts of the different alternatives as a stand-alone analysis.

The County, in cooperation with other affected agencies such as the City of Folsom and the County of Sacramento, is currently working on the U.S. Highway 50 Corridor Light Rail Route Refinement Study to look at and analyze several different alternatives for light rail into the County. This analysis is significantly behind the work being done on the General Plan and will be the follow on document to begin implementation of policies contained in the General Plan regarding rail operations. Also, please refer to Master Response 17.

Response to Comment 273-3 (GP): The commenter states he contacted Mr. Clem Bomar at Caltrans who gave him a cost for renovating the railroad transportation corridor of approximately \$1 million per mile to bring the trackage up to a 60 mile per hour standard. It would appear from that amount that Mr. Bomar was talking about the track structure only. The problem with this information is that rail speeds on the corridor are not only restricted by the condition of the trackage itself, but also by the alignment of the tracks.

The horizontal alignment of the existing track and the underlying right-of-way will not support the kind of speeds the commenter has included in his comment. The

Railroad/Joint Powers Agency Deed Summary Map shows eight degree curves in the section west of Latrobe and ten degree curves east of Latrobe. These curves equate to maximum permissible speeds of 23 miles per hour and 21 miles per hour respectively (Formula 19-6, Standard Handbook for Civil Engineers, Third Edition, 1983). To increase the corridor speeds to the 60 miles per hour described in the comment would require many significant realignments increasing these costs dramatically with new right-of-way, major construction including extensive grading, bridges, and all new track work, environmental mitigations, etc.

However, using the information provided by the commenter, i.e., Mr. Bomar's information and the Colorado Rail Car brochure the commenter attached, the capital costs come to at least \$85 million. (28 miles at \$1 million per mile, 16 crossings at \$250,000, and fleet equipment costs of \$53.1 million) There would also be an annual operating cost of approximately \$5.0 million for the fleet equipment (the Colorado Rail Car brochure) and an additional unknown amount for track, crossing, and signal operations and maintenance.

It is unknown what land use densities would be required to be able to support these costs. Given the forecasted growth to 2025 is approximately 30,000 new residential units, the capital cost per new unit would be approximately \$2,800 each. With the need to make significant realignments of the existing track and right-of-way, it is certain that these costs are going to be significantly higher. Also, please refer to Master Response 17.

Response to Comment 273-4 (EIR): Section 5.2 (EIR Volume 1) addresses issues related to conversion of agricultural land uses. Subsection 5.5.1 addresses water availability for all land uses in the County and identifies a significant impact because there is insufficient supply to accommodate future demand, including agriculture. Potential water shortages are identified as significant in Impact 5.5-1. Mitigation Measures 5.5-1(a), (b) (as modified, see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document), and (c) are designed to reduce the likelihood of shortages. In particular, Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) will require that water supply planning (2-year projection, including drought conditions) before all ministerial and discretionary development approvals to ensure available water supplies. Specifically, Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) requires consideration of demand within the 20-year projection "to existing and planned future uses within the area served by the water supplier, including ... agricultural ... uses."

Response to Comment 273-5 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 253-29.

Response to Comment 273-6 (EIR): Land owned by BLM is not anticipated to be at risk of development and, in any case, is not under the County's jurisdiction and so was not included in the -IBC overlay (also please refer to Response to Comment 238-3). The commenter recommends that the U.S. Highway 50 underpasses at Greenstone Road and Shingle Springs Drive be identified as wildlife corridors in the EIR; the list on page 5.12-90 was not intended to be exhaustive and no change to the DEIR is necessary.

The commenter suggests that all undeveloped parcels with tree or shrub vegetation should be mapped and included in the EIR. This level of detail is not appropriate for the General Plan, which addresses habitat preservation on a programmatic (rather than parcel-specific) level. The EIR is not required to provide mitigation for projects such as roads, parcel splits, and boundary line adjustments, but this determination may be made at the County's discretion by requiring that fees be paid by the project applicant to the INRMP conservation fund.

The EIR includes mitigation that encourages the planting of native shrubs and trees; see Policies 7.4.5.1 and 7.4.5.2 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives (page 243); Measure CO-O of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative (page 270); and Measure CO-P of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative (page 273).

Response to Comment 273-7 (EIR): The commenter's support for Alternative #12: Compact Development and the relevant policies of Alternative #9: Modified El Dorado Hills Development South of U.S. Highway 50, as they relate to providing further growth while minimizing quality of life impacts, is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for consideration in their deliberations on the General Plan.

**LETTER 274: MARK A. PERLBERGER, HALBEAR ENTERPRISES, REPRESENTING
CAMBRIDGE SQUARE PARTNERS**

Response to Comment 274-1 (GP): As the commenter notes, the request for a split land use designation of Commercial (C) and Multifamily Residential (MFR) for APN 109-010-02 is included in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The parcel is assigned the C designation in the 1996 and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. Policies in these Alternatives allow mixed residential and commercial uses on commercially-designated parcels. The commenter could potentially develop the parcel for both uses without the requested change. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 275: MICHAEL J. COOK, HEFNER, STARK & MAROIS LLP, REPRESENTING EL DORADO SAVINGS BANK

Response to Comment 275-1 (GP): The commenter's requested land use designation for the parcel (Commercial) was not included in any of the General Plan alternatives. Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the parcel is designated Medium Density Residential (MDR). In the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, the designation is the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel is designated Rural Lands (RL). This Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, additional new commercial parcels were not identified. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 276: MICHAEL J. COOK, HEFNER, STARK & MAROIS LLP, REPRESENTING SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES

Response to Comment 276-1 (GP): The commenter's objection to the land use designations applied to his client's parcels under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative are noted for the record. Although the subject parcels may possess the characteristics of Low Density Residential parcels, the defining policy direction for parcel designations under this alternative is Policy LU-1b, which limits all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

The commenter's previous parcel-specific request on behalf of his client is detailed in Table A-3 of Appendix A in Volume 2 of the EIR. Note that this table incorrectly identified some of the commenter's client's parcels. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for the revised table.

LETTER 277: HOWARD AND MARY LOU KLEIN

Response to Comment 277-1 (GP): The subject parcel (APN 108-150-31) is assigned the requested land use designation (Low Density Residential [LDR]) under the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. The commenters oppose the Rural Lands (RL) land use designation assigned to their parcel in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. Land use designations under this Alternative were established using direction provided in Policy LU-1b, which states that no parcel can be subdivided into more than four new parcels. This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative.

The discrepancy referred to by the commenter may be the result of entering an incorrect parcel number into the General Plan database on the General Plan Web Site. The parcel number presented in the comment letter was incorrect. The correct parcel number is 108-150-31 (not 108-150-131). Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 278: SUSAN KOHLER

Response to Comment 278-1 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations. Zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7 for an explanation of the difference between land use designations and zoning.

The commenter requests assignment of the Low Density Residential (LDR) designation to APN 089-110-62. This designation is included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. Under both the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the parcel is designated Rural Lands (RL). Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the RL designation is consistent with other similarly-sized residential parcels. In general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 279: MICHAEL J. McDOUGALL, MJM PROPERTIES, LLC

Response to Comment 279-1 (GP/EIR): Comment noted. The time and effort devoted to reviewing the document by this and other commenters is acknowledged.

Response to Comment 279-2 (GP/EIR): As noted by the commenter, the existence of the referenced plans and the fact that the County has entered development agreements with respect to certain of the lands addressed by those plans is explained in the EIR and in the General Plan alternatives. The development agreements relating to the referenced specific plans each provide that, subject to certain exceptions, the underlying landowner has the right to proceed with development in accordance with applicable conditions of approval and the plans and policies in effect at the time the development agreement was approved.

With respect to the effect of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative, the Specific Plans referenced by the commenter contemplate expansion of U.S. Highway 50 to eight lanes to mitigate the traffic impacts associated with those plans. The EIR in Section 5.4 (Volume 1) describes the significant traffic impacts that are expected to occur in connection with a policy to discourage expansion of U.S. Highway 50 beyond six lanes.

LETTER 280: MAIDU GROUP, MOTHER LODE CHAPTER, SIERRA CLUB

Response to Comment 280-1 (GP): It is acknowledged that the comments are submitted on behalf of the Sierra Club.

Response to Comment 280-2 (GP): The commenter's descriptions of alternatives analyzed in the EIR are acknowledged. The commenter asks why the EIR used 1999 information on the number of existing commitments that have been built. As discussed on page 4-11 of Volume 1 of the EIR, Economic and Planning Systems utilized 1999 as the baseline date for its land use forecasts because it was the best information available at the time. The 1999 baseline does not affect the 2025 or buildout projections. As noted in the EIR, an increment of the forecasted development has occurred between 1999 and today, which may slightly reduce the difference described in the EIR between the forecasted development and existing conditions.

Response to Comment 280-3 (GP): Volume II of the original 1996 General Plan was not included as part of the proposed General Plan Alternatives in part because it was out of date as noted by the commenter. The introductory material in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative was not intended as a replacement for the background information in Volume II. Rather, updated information is provided in the current EIR and serves as a baseline for analysis of the environmental impacts of the General Plan alternatives. To make the General Plan alternatives more readable and user-friendly, the background information was not repeated in the General Plan alternatives themselves.

Response to Comment 280-4 (GP): The staff appreciates the suggestions made by commenter in its 2001 scoping comments on land use and community design, which were considered in developing the General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 280-5 (GP): The concerns and opinions in the comment expressing support for the removal of permissive language from the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and that these alternatives have accompanying implementation measures, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-6 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5 and Response to Comment 238-2. The proposed General Plan alternatives do contain numerous specific standards. However, in some cases detailed standards would not be appropriate for a General Plan-level document. In such cases, the General Plan alternatives (or proposed mitigation measures) include policies that establish performance standards, and include implementation measures calling for development of specific standards or criteria in the Zoning Ordinance.

Response to Comment 280-7 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 280-8 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5. The commenter is correct that development agreements and tentative maps covering about 14,500 units had been approved prior to the Writ of Mandate, although the statement that these approvals occurred after 1996 is not entirely correct; some of the approvals (such as the Serrano development agreement) were made prior to 1996. The commenter's statement that the project approvals and development agreements adopted before the Writ of Mandate was issued have already foreclosed many good planning options, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-9 (GP): The commenter states that the "graph above shows the projected population of the four 'equal-weight' General Plan alternatives taken from information presented in the DEIR" and that this format is more informative than the tabular form in which it is presented in the DEIR (Volume 1). However, the graph referred to in this comment does not appear in the commenter's letter. No further response is possible.

Response to Comment 280-10 (GP): The commenter's concerns with the four "equal-weight" General Plan alternatives with respect to air quality are noted for the record. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-475 regarding the effect of exceedences of air quality standards.

Response to Comment 280-11 (GP): The commenter's support for Alternative 12 with inclusion of the Important Biological Corridor overlay and the requirement for an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. An analysis of the No Project Alternative ("Alternative #1") is required by CEQA to be included in the EIR. Although the County will seek to have the Writ of Mandate lifted when a General Plan is adopted, the No Project Alternative analysis describes the impacts that would occur if the County does not adopt a new General Plan, or if the County decides to adopt a General Plan with restrictions on new development similar to those contained in the Writ of Mandate.

Response to Comment 280-12 (GP): It is acknowledged that the commenter is indicating in subsequent comments preferences relative to the text of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Response to Comment 280-13 (GP): The commenter's preference for Alternative 12 (Compact Development) in terms of the Land Use Element, and its support for the Housing Element in its efforts to provide more affordable housing, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. With respect to compliance with air quality law, please refer to Response to Comment 281-475.

Response to Comment 280-14 (GP): The commenter's opposition to road widening is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Regarding the wildlife movement issues for widened roads, please refer to Response to Comments 281-522, 281-525, and 281-526. With respect to compliance with air quality law, please refer to Response to Comment 281-475.

Response to Comment 280-15 (GP): The commenter's preference for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative's definition of "worsen" in Policy TC-1d is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-16 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 280-66.

Response to Comment 280-17 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 280-67 through 280-71.

Response to Comment 280-18 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 280-72 through 280-74. As stated in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, recent State legislation (Water Code Section 13290 et seq.) requires the State to set standards for onsite sewage treatment system permitting and operation by January 1, 2004. When the State has established these standards, the County will be required to apply them. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that PS-4c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative prohibiting septic systems on parcels less than five acres, unless there is public water, is unrealistic for financial and practical reasons, are noted for the record. However, because no specific reasons for this opinion are presented, and the expanded discussion referenced by the commenter does not appear to address the cited policy, a specific response is not possible.

Response to Comment 280-19 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 280-75.

Response to Comment 280-20 (GP): The commenter notes that the policies relating to Emergency and Law Enforcement Service are identical in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Response to Comment 280-21 (GP): Implementation Measure PS-M requires the development and implementation of a Library Master Plan. This Plan would necessarily include a component relating to funding mechanisms for library services.

Response to Comment 280-22 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 280-80 through 280-82.

Response to Comment 280-23 (GP): The commenter notes that the policies relating to Utilities are identical in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Response to Comment 280-24 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 280-84.

Response to Comment 280-25 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 280-85 through 280-88. Please also refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 280-26 (GP): The commenter notes that there are no policies in either alternative concerning naturally occurring asbestos. Ordinance 4548, adopted in January of 2000, deals with activities that could potentially create health risks. It requires applicants for grading permits in areas identified on the "Potential Asbestiform Minerals Map" to submit an Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan and to adhere to strict procedures to mitigate any dust impacts. Additional sections of the ordinance include requirements for the use or sale of serpentine material for surfacing purposes and requirements for mining. In addition, the County Environmental Management Department website contains information on naturally occurring asbestos; the map referred to above; current information on asbestos-related issues in the County; and useful links to other sites containing additional data. The EIR proposes as mitigation three new policies that would strengthen standards; provide disclosure on properties known to contain naturally occurring asbestos; and require annual reporting to the Board of Supervisors (see pages 5.8-88 through 5.8-106 in Volume 2 of the EIR). Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219.

Response to Comment 280-27 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 280-93 through 280-96.

Response to Comment 280-28 (GP): The commenter expresses the opinion that the Hazardous Materials policies are deficient in both the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Implementation Measure HS-E requires the maintenance and updating of the *Hazardous Waste Management Plan* and Implementation Measure HS-F requires the development and updating of a plan for the storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials used at County-operated facilities. Please also refer to the discussion on Hazardous Wastes contained in Volume 2 of the EIR, Section 5.8, and Response to Comment 280-97

Response to Comment 280-29 (GP): The EIR analyzes air quality impacts in Section 5.11 and determines that all impacts for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives are significant and unavoidable. The EIR proposes mitigation measures to reduce emissions, including emissions of ozone precursors. The commenter does not indicate how the proposed alternatives would violate the Sacramento Area Regional Ozone Attainment Plan based on information in the EIR. Attainment of the 2005 emissions targets in the Attainment Plan depends on region-wide factors and cannot be determined

based solely on El Dorado County emissions information. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-465.

Response to Comment 280-30 (GP): The commenter's preference for the noise policies contained in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please also refer to Responses to Comments 280-101, 280-103, and 281-433.

Response to Comment 280-31 (GP): The commenter's preference for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative's Conservation and Open Space policies because of the Important Biological Corridor overlay and the requirement for an Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The commenter's statement that Policy CO-2b in Alternative #2 (Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative) disallows mineral extraction on agricultural lands is not accurate. Unlike Alternative #3 (Environmentally Constrained Alternative), Alternative #2 does not have an Agricultural Lands designation, and therefore that designation is not included in the list of compatible land uses. However, Alternative #2 does have an Agricultural District overlay designation. Mineral extraction would be incompatible with certain lands covered by the overlay, depending on the underlying designation.

Response to Comment 280-32 (GP): The commenter's preference for the Agriculture and Forestry policies in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and in particular the base land use designation "Agriculture," is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-33 (GP): Please also refer to Response to Comment 281-49.

Response to Comment 280-34 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment stating the commenter's preference for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative in terms of the Parks and Recreation Element, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please also refer to Responses to Comments 253-15, 280-138, 280-139, 280-143 and 280-144.

Response to Comment 280-35 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment stating their support of the Economic Development Element's focus on supporting local business, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-36 (GP): The opinion expressed in this comment stating the commenter's approval of allowing mixed uses in primarily residential and primarily commercial areas and measures to reduce light and glare, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-37 (GP): The opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's preference for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative because of its inclusion of the Important Biological Corridor overlay, the Agricultural Lands land use designation, and requirement for an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-38 (GP): The commenter's preference for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative for its separation of communities policies with regard to El Dorado/Diamond Springs and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative for its separation of communities policies for Cameron Park/El Dorado Hills, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-39 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the designation of Georgetown and Camino/Pollock Pines as Community Regions (in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative) should be reconsidered because of the unlikelihood of constructing a public sewer system, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The Community Regions defined in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative exclude Georgetown and Camino/Pollock Pines.

Response to Comment 280-40 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment supporting Goal LU-3 and stating that open space and recreation are not necessarily identical in function are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. A golf course would not qualify as required open space under Policy 2.2.3.1 of the 1996 General Plan, however existing golf courses have been designated as Open Space to accurately identify that additional residential development would not occur. See also Response to Comment 107-5. Item (B) in Policy LU-3b refers to lots as well as housing units. Concerning Policy LU-3e, this policy focuses on the design aspects of projects, in particular the creation of pedestrian-friendly development. Policies addressing bicycle paths are contained in Goal TC-4.

Response to Comment 280-41 (GP): Open space, recreation, habitat preservation, and resource extraction can and do often coexist. The Natural Resource designation was established to recognize that substantial areas of timberland in the County are

appropriately managed for multiple uses, and to more appropriately designate open space uses dedicated to resource extraction as compared to the more commonly recognized open space uses of preservation and recreation. The EIR recognizes that mining can in some cases cause conflicts with open space preservation goals. Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(h) addresses this concern for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives.

Response to Comment 280-42 (GP): Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-63.

Response to Comment 280-43 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-433.

Response to Comment 280-44 (GP): The opinion expressed in the comment supporting Goal LU-5 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative which would eliminate inconsistencies between TRPA's regulations and the County's, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-45 (GP): The commenter's support for the Scenic Corridor policies contained in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Implementation Measure LU-F in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires preparation of a Scenic Corridor Ordinance within one year of General Plan adoption. The Ordinance would necessarily describe the process of designating scenic corridors. Please refer also to Response to Comment 198-5.

Response to Comment 280-46 (GP): Policy LU-7a does provide standards for zone changes and General Plan amendments for higher density or greater intensity of use, setting forth six findings that must be made prior to such actions. These standards, if adopted, can be applied immediately upon adoption of the General Plan. No interim standards are required.

Response to Comment 280-47 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment stating the commenter's preference for the wording under Bullet 6, Implementation LU-A, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. LU-A does require that the Zoning Ordinance actually be revised, and sets forth a timeframe of one year from General Plan adoption. Implementation Measures LU-J and LU-K require development of programs to monitor population and employment trends and the effectiveness of General Plan policies and programs. These programs are designed to provide the Board with information on whether General Plan policies and programs are being attained. Policies LU-9(a) through LU-9(c) provide guidance on how the Board should act in response to this information. Such actions would take the form of a General

Plan or zoning amendment, which do not require express authorization in the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-48 (GP): Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-465 regarding air quality conformity. Exceedance of a standard, as described in Section 5.11 (EIR Volume 2), is not the equivalent of a legal violation.

Response to Comment 280-49 (GP): The commenter's preference for the circulation diagram and concurrency policies of Alternative #2 is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. It should be noted that none of the alternatives call for "unlimited future expansion" of U.S. Highway 50 or any other roadways. The circulation diagrams for each of the alternatives define the extent of proposed roadway expansion, and the EIR recognizes the fact that significant additional expansion would be infeasible.

Response to Comment 280-50 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 14 regarding lane width on U.S. Highway 50. The problems related to obtaining funding for roadway improvements are discussed on pages 5.4-57 through -65 of Volume 1 of the EIR. The effects of the proposed low-density land use patterns on traffic are illustrated by the traffic modeling results discussed in the EIR. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on widening U.S. Highway 50, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-51 (GP): Policy 3.2.1.5 is not a "completely new" policy, but rather is one of the policies contained in Measure Y. The initiative referred to in the policy is Measure Y. Modifications to Policy 3.2.1.5 are shown in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 280-52 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 14. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on widening U.S. Highway 50, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-53 (GP): The commenter's support of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative's standards for "worsened" traffic is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-54 (GP): The commenter's support for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative's measure of compliance with the construction of necessary road improvements (Policy TC-1i of that alternative) is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-55 (GP): The commenter's support for Policies TC-1q of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and TC-1p of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, which address pedestrian accessibility in new subdivisions, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-56 (GP): The commenter's support for Policies TC-1r of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and TC-1q of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, which address road construction methods that seek to lessen environmental impacts, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-57 (GP): The commenter is correct that the sentence structure of Goal TC-3 in both the Roadway Constrained and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives is awkward. Please see the amended version in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for clarification.

With regard to Policy TC-3a, the commenter feels that federal and State standards and regulations should be included. Even though the purpose of the AQMD is to administer the California and Federal Clean Air Acts via guidelines set forth by State and Federal Agencies, clarification of this point could be helpful. Please see the General Plan Errata, Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 280-58 (GP): The commenter requests progressive retrofitting of curbs and sidewalks adjacent to schools or parks be added to Policy TC-5c. The County cannot require private property owners to install curb and sidewalk along their frontage without an associated discretionary development project. The County already installs sidewalks on major roads, especially near schools and parks, as funding becomes available for such projects. However, to add a policy requiring the County to do so would be difficult and expensive to implement.

Response to Comment 280-59 (GP): For a discussion of the County's role in the Sacramento Placerville Transportation Corridor Joint Powers Authority (SPTC JPA), particularly in regard to potential rail use, please refer to Master Response 17. Please refer to Response to Comment 66-84 for discussion relevant to the nonmotorized use of the SPTC, or El Dorado Trail as well as a discussion of inter-departmental responsibilities. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-60 (GP): In many cases, implementation measures have been written to assist with application of the proposed policies. For example, implementation of Policy TC-1q is listed in Measure TC-C. For others, such as Policy TC-

1u, implementation will occur as overall General Plan implementation commences (in this case, as new road alignment plans are developed consistent with the approved Circulation Diagram). The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's position on implementation of the proposed policies, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-61 (GP): Proposed Implementation Measures TC-D, TC-K and TC-N would direct the County to work with various agencies to seek grants and other funding for roadway improvements and maintenance, transit and bikeway construction. It is acknowledged that such funding is uncertain. The EIR does not rely on these measures as mitigation.

Response to Comment 280-62 (GP): The course of action in the event that monitoring finds unacceptable LOS is governed by the LOS policies for each alternative. Please refer also to Response to Comment 280-47

Response to Comment 280-63 (GP): The use of "urban" for transportation purposes is based upon the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) designation of urban, originating from the 2000 census data.

Response to Comment 280-64 (GP): These measures are appropriate for consideration in conjunction with Implementation Measure HS-B of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives.

Response to Comment 280-65 (GP): The opinion expressed in the comment stating the commenter appreciates the attention to the policies addressing the provision of affordable housing in the Housing Element, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-66 (GP): As with Implementation Measure LU-A, Measure PS-B does require revisions to the County Code, not simply review. Please refer also to Response to Comment 280-47. Interim standards prior to implementation of Measure PS-B(C) are not required; that measure implements Policy PS-7(c), which specifically identifies the evidentiary showings relating to safety that must be made by project applicants.

Response to Comment 280-67 (GP): The commenter notes that the policies under Water Supply are identical in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. In addition, the commenter notes differences in wording at the beginning of Implementation Measure PS-C. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, it states "Work with the Water Agency and water service providers..." This language was unintentionally omitted from the Environmentally

Constrained Alternative and will be added to the text. See Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for the changes.

Response to Comment 280-68 (GP): The commenter's statement that provision for an annual evaluation of water supply should be in the General Plan is noted. Although page 207 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and page 209 of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, under the "Water Supply" section, states that the Water Agency is responsible for preparing an annual water availability report, a new policy is proposed for inclusion in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. See Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for the text of the new policy.

Response to Comment 280-69 (GP): Policy PS-2a, states in part that new surface water supplies may include reclaimed water. To the extent reclaimed water can and does replace potable water, such that potable water can be used elsewhere, it qualifies as "new water." This policy is under Goal PS-2, which states "To ensure that the County has adequate water for existing and proposed residential, commercial/industrial, and agricultural uses." The policies under this section are referring to a range of water usage, not just uses requiring potable water.

Response to Comment 280-70 (GP): Concerning Policies PS-2d and PS-2e, applicants on discretionary projects would be required to have professional testing done to determine the adequacy of the supply. This would also apply to determining parcel sizes on potential subdivisions. Please also refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 280-71 (GP): The commenter's suggested language change for Policy PS-3b in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Policy PS-3b and Measure PS-D would require certain types of new development to utilize reclaimed water. The measure would ensure that reclamation is incorporated into new development where appropriate. It is recognized that use of reclaimed water is regulated under State law. Policy PS-3b does not require cross-connections, but emphasizes their control and protection.

Response to Comment 280-72 (GP): The authority of the RWQCB to regulate onsite sewage treatment systems is acknowledged. Policies under Goal PS-4 would be applied in addition to, not in lieu of, State regulations. Policy PS-4e is based on the assumption that if a community system is serving a number of parcels, an area with appropriate soils for such onsite disposal could be located.

Response to Comment 280-73 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that Policy PS-4b in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Policy 5.3.1.1 in the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative (working with service providers to develop public wastewater treatment facility in Community Regions of Georgetown, Camino, and Pollock Pines) is unrealistic, are

noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. In the event connections to wastewater treatment facilities are not available in these areas, Policy PS-4a would require that an applicant for new development demonstrate that the proposed water disposal system can accommodate the highest demand that could be permitted on the land in question, which would limit development in these areas to a level which could be served by available wastewater infrastructure.

Response to Comment 280-74 (GP): The commenter is directed to the EIR analysis of Impact 5.5-8 (Increase in Groundwater Pollutants from Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (Septic Systems). Mitigation Measure 5.5-8 proposes a new policy which would require the Environmental Management Department to conduct an annual monitoring program of all septic systems installed since implementation of Ordinance 4542.

Response to Comment 280-75 (GP): The County has been granted an extension to July 1, 2005 by the Integrated Waste Management Board to meet the fifty percent recycling goal. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment requesting retroactive application of Policy PS-6b (requirement for onsite recycling in commercial, industrial and multifamily residential projects); extension of mandatory garbage collection; and tightening of contracts with franchisees to promote more recycling, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The County has implemented a program for homeowner recycling (see page 5.6-16 to 5.6-20 of Volume 1 of the EIR) which is why the General Plan policies focus on construction waste. There was no existing program for recycling of construction waste at the time the draft General Plan was written. However, the County has recently adopted a Construction Recycling Ordinance.

Response to Comment 280-76 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5 and Response to Comment 280-66.

Response to Comment 280-77 (GP): The commenter identified a policy that was inadvertently omitted from the text of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative. See Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for the text of this policy.

Response to Comment 280-78 (GP): The policy establishes a performance standard. Signoff by a relevant purveyor in the form of a "will-serve letter" would satisfy the performance standard.

Response to Comment 280-79 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 280-21.

Response to Comment 280-80 (GP): The commenter notes that the policies and implementation under Schools are identical in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus"

Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 280-81 (GP): The County can and has used the development agreement process to require set-asides for school facilities. A number of development agreements in the past (e.g. Valley View, The Promontory, and Serrano) have identified schools sites. However, the County cannot require developers to enter into development agreements. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-289.

Response to Comment 280-82 (GP): Safety concerns would be considered a component of determining the appropriateness of the site.

Response to Comment 280-83 (GP): The commenter notes that the policies and implementation under Utility Services are identical in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The commenter is referred to Ordinance 4599 (Wireless Communication Facilities). In this ordinance, wireless communication facilities are described as including transmission and relay towers, dishes, antennae and similar facilities. Please also refer to Responses to Comments 281-264 through 281-266.

Response to Comment 280-84 (GP): The document, *Multi-Hazard Functional Emergency Operations Plans*, as referenced by the commenter, is intended to be an outline of the County's emergency operations plans. Specific and detailed information, such as evacuation routes, is coordinated through the County Office of Emergency Services (Hackett 2003).

Response to Comment 280-85 (GP): As noted by the commenter, Policy HS-2c in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative precludes development in areas of high and very high wildland fire hazard. However, the policy also states "unless it can be demonstrated that the hazard can be reduced to a moderate or better level as determined by the local fire protection district..." This caveat would give fire districts (such as the El Dorado Hills district) the ability to determine their capability of serving wildland fire hazard areas. Please also refer to Responses to Comments 281-381 through 281-389.

Response to Comment 280-86 (GP): The commenter's preference for the prohibition on new gated subdivisions under Alternative #3 is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 280-87 (GP): The Open Space designation would provide fire hazard benefits. The policies in the Health and Safety are designed to provide safety measures for development that occurs in areas not designated Open Space.

Response to Comment 280-88 (GP): There are existing fire standards in place that will continue to apply in the interim. The Wildfire Safety Plan called for by Implementation Measure HS-B will include the mentioned items.

Response to Comment 280-89 (GP): The commenter notes that the policies and implementation for Geologic Hazards are identical for both Alternatives. Please also refer to Response to Comment 280-26 regarding asbestos.

Response to Comment 280-90 (GP): The risk of geologic hazards in the County is low. There are no Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones or Seismic Hazard Zones within the County, and exposure of new development to seismic hazards is not considered a significant impact in the County under existing building regulations. Avalanche and landslide hazards are considered significant but would be mitigated by proposed Mitigation Measure 5.9-2(a). Implementation Measure HS-C would create a program to monitor and develop additional information on geologic hazards that would further improve the County's ability to address these hazards, but this necessarily would occur over an extended timeframe. Please refer to Response to Comment 280-87 and Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 280-91 (GP): The commenter points out that abandoned mines aren't addressed in Policy HS-4b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. See Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for a modification of this policy. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-418.

Response to Comment 280-92 (GP): The County's response to the issues raised in the Writ of Mandate is discussed in EIR Volume 3, Appendix G. A revised copy of this is included in this Response to Comments document (in Appendix C.2). Mitigation Measure 5.9-2(b) would add a new policy to the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative regarding avalanche hazards that address the problem identified in the Writ of Mandate with the 1996 General Plan policy found inadequate by the Court.

Response to Comment 280-93 (GP): Implementation Measure HS-D requires the County to update flood hazard maps and other relevant floodplain data as information becomes available. FEMA is currently updating flood mapping (in digital format). The County is on the list of jurisdictions to be mapped within the next ten years. Expanded language will be added to the appropriate sections of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, under "Flood Hazards." See Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for this modification. Regarding the use of the 100-year floodplain as a planning criterion, please see Response to Comment 281-340.

Response to Comment 280-94 (GP): Please refer also to Responses to Comments 162-31 and 281-331.

Response to Comment 280-95 (GP): The regulatory environment related to dam safety, including federal, State, and county laws and programs, is described beginning on page 5.8-54 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

The California Water Code defines a “dam” as a barrier at least six feet in height or capable of impounding 15 acre feet of water, regardless of height (Section 6003). The County uses this definition of a dam as well. Although the Water Code states that “all dams and reservoirs in the state are under the jurisdiction of the department [of Water Resources]”, the State only actively takes jurisdiction over dams that “impound or divert water, and which either (a) is or will be 25 feet or more in height from the natural bed of the stream or watercourse at the downstream toe of the barrier, as determined by the department, or from the lowest elevation of the outside limit of the barrier, as determined by the department, if it is not across a stream channel or watercourse, to the maximum possible water storage elevation or (b) has or will have an impounding capacity of 50 acre-feet or more” (Section 6002). Currently, the County Department of Transportation takes jurisdiction over the construction of dams in excess of six feet in height but less than 25 feet in height, regardless of capacity; dams allowing storage in excess of 15 acre feet but less than 50 acre feet, regardless of height; and the construction of any dams less than six feet in height that require the movement of 250 yd³ (or more) of material (El Dorado County Code Chapter 15.14). This is consistent with direction provided in the California Water Code. The owner of a dam is responsible for the maintenance of dams that may have been built under the County’s jurisdiction. Often, permits are also required from other State or federal agencies, such as the Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, in order to construct dams. Because authority for the oversight of dam construction is already contained in the County code, an additional policy addressing dam construction is not necessary. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-333.

Response to Comment 280-96 (GP): Flooding from a 100-year event and localized flooding from drainage problems are two different issues. The County Drainage Manual addresses the latter. One-hundred-year flooding is addressed as well in the EIR (see Response to Comment 281-341). Goal HS-5 of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives is also relevant.

Response to Comment 280-97 (GP): Policy HS-6b in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires hazardous materials management plans from businesses (not just County facilities) that propose to “handle, store, and/or transport hazardous materials...” The implementation measures in these alternatives do address management of hazardous waste sites, in addition to information collection. Implementation Measure HS-E requires the update of the Hazardous Waste Management Plan for manage of hazardous waste.

Response to Comment 280-98 (GP): Please refer to Responses 280-26 and 280-29. Policy HS-8d in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, requiring the County to identify and reserve the necessary right-of-way for extending light rail to El Dorado Hills, is implemented by Measure TC-Q of the Transportation and Circulation Element. Please refer also to Response to Comment 280-48 regarding violations of State and federal law.

Response to Comment 280-99 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 280-100 (GP): The commenter notes that the text and policies under the Airport Safety section are identical in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Response to Comment 280-101 (GP): The commenter notes that the policies and implementation are identical in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative for the Noise section, with some differences in the standards in Tables HS-1, HS-2, HS-3 and HS-4. The commenter's preference for the more protective standards in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Regarding noise standards for cemeteries, please refer to Response to Comment 281-433. Regarding the five decibel threshold, please refer to Response to Comment 281-431.

Response to Comment 280-102 (EIR): The identified contours are largely dependent on measured (or, for future conditions, estimated) traffic volumes. Modeling was conducted to approximate the 60 dBA contours anticipated under future conditions. However, it should be noted that these contours are not intended to represent absolute lines of demarcation. Future road widening would not significantly affect the location of the contour line. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-436. The commenter's preference for a lower maximum noise level is noted for the record. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-429 for an explanation of the 60 dBA level used in the EIR. Please also refer to Response to Comment 281-435.

Response to Comment 280-103 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that Policy HS-14e in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative should be expanded to state that the flight path should not change where it would worsen the existing situation for residents anywhere in the County, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. The location of flight paths is not the jurisdiction of El Dorado County; rather, it falls under the control of Sacramento County and the Federal Aviation Administration. Please see the discussion on pages 5.10-35 through 5.10-42 of the EIR, Volume 2.

Response to Comment 280-104 (GP): The commenter's preference for Policy CO-1c in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, which precludes grading during the rainy season unless properly mitigated, over the same policy in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, which only discourages such grading, is noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Whatever alternative General Plan is selected by the Board of Supervisors, grading activities within El Dorado County are subject to the County

Grading Ordinance, and provisions of State and Federal law associated with wetlands, stream alteration, and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The County has submitted the required Discharge Permit application and a draft "Storm Water Management Plan" (SWMP) to the State Water Quality Control Board, which includes proposed Best Management Practices for controlling and minimizing erosion, sediment transport, and discharge of pollutants into surface waters within the County of El Dorado.

Response to Comment 280-105 (GP): The "County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance" currently controls grading activities within the County, and this ordinance will be updated as part of the implementation programs associated with the adoption of the General Plan. Regarding asbestos policies, please refer to Response to Comment 280-26.

Response to Comment 280-106 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's support for Implementation Measure CO-A regarding applicant funded monitoring of erosion control measures, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The measure does require that identified revisions to the County Code be made, and provides a three-year timeframe for doing so. Please also refer to Response to Comment 280-47.

Response to Comment 280-107 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's preference for disturbance of slopes of 30 percent or more being prohibited both in and out of the Important Biological Corridor (IBC) areas, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The policies in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are not a "loosening" of slope standards. Current County regulation restricts the installation of septic systems to areas with slopes less than 30 percent, but County design standards would allow development in areas in excess of 40 percent. The 1996 General Plan discouraged (but did not prohibit) development on slopes 40 percent or greater. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative prohibits development on slopes 30 percent or greater, with limited exceptions. Outside the -IBC, development could proceed only if hazards could be reduced to acceptable levels. Within the -IBC, exceptions would be allowed only to avoid a regulatory taking or to protect public health, safety and welfare or avoid hazards from existing infrastructure. These policies represent a significant strengthening from the prior policies. It should be noted that embankments constructed with slope ratios of two horizontal to one vertical are routinely constructed, and are safe, stable, and with proper treatment are not susceptible to undue erosion potential. This slope ratio represents a 50 percent slope. Excavations can be routinely constructed to this same slope ratio, and with proper oversight from registered Civil Engineers, registered Geotechnical Engineers, or certified Engineering Geologists, can be constructed at slope ratios of 1.5:1 (66 percent), 1:1 (100 percent), or steeper.

Ministerial building permits on existing parcels are subject to the applicable building codes, and County ordinance codes. It is noted that Policy CO-1d in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative does apply to ministerial projects. For the purposes of land use forecasting, it was conservatively assumed that at least one single family dwelling could be constructed on each existing legal residential parcel, notwithstanding slope limitations. Slope was considered a constraint on development at maximum density only for medium-density and multifamily residential uses.

Implementation Measure CO-A has been modified to include an update to the County Grading Ordinance. See Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for changes. In addition, the EIR proposes Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(b) which limits disturbance of slopes 25 percent or greater outside of Important Biological corridor overlays areas unless it can be demonstrated by a California-registered civil engineer or an engineering geologist that hazards to public safety can be reduced to acceptable levels.

Response to Comment 280-108 (GP): Policies CO-1d in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and CO-1e in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative will be changed to reflect the proper designations of engineers and geologists. See Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for these changes. The commenter's preference for a requirement that a biologist be involved as well is noted for the record. There is nothing in either policy that precludes the involvement of a biologist.

Response to Comment 280-109 (GP): Please see Response to Comment 280-108 regarding exceptions to slope restrictions. Policy CO-1d does not remove slope constraints. It mandates adequate mitigation, which in particular cases may be economically or technologically infeasible.

Response to Comment 280-110 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 280-31.

Response to Comment 280-111 (GP): Policies CO-2c through CO-2g do not conflict with Measure A; they add additional requirements for mining uses. In some cases, Measure A may impose more stringent requirements than the proposed policies, but the policies would not preclude application of the more stringent requirements.

Response to Comment 280-112 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 280-41, 280-131, 281-542 through 281-546, and 299-5.

Response to Comment 280-113 (GP): The most current version of mineral land classification from the State identifies sources of construction aggregate. Please refer also to Master Response 21.

Response to Comment 280-114 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 280-47 and 280-106, and to Master Response 5. Policy CO-2d and Implementation Measure CO-

A(B) set forth narrative standards regarding mining buffers that could easily be applied to new development on a case-by-case basis prior to the adoption of specific standards, through Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(c). Application of Measure A would also prevent conflicts with mining.

Response to Comment 280-115 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 5, and Responses to Comments 238-2 and 281-533.

Response to Comment 280-116 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment supporting Policy CO-3e (integration of surface water features into new development) in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, but recommending that exceptions to the policy be difficult to get, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-117 (GP): The language contained in Policy CO-3f is correct. The term "USGS hydrologic unit is defined on page 257 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and page 259 of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. As noted by the commenter, the features listed in Policy CO-3f are listed incorrectly in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please refer to Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for a modification of the language. Please refer also to Response to Comment 46-12.

Response to Comment 280-118 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's preference for the 3:1 habitat restoration for wetlands and other water features contained in Policy CO-3f of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Provisions for long term monitoring would be included in mitigation measures for specific projects.

Response to Comment 280-119 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's support for the policies under Goal CO-4 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and that they should also apply to ministerial projects, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The commenter's request to eliminate the term "reduce" from proposed Policy CO-4a is also noted. The commenter is incorrect that any discharges of pollutants to surface waters would violate state and federal law. Point source discharges and some non-point source discharges can be permitted with an approved discharge permit, and some non-point source discharges are not regulated. Accordingly, "reducing" discharges remains a necessary and appropriate goal. Relating to the concern of the commenter on implementation of Measure CO-D of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in July of 2003 the County submitted a second version of the County of El Dorado Tentative Storm

Water Management Plan (TSWMP) to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). This Plan addressed comments and concerns of the RWQCB expressed after their review of the original TSWMP. Requirements of the Plan will apply to ministerial permits that disturb over one acre of ground. The County will undertake a public review process for the Plan after the RWQCB completes a final review, and approves the TSWMP. This is an ongoing process involving County Staff and RWQCB Staff that will take some unknown time to complete, and is highly dependent upon attention from both agencies. It is anticipated that the final Storm Water Management Plan will be completed and adopted within three years.

Response to Comment 280-120 (GP): Policy CO-6d of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires the County to protect biologically important core areas with application of the Important Biological Corridor overlay. This policy is implemented by Measure CO-K, as stated by the commenter. The standards applied to different areas of the County may vary based on various factors that would govern their effectiveness, such as topography, presence of sensitive resources, and existing parcelization. The narrative criteria set forth in Measure CO-K could be applied on a case-by-case basis during the interim period before adoption of specific standards. Please also refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 280-121 (GP): Please also refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 280-122 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's support for Policy CO-5e in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Implementation Measure CO-G in both Alternatives (implementation in part for Policy CO-5d) states "Work cooperatively with the State Department of Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to implement the rare plant ecological preserve and recovery program and to develop a long-term preserve strategy...."

Response to Comment 280-123 (GP): The Plant and Wildlife Technical Advisory Committee was formed as required by Policy 7.4.2.7 of the 1996 General Plan. The Committee has worked on biologically-related issues for a number of years and participated in formulation of policies for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. There is no need to place creation of the Committee in the policy document.

Response to Comment 280-124 (GP): The commenter is referred to Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(i) in the EIR that would require the County to replace Implementation Programs CO-E, CO-F and CO-I with Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(d) (preparation of an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan).

Response to Comment 280-125 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's support for Policies CO-6b and CO-6d in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-126 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's support for Goal CO-7 and Policy CO-7a in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Although implementation for Policy CO-7a directs the preparation of an Oak Woodland Management Plan, the policy itself would not preclude identifying and protecting heritage and landmark trees of species other than oaks.

Response to Comment 280-127 (GP): The commenter is directed to the County Agriculture Department website for a description of the weed eradication program. Please also refer to Response to Comment 253-29.

Response to Comment 280-128 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's support for Goals CO-8 and CO-9 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative concerning cultural resources, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please also refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 280-129 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's support for possibly re-forming a Cultural Resources Commission, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The Board of Supervisors formed a subcommittee to consider options (including re-forming the Commission). The subcommittee is continuing to meet on this subject.

Response to Comment 280-130 (GP): The commenter points out that no policy under Goal CO-10 addresses identification of cemeteries. The stated goal should not include identification of cemeteries. Unidentified cemeteries may be discovered as a result of surveys required for discretionary projects, but requiring a separate program for identification is beyond the scope of this document. See Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for the modification of Goal CO-10 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Objective 7.5.4 of the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative. Please also refer to Response to Comment 280- 43.

Response to Comment 280-131 (GP): The Open Space designation is designed to be applied to a broad range of uses and activities, including resource conservation, habitat preservation, and recreation, just as other land use designations, such as Commercial, also cover a wide range of uses and activities. Differentiation between open space uses is more appropriate at the zoning level, as is done for commercial and industrial uses.

Under Section 65560(b) of the Planning and Zoning law, the managed production of forest lands and areas containing major mineral deposits is considered one of the functions of open space. As discussed in Response to Comment 280-41, these open space functions would be protected under the proposed Natural Resource designation. Other functions of open space (recreation, agriculture, habitat preservation, etc.) would also receive some protection under the NR designation, but would additionally receive more direct protection under other designations (e.g., Open Space, Ecological Preserve Overlay, and -IBC Overlay), and under various policies. All General Plan Alternatives contain policies that function to create or protect different types of open space. For example, in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, Policy LU-3a promotes clustered compact development with open space; LU-3b provides for planned developments which require a minimum 30 percent open space/recreation area; LU-7f and Implementation Measure LU-I relate to a transfer of development rights program; Goal CO-5 promotes the protection of special status species through, among other methods, acquisition of conservation easements; Goal AF-1 concerns the protection of agricultural and rangelands; Measure AF-D requires programs to ensure the conservation of agricultural lands; and PR-2 would promote and conserve resource-based recreation uses. In the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative, Objective 2.2.3 relates to planned developments and transfers and development rights; Objective 7.4.1 provides methods for protection of special status species; Objective 2.2.4 covers density bonuses; and Objectives 8.1.3, 8.3.1 and 8.3.2 relate to identification and preservation of timberlands. Transfers of development rights and acquisition of conservation easements are two of the methods recommended in the Governor's Office of Planning and Research document cited by the commenter. Please also refer to Responses to Comments 281-542 through 281-546, and 299-5.

Response to Comment 280-132 (GP): The commenter points out that Policy CO-12a does not pertain to Goal CO-12 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Staff agrees, and this Goal has been deleted and Policy CO-12a will be moved to Goal CO-6. In addition, Implementation Measure CO-P of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative has been moved to a bullet under LU-A. Please refer to Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for these modifications.

Response to Comment 280-133 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's preference for Policy AF-1 in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative concerning the Agricultural Land designation and the protection of

grazing lands, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-134 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's preference for Policies AF-1b through AF-1g in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-135 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating the commenter's support for Policies AF-2a and AF-3a in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-136 (GP): The policies in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative do not eliminate the review authority of the Agricultural Commission. They are generalized descriptions of County policy. Implementation Measure AF-E specifies development of a procedure for the Agricultural Commission to review and provide recommendations on discretionary projects affecting agricultural/forestry lands.

Response to Comment 280-137 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 280-66.

Response to Comment 280-138 (GP): The commenter points out minor language differences between the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative in paragraph 3 under the discussion "General Services Department, Airports, Parks, and Grounds Division" in the Parks and Recreation Element. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative will be modified to reflect the language contained in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please refer to Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for these modifications.

Response to Comment 280-139 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 17.

Response to Comment 280-140 (GP): The commenter requests that the information on El Dorado Irrigation District facilities on page 293 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and page 295 of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative be updated in connection with Project 184. Please refer to Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for changes to the text.

Response to Comment 280-141 (GP): As reflected in Table 5.7-9 in Volume 2 of the EIR, the County has increased its inventory of parkland over the last 15 to 20 years with the addition of Henningsen Lotus Park and Pioneer Park. Bass Lake Park is currently in the planning stages and other regional parks are proposed in Pollock Pines and South

Lake Tahoe. These facilities will aid in satisfying current recreational needs and accommodating any future growth in these areas of the County.

Response to Comment 280-142 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 253-15.

Response to Comment 280-143 (GP): Development Agreements are required by law to be consistent with the General Plan in place at the time of execution. Policy PR-1a addresses the commenter's concern.

Response to Comment 280-144 (GP): The commenter is directed to Policy LU-6f of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative which deals with limiting excess nighttime light and glare. Implementation Measure LU-A (bullet 13) requires the strengthening of the Zoning Ordinance (Section 17.14.170). The lighting ordinance could at that time be modified to include park lighting standards.

Response to Comment 280-145 (GP): Policy PR-1b states that the County will strive to attain County-owned parkland at a minimum of five acres per thousand residents. The *Parks Master Plan*, as required by Implementation Measure PR-A, could provide more specific standards for provision of parklands throughout the County.

Response to Comment 280-146 (GP): Implementation Measures were identified where they appeared to be necessary. Additional recommendations are welcome.

Response to Comment 280-147 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating some of the problems addressed by implementation measures could be alleviated by more aggressive use of Development Agreements, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-148 (GP): The commenter's support for the Economic Development Element is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 280-149 (GP): The commenter points out language differences in Implementation Measure ED-E in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Measure ED-E in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative will be changed to mirror the measure in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Response to Comment 280-150 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that only nonbusiness representatives to an economic advisory body would not have conflicts of interest, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Membership in the proposed economic advisory body will be determined by the Board of Supervisors once this group is established.

Response to Comment 280-151 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding eliminating the provision for incentives and tax credits in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The commenter also suggests that ED-A(C) be changed to read "locally-owned businesses." Consideration of this change would be more appropriate once the economic advisory body is created.

Response to Comment 280-152 (GP): The questions posed by the commenter would more appropriately be considered by the new economic advisory body, not in a General Plan EIR.

Response to Comment 280-153 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 174-65.

LETTER 281: MAIDU GROUP, MOTHER LODE CHAPTER, SIERRA CLUB

Response to Comment 281-1 (EIR): The organization of the General Plan alternatives is determined largely by the required General Plan elements set forth in State planning law. The organization of the EIR, while similar to that of the General Plan, is based on environmental impact categories, which do not always correspond to General Plan elements. In some cases, the policies of a particular element may have effects in several impact categories, and are therefore treated under multiple sections of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-2 (EIR): Written responses to the comments submitted on the 1996 EIR by Taxpayers for Quality Growth and others were provided in the responses to comments prepared for that EIR. While the 1996 General Plan Alternative is similar to one of the alternatives considered in the 1996 EIR, the environmental analysis in this EIR is completely new, and issues raised on the earlier EIR and found to have merit by the Court in the ensuing litigation have been addressed in the new analysis (see Appendix G of Volume 3 of the EIR – this has been revised and included in Appendix C.2 of this Response to Comments document). The comments on the 1996 EIR are not applicable to the current EIR, and responses to those comments have not been prepared as a part of this process.

Response to Comment 281-3 (EIR): Scoping comments submitted by the Maidu Group of the Sierra Club on the NOP are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-567 through 281-1071.

Response to Comment 281-4 (EIR): It is noted that the commenter provides cited references at the end of each section and has used symbols to indicate questions that should be answered and suggested mitigation measures.

Response to Comment 281-5 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding energy conservation and green building are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-569 through 281-575.

Response to Comment 281-6 (EIR): The commenter reiterates information provided in the setting portion of Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing. The 1997 information relating to the area of the County in agricultural production identified by the commenter (agricultural acreage/Williamson Act acreage) was obtained from the most current source available. State agencies often encounter delays in finalizing and processing data submitted to them by the various counties, resulting in a gap of several years in the date of the best available information. This information was included to provide a general indication of land use trends in the County. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-33.

Response to Comment 281-7 (EIR): A CD containing the DEIR was reviewed by staff and Exhibit 5.1-1 is on the disk. If the commenter is unable to access this table, it is also

available on the County website, under the General Plan heading. A hard copy is also available for review at the Planning Department offices.

Response to Comment 281-8 (EIR): The land use projections do not assume the expansion of wastewater infrastructure in the Georgetown and Camino/Pollock Pines areas. There is existing high-density development in the Georgetown and Camino/Pollock Pines areas currently served by septic systems. This development would benefit from improved infrastructure. Impacts related to the need to construct additional infrastructure for wastewater treatment are analyzed in Section 5.5 of Volume 1 of the EIR, in terms of the environmental impacts of facilities construction and water quality issues. With the exception of the Tahoe Basin, only areas within EID's wastewater collection service area would be connected to a wastewater collection and treatment system. The impacts related to wastewater disposal necessitated by development outside the EID service area are also analyzed in Section 5.5 of the EIR, Volume 1.

Response to Comment 281-9 (EIR): The General Plan does contain standards as required by Section 65302. However, a General Plan is a program level planning document covering a large land area and a wide range of planning issues. Zoning, subdivision and other County ordinances are designed to implement General Plan policies that require the development of standards at a greater level of specificity than appropriate for a General Plan, such as sign standards, height limits, and the other examples cited by the commenter.

Response to Comment 281-10 (EIR): The commenter is correct in the statement that the County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Section 15.14 of the County Code specifies 250 cubic yards as triggering the need for a grading permit. See Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for changes. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-19 for a discussion of this threshold for grading activities.

With regard to treatment of grading activities in asbestos-prone areas, the following precautions are currently in place with various departments within the County. The Grading Ordinance exempts excavations in connection with a building permit because the Building Department incorporates grading into their process. With every building permit issued within the County, (not just identified asbestos-prone areas) the Building Department, in cooperation with the Environmental Management Department, enforces the requirements set forth in the Air Pollution Control District's *Prescriptive Standard - Fugitive Dust Prevention and Control and Contingent Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan*. Building permits are also required for outdoor construction that may involve grading activity such as swimming pools, retaining walls over four feet in height, and fences over six feet. The intent of this Prescriptive Standard is to insure adequate dust control and asbestos hazard mitigation measures are implemented during all phases of project construction and operation, including any soils that require capping or soils moved offsite. These soils are considered and managed as hazardous substances.

The EIR proposes mitigation measures that address the need for more stringent asbestos control measures. These include the following:

- Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) requires that all discretionary and ministerial projects of 120 square feet or larger would be required to undergo a General Plan conformity review to ensure that all applicable General Plan policies are complied with. This would include the vast majority of projects in the County; including projects too small to qualify for a grading permit. In this way, unregulated asbestos exposure would be addressed and the circumstances identified would be brought to the attention of the appropriate decisionmakers prior to project approval.
- Mitigation Measure 5.8-9(b) (as clarified – see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document) requires all projects requiring a building permit that would result in earth disturbance in asbestos-prone areas to have a California registered geologist inspect the project site using appropriate test methods and to amend the Prescriptive Standards for Fugitive Dust Prevention and Control Plan and Contingent Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan. This mitigation measure has been further clarified (see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document) to required the County Air Quality Management District to evaluate post-construction exposure to asbestos on sites known to contain asbestos, and only allow development to be occupied when it is deemed asbestos levels do not create significant health risk exposure.
- Mitigation Measure 5.8-9(c) requires a public information program for each of the four Alternatives to notify the public about the health risks of asbestos exposure through a property deed notification program. The measure also requires the adoption of a Naturally Occurring Asbestos Disclosure Ordinance.
- Mitigation Measure 5.8-9(d) requires the Environmental Management Department to report annually to the Board of Supervisors any new information regarding asbestos.

The above mitigation measures add significant regulation and protection, and fully address the potential for significant impact regarding this issue area.

Response to Comment 281-11 (EIR): The purpose of the EIR is to analyze the impacts of proposed policies and actions into the future (in this case at 2025 and Buildout) compared to existing conditions. It is based on detailed forecasting, as well as an assumption of full buildout. A detailed comparison of existing conditions with those of 25 years ago is beyond the scope of this EIR. The extent of future sprawl under each of the proposed alternatives and its related effects on land consumption and other impact categories are analyzed in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-12 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding land use and housing are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-576 through 281-602.

Response to Comment 281-13 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-11.

Response to Comment 281-14 (EIR): The text under Table 5.1-5 has been revised to clarify that USFS land exchanges are with private land owners, not the County. Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for changes to the text.

The commenter's statement that the boundaries of the Important Biological Corridor are not yet known is incorrect. The boundaries of the Important Biological Corridor overlay are proposed and mapped as part of the proposed Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please see Figure LU-1 in that alternative.

Economic impacts are not environmental impacts, as defined by CEQA. Therefore, a detailed fiscal analysis of the General Plan alternatives is not included in the EIR. Where fiscal considerations are relevant to the environmental impact analysis, they are discussed in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-15 (EIR): The differences in the size of Rural Regions among the alternatives, although seemingly small when expressed as a percentage of Rural Region area, are substantial. Rural Regions comprise between approximately 93 to 95 percent of the County, so even small differences in the size of Rural Regions have a substantial effect on the size of the remaining Community Regions and Rural Centers. Please see Table 3-7 in Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-16 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment supporting Mitigation Measure 5.1-1 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-17 (EIR): The commenter reiterates the discussion on page 5.1-48 of the EIR, Volume 1, with respect to community separators. As stated in the EIR, the potential effectiveness of a policy to create community separators is difficult to judge, because it depends in large part on voluntary land owner participation. Please also refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for changes to page 5.1-48 that further address this issue.

Response to Comment 281-18 (EIR): The last sentence of the proposed implementation measure states as follows: "In lieu of requiring detailed resource assessments as part of initial applications, the County shall establish a program for preliminary site inspections by qualified professionals employed or retained by the County to determine the need (if any) for specific resource evaluations required to complete this review." This addresses the commenter's concern.

Response to Comment 281-19 (EIR): Proposed Mitigation Measure 5.1-3 (b) would apply to all projects that are subject to Mitigation Measure 5.1.-3(a) (i.e., structures over 120 square feet and grading permits).

Response to Comment 281-20 (EIR): The opinion expressed in the comment stating Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(c) recognizes the problem of delayed implementation for policies in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-21 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-433.

Response to Comment 281-22 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 107-2 and 107-3.

Response to Comment 281-23 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-433. With respect to potential disturbance to unmarked gravesites at identified cemeteries, proposed Mitigation Measure 5.13-1(g) would revise Policy CO-10b in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative to state that projects located adjacent to cemeteries will be evaluated to ensure that they do not disturb human interments. Protection could include setbacks and buffer areas.

Response to Comment 281-24 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 107-1 and 107-2.

Response to Comment 281-25 (EIR): It is recognized that there is a need to serve all housing market segments. Currently the market seems to be most focused on large houses that better serve the upper income segment. The Housing Element provides policies and implementation measures that address a wide range of housing types.

Response to Comment 281-26 (EIR): The commenter notes that because of policies in the Housing Element directed at conserving the stock of affordable housing, the EIR deems the impact "less than significant." Please see Section 5.1.2 of Volume 1 of the EIR for the full text of the analysis.

Response to Comment 281-27 (EIR): The commenter's statement concerning the continued conversion of farmland into suburban subdivisions is acknowledged.

Response to Comment 281-28 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding agriculture are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-974 through 281-994.

Response to Comment 281-29 (EIR): The Planning staff does not have information regarding the information requested by the commenter nor was this request determined to be relevant to the General Plan EIR analysis. The analysis of impacts to agricultural

lands in the EIR does not assume that impacts will be reduced by participation in the Farmland Protection Program, which is not a County program.

Response to Comment 281-30 (EIR): Water pollution associated with runoff from irrigation tailwater has most typically been a problem in California in large, flat valley agricultural regions with cultivated fields where the soil is disturbed and in some cases with runoff of pesticides in flood irrigation of orchards. The extent to which tailwater may currently run off irrigated lands in the County is not known. Unlike areas where tailwater runoff has proven to contribute substantially to water quality degradation, agriculture in El Dorado County is not typically flood irrigated, which is a major source of runoff. As described on page 5.5-99 of Volume 1 of the EIR, there are no waterways in western El Dorado County that are listed by the State as impaired, suggesting that agricultural tailwater has not resulted in any substantial water quality impacts in the County.

Response to Comment 281-31 (EIR): In certain instances, issuance of Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is exempt from CEQA. Conversion of land from one use to a vineyard does not require a WDR, unless, under certain conditions, a winery is constructed. Please see page 5.5-17 of Volume 1 of the EIR. Also, please see Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(c) concerning water quality impacts from grading.

Response to Comment 281-32 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 210-6 and 210-7.

Response to Comment 281-33 (EIR): Because the EIR seeks to analyze future potential effects associated with farmland conversion, past trends were not extensively analyzed. However, Table 5.2-4 of Volume 1 of the EIR summarizes the conversion of farmland for the period 1998-2000; these data were provided for informational purposes. Data for the most recent period, 2000–2002, were not available from the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection at the time the EIR was prepared. This recently-released data indicate that, for the 2000–2002 period, important farmland and grazing land acreages in El Dorado County changed as follows:

| | Total Acreage Inventoried | | Acreage Changes | | Net Acreage Changed |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------|-----------------|--------|---------------------|
| | 2000 | 2002 | Lost | Gained | |
| Important Farmland | | | | | |
| Prime Farmland | 989 | 950 | 141 | 102 | -39 |
| Farmland of Statewide Importance | 909 | 930 | 196 | 217 | 21 |
| Unique Farmland | 4,680 | 4,413 | 1,177 | 910 | -267 |
| Farmland of Local Importance | 61,714 | 61,215 | 1,767 | 1,268 | -499 |
| Grazing Land | 203,798 | 201,738 | 3,537 | 1,477 | -2,060 |
| TOTAL | 272,090 | 269,246 | 6,818 | 3,974 | -2,844 |

Data regarding changes for the period of 1996–1998 are available from the Department of Conservation (DOC) (see <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/index.htm>). However, because of a change in mapping methodology by the DOC, the data for the 1996-2002 period cannot be compared (the DOC switched to a digital database created by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service between the 1998-2000 and 2000-2002 reporting periods; that database provides more accurate data regarding agricultural soils locations). According to the DOC, farmland conversion trends did not dramatically change from 1996 to 2002 (Penberth, Molly. California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Conversation with Sue Lee, Senior Planner. November 19, 2003).

For the period 1992-2003, 1,703.2 acres of land currently under Williamson Act Contracts have been identified for nonrenewal, resulting in a net increase of 281.1 acres. During the same period, the County gained 1,984.3 acres of new Williamson Act Contract land. (El Dorado County Assessor’s Office Records 2003).

Response to Comment 281-34 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 173-8, 216-41, 248-7, 263-8, and 281-33.

Response to Comment 281-35 (EIR): Table 3-4 in Chapter 3 of Volume 1 of the EIR shows the acreage of each land use designation for each alternative. Adding the acreages of land use designations in which agriculture is permitted results in the following:

| | |
|---|---------------|
| No Project/1996 General Plan Alternatives | 946,498 acres |
| Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative | 974,894 acres |
| Environmentally Constrained Alternative | 997,376 acres |

These figures reflect the amount of acreage that could be in agricultural production at buildout of the applicable General Plan alternative. It is impossible to calculate acreage “remaining” at 2025 and buildout because the amount of conversion to and out of agricultural use are unknown. The area of agricultural lands with a medium or high conversion potential under each alternative are set forth in Table 5.2-5.

The estimates and assumptions used to arrive at the agricultural water demand figures in Section 5.5 are described in notes to Tables 5.5-6 through 5.5-8, and in Table 5.5-1 note 2.

Response to Comment 281-36 (EIR): Under the current ordinance, unless a project is discretionary or requires a timberland conversion permit from DCF, an environmental review is not required for conversion of woodland or other lands to vineyards. However, proposed Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(c) would add a new policy to all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives which would require agricultural grading activities that turn over one acre or more of soil to obtain a grading permit, which is discretionary. Please refer to Master Response 5. In addition, Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(e) has been revised to mitigation for agricultural conversion of more than one acre of important habitat. Please see Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 281-37 (EIR): I is acknowledged that requiring agricultural fencing on adjacent residential property would likely cause substantial secondary impacts by also constructing barriers to wildlife movement. The EIR includes mitigation in Section 5.12 that would reduce the impact of fencing on wildlife movement. Mitigation Measure 5.12-3(b) would add the Important Biological Corridor overlay to all four of the equal-weight alternatives of the General Plan. Implementation measure CO-K (now only in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative) requires development of the overlay. Under Mitigation Measure 5.12-3(b), lands located under the overlay district would be subject to a requirement that prohibits fences that would restrict wildlife movement.

Response to Comment 281-38 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment suggesting that Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(f) be changed to require animals that might harass livestock to be confined in smaller areas rather than have perimeter fencing, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-39 (EIR): It is recognized that there would be some loss of agricultural land, even with this mitigation measure. The mitigation measure would require conservation of existing agriculture, but would not create new agriculture. This program, by creating permanent set-asides of land suitable for agricultural production, would provide substantial protection over agricultural lands in the County.

Response to Comment 281-40 (EIR): The creation of a new agricultural zoning district and ordinance changes were completed in advance of the General Plan adoption because a number of Williamson Act Contract requests were being delayed pending

General Plan adoption and a complete revision of the Zoning Ordinance. Adoption of the new district will enable additional contracts to be executed. The preservation of agriculture through incentives such as Williamson Act contracts is consistent with the goals of all of the proposed General Plan alternatives. Uses such as ranch marketing or winery activities will not be allowed by right in the new district. Accordingly, the new district is not anticipated to create environmental impacts that are not already addressed in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-41 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment agreeing with the statement that the potential for loss of agricultural land through expansion of visitor-serving activities is considerable under present regulations, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-42 (EIR): The traffic modeling performed for the General Plan assigned trip generation values to agriculturally-designated properties based upon established average trip generation rates for that land use type. The Ranch Marketing Ordinance allows by right “special events for commercial purposes not to exceed 125 persons with the number of events not exceeding the following limits:

- i. Parcels less than 20 acres in size – six per year
- ii. Parcels 20 acres or more in size – 12 per year
- iii. All Special events shall be subject to available parking as set forth in subsection 17.14.180(c).”

Given the relatively small size of these permitted events; the fact that there are specific limitations on the number of events that may occur per year; the fact that commercial events generally are scheduled for non peak hour periods; and the fact that it would be speculative to attempt to predict the numbers of properties that would engage in these activities, it was determined that this could not be incorporated into the traffic analysis for the General Plan alternatives.

The County does not track, or regulate temporally, the special events that are allowed by right under the Ranch Marketing Ordinance. Those special events that require a special use permit however, such as concerts, carnivals, music festivals etc., are reviewed with respect to timing, and potential impacts, including traffic congestion, and County approval for a proposal could be withheld if a large event was proposed for Apple Hill season, and it caused the increase in traffic to reach unacceptable levels.

At this point, the staff is not aware of any traffic problems related to special events allowed by right in agricultural districts. The Apple Hill season is generally a period of traffic congestion in the Camino area, but that congestion does not typically occur on weekday peak hour periods, and that period is not considered a special event under the

terms of the Ranch Marketing Ordinance. Also, Apple Hill Growers are engaging in such things as free shuttle busses from the Placerville area to address the congestion issue. If agriculture expands, the potential for traffic problems to occur as a result of special events would be dependent upon the area of the County where the agricultural expansion occurred; the nature of the road system where the expansion occurred; the potential for the type of agricultural activity engaged in to lend itself to conducting special events; whether the event occurs on a weekday or a weekend; and whether shuttle busses or other transit programs are in place to handle the traffic associated with the special event. Given that high number of variables, it is impossible to predict whether future problems attributed to special events will occur as a result of the expansion of agriculture.

Response to Comment 281-43 (EIR): Please refer to the responses to Letter 173.

Response to Comment 281-44 (EIR): The commenter points out that proposed Mitigation Measure 5.2-3 would incorporate productive and suitable agricultural land into Agricultural Districts, thereby extending the treatment of such lands to all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-45 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding forestry are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-995 through 281-1015.

Response to Comment 281-46 (EIR): The commenter provides information about historic forest management activities in El Dorado County. The staff shares the commenter's concerns regarding the current level of wildfire risk. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection recognized the current character of the County's vegetation as it developed its Fire Hazard Severity Rating and fuel hazard ratings associated with the California Fire Plan (please refer to pages 5.8-116 and 117 of Volume 2 of the EIR and the Fire and Resources Assessment Program's Internet website at <http://www.fire.ca.gov>). The fire hazard risks are recognized and policies have been included in all of the General Plan alternatives to address the issue. The EIR also addresses the issue and assigns mitigation to address the issue (please refer to pages 5.8-131 through 133 of Volume 2 of the EIR).

Response to Comment 281-47 (EIR): The comment accurately states the definition of timberlands used in the EIR and reiterates the statement on page 5.2-77 of Volume 1 of the EIR that commercial logging can create conflicts with residential development, and can affect air quality and water quality. The comment notes that the EIR analysis of impacts to forestry resources is focused on private timberland. The forestry section of the EIR addresses protection of forestry resources. The impacts considered in this section address issues associated with potential conversion of timberland to nontimber uses or creation of obstacles to processing of timber resources. The analysis is focused on timberlands that are within the jurisdiction of the County, because the County has no control over the management and protection of forestry resources under the jurisdiction of the federal or State government. Thus, the EIR is appropriately focused on those

resources that could be affected by actions taken by the County in implementing the General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-48 (EIR): The text on page 5.2-80 of Volume 1 of the EIR has been modified as suggested by the commenter. Although the logging industry includes employment at the remaining operating mills, truck drivers and forestry workers, it is not a major source of employment as is reflected in the text. Also, since the DEIR was published, the Wetsell-Oviatt mill has been closed. These modifications are shown in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 281-49 (EIR): As stated by the commenter, the California Division of Forestry and Fire Protection ("CDF") has jurisdiction over timber harvest plans (THPs). Applications for THPs are sent to the County for review, but the County does not have authority to approve THPs or to issue its own regulations regarding timber harvesting. Section 4516.5 of the Forest Practice Act, cited by the commenter, authorizes local governments only to propose regulations to CDF, which CDF may or may not adopt; the section expressly prohibits Counties from regulating the conduct of "timber operations" or requiring a permit or license for those operations, except on lands of less than three acres outside of timber preserve zones. "Timber operations" are defined in the statute to include, among other things, soil erosion control, protection of stream character and water quality, water distribution systems, flood control, stand density control, reforestation methods, mass soil movements, location and grade of roads and skid trails, excavation and fill requirements, slash and debris disposal, haul routes and schedules, hours and dates of logging, and performance bonds. The County of Santa Cruz timber harvesting regulations referenced by the commenter (from Chapter 16.52 of the Santa Cruz County Code) were adopted prior to the enactment of the preemption provisions of the Forest Practice Act. They are considered obsolete by the Santa Cruz County Planning Department and are not applied. (Pers. Comm., Mark Deming, November 2003).

Response to Comment 281-50 (EIR): As stated above, THPs are routed to the County for review. Approval from the Department of Transportation may be needed if the project would involve either an encroachment permit or a grading permit, but the County does not have the authority to approve or deny THPs, or to enforce their terms.

Response to Comment 281-51 (EIR): Regarding enforcement of timber harvesting requirements, please refer to Response to Comment 281-49. Local governments like the County do have the authority to regulate the location (as opposed to the conduct) of timber operations. As the commenter notes, the County's Zoning Ordinance permits timber harvesting and production by right in the AE, TC, and TPZ zones.

Response to Comment 281-52 (EIR): The commenter is correct that, under the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, land zoned for timber production could be converted to other agricultural uses. Primarily, this would take place in areas zoned Agriculture Exclusive (AE). Land in the Timber Preserve Zone (TPZ) zoning district that is

in timber production would be strongly protected from conversion to other types of uses, including other agricultural uses, and such a conversion would require Agricultural Commission review. The small amount of timberland zoned AE that would be at risk of conversion would not result in a significant impact countywide because a much greater proportion of land in timber production is zoned TPZ and would be protected. Thus, this impact is considered less than significant.

Regarding the suggestion that the County adopt its own forest practice regulations, please refer to Response to Comment 281-49.

Response to Comment 281-53 (EIR): The commenter notes that the Legislative Analyst's office recommends enactment of legislation imposing fees on timber operators to fully cover the costs incurred by State agencies in reviewing and enforcing timber harvest plans.

Response to Comment 281-54 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-49.

Response to Comment 281-55 (EIR): The commercial timber on lands that are zoned TPZ (Timber Preserve Zone) may be harvested through a number of standard methods, consistent with the California Forest Practice Rules. Before the timber can be harvested, the landowner must receive approval for his Timber Harvest Plan (THP) from the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. Restoration and reforestation are requirements of State law and are typically articulated in the THP. TPZ land that is harvested would retain its TPZ zoning after timber harvest unless the landowner chooses to cancel the contract through which the TPZ zoning is assigned. In other words, the property remains an area for timber production, even though another commercial harvest may not be available for decades.

Response to Comment 281-56 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment supporting provision for establishment of a Scenic Corridor Ordinance and Scenic Corridor Combining Zone District; stating a preference for the more protective wording in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative; identifying State Route 49 as a scenic corridor; and supporting extending limitations on ridgeline development to ministerial projects and applying it to the State Route 49 corridor, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-57 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment representing the commenter's position on degradation of existing visual character or quality of the area or region, are noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-58 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-593.

Response to Comment 281-59 (EIR): A detailed map of previously-constructed cell towers in the County is not available and was not determined to be necessary for the purposes of the General Plan EIR analysis (please refer also to Master Response 2). Impact 5.3-1 analyzes the visual impacts of communications infrastructure, including cell towers, and concludes that they would contribute to a significant visual impact, but could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(b) would revise applicable policies to expressly require that the Scenic Corridor Ordinance include standards for wireless communication structures.

Response to Comment 281-60 (EIR): Evaluating the effect of cell towers on property values is not within the scope of a General Plan or a General Plan EIR. Further, property value effects are economic issues, not environmental issues requiring evaluation in an EIR. It is acknowledged that cell towers can be a controversial land use.

Response to Comment 281-61 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-554.

Response to Comment 281-62 (EIR): The County recently adopted regulations that address visual impacts of wireless communication facilities. This is briefly summarized on page 5.6-60 of Volume 1 of the EIR. The entire County Code is available online.

Response to Comment 281-63 (EIR): The comments presented by the commenter regarding directional shielding are noted for the record. Additional analysis in the EIR is not required. The EIR evaluates potential impacts from night lighting and provides mitigation. Proposed Mitigation Measure 5.3-3(b) specifically refers to “directional shielding.” In addition, the County’s lighting ordinance requires top and side shielding. Please refer also to Response to Comment 108-15.

Response to Comment 281-64 (EIR): For all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, the Mitigation Measure 5.3-3(b) requires that nighttime lighting be limited. For the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, the mitigation measure states, in part:

“Include standards, consistent with prudent safety practices, for outdoor lighting to reduce high intensity outdoor lighting and glare in the update of the County Zoning Ordinance. Consideration will be given to design features....”

For the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and the Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the mitigation measure states, in part:

“Development shall limit excess nighttime light and glare from parking area lighting, signage and buildings. Consideration shall be given to design features...”

In all cases a number of design features are identified for consideration. In all cases, nighttime lighting is to be reduced, but the means for doing so may appropriately differ due to operational differences between projects. Design features for one project may not

be appropriate for another. It may be appropriate to require automatic parking lot light shut-offs for a use where parking is more event driven and people arrive and depart at similar times, such as a church. In that case, lighting would generally be on when people arrive and leave, but not for the hours of time when an event is underway, or in between. Automatic shutoffs may be inappropriate, by contrast, for a parking lot at a shopping center, where people arrive and leave sporadically and automatic shut off lighting could be both annoying (constantly turning on and off) and a public safety and practical concern.

Further, public safety is an important consideration. Insufficient lighting in parking lots can create opportunities for criminals to hide and surprise an unknowing person, and allow for greater opportunity to commit property crimes, etc. Insufficient lighting can also lead to injuries (e.g., not being able to adequately see ground features and tripping over a planter curb).

The County's existing Ordinance requires that light be directed downward and prohibits spillover of lighting to adjacent properties. Please refer also to Response to Comment 108-15.

Response to Comment 281-65 (EIR): The commenter suggests that "sport fields" be added to revised Policy LU-6f on page 5.3-39 of Volume 1 of the EIR. See Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for modification to this policy.

Response to Comment 281-66 (EIR): The changes to Mitigation Measure 5.3-3(b) requested by the commenter would provide more detail than is required for General Plan policy. The suggested level of specificity would be more appropriate during the Zoning Ordinance revision required by Implementation Measure LU-A (to strengthen limitations on light and glare).

Response to Comment 281-67 (EIR): The suggestion by the commenter to evaluate requirements to retrofit existing lighting to gradually reduce nightglow from existing sources does not relate to the impacts of future development and is beyond the scope of this EIR. The EIR is required to evaluate impacts from future development under the General Plan. Existing lighting levels are part of the environmental baseline. The County may consider the issue of retrofitting existing light sources in implementing the policies set forth in the alternatives (2.8.1.1, LU- 6f, and Implementation Measure LU-A) and Mitigation Measure 5.3-3, which call for revision of the County Zoning Ordinance to address light and glare.

Response to Comment 281-68 (EIR): The suggestions presented by the commenter would be more appropriately addressed in development of Implementation Measure LU-A, which involves revision of the Zoning Ordinance to strengthen the limitations on light and glare.

Response to Comment 281-69 (EIR): The general focus of this comment is that the County cannot build its way out of traffic congestion. The basic premise behind this comment is that constructing new roadways or widening existing roadways induces more travel demand. The inducement occurs according to basic economic principles because reducing the cost of travel (i.e., reduced travel time due to a new road improvement) will increase the amount of, or demand for, travel. In other words, road improvements prompt traffic increases and these gains diminish travel time benefits to some degree. To what degree and under what circumstances, however, remains a matter of debate.

Transportation research of induced travel is somewhat limited compared to other transportation subjects, but interest by researchers has grown steadily over the last few years given the controversial nature of the subject as it relates to investments in new or widened roadways. The ability of the research to fully explain the complicated relationships between the variables involved in induced travel has not been completely sorted out. In simple terms, travel time savings to a driver can result in a change of route, change of schedule, consolidation of trips, change in mode of travel and/or change of final destination. All of these changes can have an impact on the number of vehicle trips and the amount of vehicle miles of travel (VMT) in a study area.

The latest research on the subject by Robert Cervero¹ from U.C. Berkeley explains that induced travel involves a two-way causal relationship between road use and road supply and concludes that much of the previous research involving induced travel failed to capture this two-way relationship. Further, many studies, according to Cervero, have overstated induced-demand effects because they have not correctly specified the chain of events between added roadway capacity and traffic growth. The statistical relationship between road supply and traffic is not the result of a simple, one-way, causal link between the former and the latter, but rather a simultaneous relationship in which more traffic also spawns more roads. The transportation planning and programming process is designed to anticipate and respond to changes in traffic. Thus, correlation between road supply and traffic could reveal nothing more than this process is working successfully. Likewise, findings that road expansion fails to relieve congestion could simply indicate that regions are failing to keep pace with burgeoning demand for additional road capacity. These statements are indicative that the research of induced travel is still evolving and that researchers are just beginning to unravel the complex relationships between investments in roadway capacity and the resulting travel demand effects.

In the context of the El Dorado County General Plan, induced travel was considered but found not to play a major role in the development of the Land Use and Circulation Elements for the following reasons.

¹"Induced Travel Demand and Induced Road Investment," Cervero and Hansen, *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, Volume 36, Part 3, September 2002, pp. 469-490.

"Road Expansion, Urban Growth, and Induced Travel: A Path Analysis," Robert Cervero, University of California, Berkeley, July 2001.

- 1) The ability of land uses to relocate based on new or expanded roadway capacity is limited by existing development agreements and the potential restrictions on growth associated with the General Plan policies related to roadway funding, development impact fees, and concurrency.
- 2) The General Plan travel demand model was originally developed for a 1998 base year when the traffic operating conditions on the roadway system were not constrained by limited capacity. Therefore, the trip generation rates in the model reflect unconstrained travel demand. In other words, existing base year trip generation activity is not suppressed by limited roadway capacity. Since these same rates are used in the 2025 model for the General Plan alternatives, no induced travel would occur from additional vehicle trips being generated because the roadway improvements eliminated major capacity constraints.
- 3) The General Plan travel demand model captures the effect of trip distribution changes resulting from constructing new roadways or widening existing roadways. In fact, the modeling process as outlined in pages 5.4-18 through 5.4-21 of Volume 1 of the EIR was structured to capture the trip distribution changes of new roadway improvements. Step 11 on page 5.4-20 specifically states that an iterative process was used to identify the optimum set of improvements and ensure that trip distribution changes that occur as a result of improvements such as new roadways were addressed. Additional evidence of this process can be found in Appendices D-3A through D-3D in Volume 3 of the EIR. These appendices include two sets of traffic volume forecasts and LOS results for each General Plan alternative. The first set contains the results associated with loading future 2025 traffic demand onto the existing roadway network. The second set contains the results associated with loading the future 2025 traffic demand onto the improved roadway network shown in each Circulation Element Diagram. In reviewing these two sets of forecasts and LOS results, key differences in volumes can be found because existing and future trips are re-distributed by the model to take advantage of travel time reductions associated with roadway improvements.

Although induced travel is not expected to prevent the County from developing an adequate roadway system, funding constraints as discussed in Impact 5.4-3 could limit the County's ability in this regard. Please refer to Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 281-70 (EIR): Increasing roadway capacity is not intended to be a permanent fix to capacity problems. Instead, roadway capacity improvements are commonly designed with an effective operational life of 10 to 20 years because of the uncertainty and cost associated with trying to forecast conditions any farther into the future. In situations where a community is at or near buildout (i.e., no new development or change in existing development), roadway capacity can be designed to permanently solve capacity problems.

Response to Comment 281-71 (EIR): Potential economic impacts to the recreation industry and businesses of both the Tahoe Basin and the West Slope due to traffic

congestion is not an environmental impact and therefore was not analyzed. It should be noted that the congestion on U.S. Highway 50 and State Route 49 are very similar among all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives and are primarily reflective of significant physical constraints such as the traffic signals on U.S. Highway 50 within the City of Placerville or the grade and alignment issues on State Route 49 between Cool and Auburn.

There are two main types of congestion within the County. The most significant congestion problems that would affect these types of industries are those that occur “off-peak”, i.e., outside of the traditional weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours. These congestion problems are usually related to the same uses described as being impacted. An example would be the heavy eastbound traffic on Friday evenings through the City of Placerville during the winter that contains a high percentage of skier traffic in the traffic mix.

Response to Comment 281-72 (EIR): Traffic congestion can affect emergency vehicle response times, especially when incidents or accidents occur on major roadways. The General Plan alternatives have been developed to minimize potential traffic congestion by including roadway improvements intended to provide LOS E or better peak hour traffic operations on most major county roadways.

Response to Comment 281-73 (EIR): No County-maintained roads are now surfaced with crushed serpentine. There are no listings available as to the number or mileage of privately maintained roads, or driveways for that matter, that are surfaced with crushed serpentine.

Recently-adopted State regulations address the allowable percentages of asbestos in serpentine rock that is sold as road surfacing material, and require the seller to provide certified lab testing to demonstrate that any serpentine rock sold for that purpose meets those standards. Any privately maintained roads that are newly constructed, or resurfaced subsequent to the adoption of this regulation will contain road rock that meets these requirements.

Response to Comment 281-74 (EIR): The proposed route of the Missouri Flat to Pleasant Valley Connector does not violate the Federal Rails to Trails Act. A portion of the proposed roadway impacts the SPTC railway corridor, but as part of the proposal, the rail corridor will be shifted slightly to the north in that area of conflict to allow for the placement of the road, and still provide the necessary continuity of the rail corridor.

Response to Comment 281-75 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment representing the commenter's position on applying the concepts of the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ “Traditional Neighborhood Development Street Design Guidelines”, are noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission

and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer to Response to Comment 198-11 for a discussion on road design standards, and also please note that Implementation Measure TC-C of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and the Environmentally Constrained Alternatives requires the County to revise its road standards to address some of the commenter’s expressed concerns, as does proposed Mitigation Measure 5.3-2.

Response to Comment 281-76 (EIR): The County road standards as identified in the County of El Dorado “Design and Improvement Standards Manual” apply to both public and private roads associated with land development projects. The same circumstance is true with respect to County drainage standards. Private roads not associated with land development projects must comply with the County Grading Ordinance, and/or the State Fire Safe Standards, as applicable.

In the more rural/ low-density areas of the County, the road standards allow for roadside ditches, cross culverts, and no sidewalks. In the urban/high-density areas of the County, road standards require curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and in some circumstances piped storm drain systems.

Response to Comment 281-77 (EIR): The commenter provides an overview of the traffic and circulation setting. No response is required.

Response to Comment 281-78 (EIR): On page 5.4-7 of Volume 1, the EIR states that roadway improvements across the County line have not kept pace with development in El Dorado County. This statement is not directed at a lack of improvements by Sacramento County, and specifically recognizes that more development has occurred in the County than can be adequately accommodated with available roadway capacity across the County line.

Response to Comment 281-79 (EIR): The commenter indicates that Greyhound no longer serves Placerville. Greyhound has also discontinued service to South Lake Tahoe.

Current service in El Dorado Hills consists of the following:

- Curb to curb dial-a-ride for all of El Dorado Hills to Pollock Pines
- A Sac-Med route providing medical transportation from El Dorado Hills to Sacramento County
- Commuter Service (7 routes) from El Dorado Hills to Sacramento
- Reverse Commute Service from Sacramento to El Dorado Hills (2 routes)

A missing piece in El Dorado Hills’ service is the provision of local fixed routes. El Dorado Transit did provide a demonstration of fixed route service for 12 months in fiscal year 1997/98 as implementation of the Unmet Needs process. However, after 12 months, the need did not materialize and the required 10 percent farebox recovery could not be met. In other words, the ridership was not adequate to justify the cost of the service.

The current Long Range Transit Plan indicates that due to consistent growth, service will eventually need to be provided in El Dorado Hills. However, no anticipated timeframe as to when it would be needed was offered. Generally speaking, transit needs increase for a given area as a population grows older. (Mindy Jackson, Director of El Dorado Transit, September 23, 2003)

Response to Comment 281-80 (EIR): The commenter's observations regarding the availability of taxi and carpool opportunities for county residents, as discussed on page 5.4-9 of Volume 1 of the EIR, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-81 (EIR): According to the 2000 census, approximately 2.5 percent of all trips from home to work in the County are made by bicycling or walking.

Response to Comment 281-82 (EIR): Policies 3.9.1.5, 3.11.1.3, 3.11.2.3, 5.8.2.1, and the policies under Objective 6.7.4 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives require bicycling, walking and other forms of transportation to be considered in project review and planning, and particularly with respect to school siting. Similar policies such as Policy TC-3c, TC-4b, TC-4g, TC-4h, TC-5a, TC-5c, PS-9c, and PS-9d are contained in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-83 (EIR): The low-density development patterns of El Dorado County do not provide many opportunities for travel by walking or bicycle. The design of subdivisions could promote walking and bicycling for recreational or social purposes by providing high quality and safe facilities. These types of facilities are encouraged by the policies contained in each General Plan alternative, but are not made mandatory requirements of subdivision design. Please refer also to Master Response 16.

Response to Comment 281-84 (EIR): The commenter repeats information contained in the EIR. No response is required.

Response to Comment 281-85 (EIR): The *Route Concept and Development Report for State Route 153*, Caltrans District 3, June 1987, states that this route is classified as a maintenance-only route, with rehabilitation projects as needed. No plans are mentioned for a change in route or alignment.

Response to Comment 281-86 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 14 and Responses to Comments 256-8 and 256-16.

Response to Comment 281-87 (EIR): The Sacramento Placerville Transportation Corridor Master Plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in February 2003. Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for corrections to page 5.4-15 of the EIR. Please refer also to Master Response 16.

Response to Comment 281-88 (EIR): The commenter repeats information contained in the EIR. No response is required.

Response to Comment 281-89 (EIR): The EIR uses the same definition of LOS F provided on page 5.4-5 of Volume 1 for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives and the same LOS capacity thresholds contained in Table 5.4-1 on page 5.4-6.

Response to Comment 281-90 (EIR): Page 5.4-17 of Volume 1 of the EIR describes recommended LOS thresholds of Caltrans and the Institute of Transportation Engineers, which range from LOS C to D for a diverse geographic area such as El Dorado County. However, as discussed on page 5.4-4 of Volume 1 of the EIR, LOS reflects the perspectives of drivers and their level of comfort and convenience and not other performance aspects of the transportation system. Please refer also to the discussion on page 5.4-55 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-91 (EIR): Page 5.4-6 of Volume 1 of the EIR describes the LOS F exceptions allowed under Policy 3.5.1.6.

Response to Comment 281-92 (EIR): The potential for worsening LOS F conditions and the resulting effects are acknowledged and described on page 5.4-27 of Volume 1 of the EIR. In some cases, LOS F conditions could extend to multiple hours and extend operational problems to adjacent roadways.

Response to Comment 281-93 (EIR): The footnote in Table TC-2 originally referred to the roadway improvements contained in the circulation diagram of the 1996 General Plan for the roadways listed in the table. In this General Plan update, the footnote refers to roadway improvements contained in the circulation diagrams of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. These improvements represent the maximum level of improvement due to physical and right-of-way constraints, which is why these roadways have been allowed to operate at LOS F. For some roadways in Table TC-2, no improvements are proposed due to the severity of the physical constraints.

Traffic analysis results from the original 1996 General Plan and EIR will be different due to changes and improvements in the data and analysis methodology. The analyses also use a different horizon year.

Page 5.4-3 of Volume 1 of the EIR describes the existing operation of U.S. Highway 50 at the County line during peak hours in the peak directions based on Caltrans travel speed runs due to the bottleneck conditions that exist at the El Dorado Hills Boulevard interchange. This methodology was used for this section of the highway because traffic counts alone would not produce accurate results. Traffic counts only measure the vehicles that make it through a section during the peak hour and do not include the vehicles waiting in queue. Travel speeds provide a more accurate measure of existing

traffic operations for these types of locations. The LOS results in Appendix D of Volume 3 of the EIR contain footnotes for the U.S. Highway 50 roadway segments where this methodology was applied.

Response to Comment 281-94 (EIR): The term V/C in Table TC-2 refers to volume-to-capacity ratio. When the original 1996 General Plan was developed, the V/C ratios in Table TC-2 were calculated based on 2015 traffic volume forecasts and capacity estimates created using methodologies (with modifications) from *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM), Special Report 209, Third Edition, Transportation Research Board, 1985. In applying the V/C ratios for traffic impact analysis associated with specific projects or this General Plan update, the volume (V) could be the existing traffic count or a future traffic volume forecast. Due to updates in the HCM, capacity is now measured using the latest HCM, which is currently the *Highway Capacity Manual*, Transportation Research Board, 2000. The HCM has different analysis methodologies and performance measures to determine LOS for different types of roadway facilities. The differences are intended to reflect driver expectations about the type of facility and its function.

When volume is higher than capacity (i.e., $V/C > 1.0$), capacity has been exceeded. In general, this condition occurs when forecasting future traffic volumes. Travel demand forecasting models do not restrict forecasts to the capacity of the roadway system and are intended to forecast the demand for roadways so that appropriate improvements can be planned. If V/C ratios exceed 1.0, then traffic operating conditions are likely to be congested with delay increasing at an exponential rate as the V/C ratio increases. The delays can result in slow operating speeds on the affected roadway, and in severe cases, spillover onto adjacent streets. The EIR uses the same analysis approach to determine LOS F conditions as any other LOS, which allows for a consistent comparison of results between alternatives.

The V/C ratios shown in Table TC-2 are a “policy” list and not a listing from an impacts analysis. As discussed above the V/C ratios shown in the table were calculated in 1995 as a part of the development of the General Plan adopted in 1996. Early in the development of the current alternatives it was determined these V/C ratios should be considered as absolute numbers and should be included “as is” in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The intent, then and now, is these V/C ratios for the listed road segments would be equivalent to and used the same as the Level of Service standards (D and E) contained in Policy TC-1c. These listed road segments are allowed to operate at LOS F, but the V/C ratio is intended to limit the extent traffic demand is allowed to exceed capacity. The County would either construct improvements, restrict growth, or use some other method to ensure the V/C ratios listed in the table are not exceeded.

Response to Comment 281-95 (EIR): The 2000 Census journey-to-work data at the Census tract or place level are not available as of September 2003. However, the 1990 Census estimates were compared with estimates from a 2002 telephone survey conducted to support the County’s Interim U.S. Highway 50 Variable Traffic Impact

Mitigation Fee Program. This comparison revealed that the 1990 Census estimates were still accurate.

Response to Comment 281-96 (EIR): Each General Plan alternative contains concurrency policies. These policies differ in regards to the specific timing of improvements. Further, Impact 5.4-3 identifies the potential funding uncertainty associated with the improvements and the potential exacerbation of funding problems that could be caused by concurrency requirements. Please refer also to Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 281-97 (EIR): The cost of transportation infrastructure improvements referenced in the comment are out of date and were based on several assumptions that are no longer valid. The most significant of those is that the Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS) report, *Fiscal & Financial Feasibility Analysis of Draft General Plan – 2015* (dated 1994), was prepared before the Level of Service Standards went through several revisions prior to adoption of the final standard of LOS E. The report was based on the road system required to maintain LOS C throughout the County. This road system was significantly more extensive and had an attendant high cost. This is one of the main reasons the LOS standard was changed to LOS E. The report also included significant costs for nonroad construction, such as transit and bicycles.

Order of magnitude cost estimates for required road improvements were developed for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives by the County Department of Transportation. Matt Boyer, Director of Transportation, reported these costs to the Board of Supervisors in a memorandum dated April 9, 2003 on the subject of Draft General Plan/Financing of Circulation Element Improvements. In summary, those costs are:

- No Project Alternative = \$810,000,000
- Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative = \$707,000,000
- Environmentally Constrained Alternative = \$798,000,000
- 1996 General Plan Alternative = \$935,000,000

Also, please refer to Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 281-98 (EIR): The commenter repeats information contained in the EIR. No response is required.

Response to Comment 281-99 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 17.

Response to Comment 281-100 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 17.

Response to Comment 281-101 (EIR): The El Dorado County Transportation Commission and the City of Folsom are jointly conducting the Folsom-El Dorado Transit Strategy Study to evaluate transit operations for the Folsom-El Dorado Corridor. This study is expected to be completed in 2004. Given the current success of the El Dorado

Commuter Bus service, expansion of this service or similar express bus service such as bus rapid transit (BRT) is being evaluated as part of the Folsom-El Dorado study.

Regional cooperation for carpooling or vanpooling is coordinated through the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), as well as major employers such as Caltrans. No studies have been conducted in El Dorado County to test the effects of restricting free parking at businesses on ridesharing. Similarly, no studies have been undertaken to analyze peak period truck restrictions.

Response to Comment 281-102 (EIR): Transportation systems management (TSM) actions would not provide sufficient capacity to eliminate the LOS impacts identified in the EIR. TSM actions could reduce the severity of LOS impacts in selected locations and the County will consider these types of improvements in implementing the General Plan as identified in Goals 3.9, 3.10, and 3.11 and their supporting objectives and policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Goal TC-3 and its supporting policies of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-103 (EIR): The El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) conducts a transit needs evaluation every year to determine the unmet transit needs of county residents. To the extent that funding is available, the County is required to address the unmet needs. If local van service for seniors or others is identified as an unmet need, the County will work to address this need within the requirements of transit funding legislation.

Response to Comment 281-104 (EIR): Please refer to Master Responses 13 and 15 and Response to Comment 281-101.

Response to Comment 281-105 (EIR): Travel speeds were not forecast for the General Plan alternatives. To accurately forecast operating speeds on U.S. Highway 50 would require a more detailed analysis. The General Plan and EIR analysis rely on LOS. Detailed LOS results for all segments of U.S. Highway 50 are contained in Appendix D of Volume 3 of the EIR. In addition, a number of regional transportation performance measures were calculated for each General Plan alternative and summarized in Table 5.4-5.

Response to Comment 281-106 (EIR): Analysis of Impact 5.4-2 in the Traffic and Circulation section of Volume 1 of the EIR concluded that the increase in traffic congestion in the County resulting from future growth would be significant and unavoidable for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. This increase will be felt most strongly during the weekday peak hour periods modeled in the traffic analysis, but will also be apparent at other times, particularly in areas that are currently experiencing traffic congestion during off-peak periods. The Apple Hill area is one example of where seasonal traffic congestion is likely to be exacerbated by increased growth in the County. Apple Hill experiences off-peak traffic congestion on most

weekends during the fall harvest season from tourists and other visitors to the area's orchards and vineyards. This traffic is likely to increase as the County's population grows and local tourism increases. Roadway capacity expansion is not proposed for the Apple Hill area as mitigation for traffic congestion. Sizing roadways to accommodate off-peak traffic congestion, particularly in areas such as Apple Hill where the congestion is only seasonal, would result in a substantial amount of underutilized roadway capacity for most of the year. In addition, significant roadway expansion in Apple Hill would detract from its rural character, which is one of the main attractions for visitors to the area. The commenter is correct that congestion can itself affect the pleasantness of the tourist experience. However, this is not likely to result in adverse economic impacts on the visitor-serving businesses on Apple Hill. An increase in traffic will occur only if there is an increase in visitors, which will increase patronage of those businesses. To the extent congestion deters some from visiting Apple Hill, traffic congestion will decrease accordingly. Present experience indicates that Apple Hill is likely to remain a popular destination notwithstanding the resulting traffic congestion.

Response to Comment 281-107 (EIR): The peak hour LOS on U.S. Highway 50 immediately west of the County line will depend on the extent of auxiliary lanes associated with the Empire Ranch Road interchange and whether Caltrans pursues implementation of an eight-lane mainline U.S. Highway 50 by 2025. The Caltrans project report and environmental clearance documents are under preparation for the Empire Ranch Road interchange and the final interchange design has not been completed. Without auxiliary lanes or mainline expansion, westbound U.S. Highway 50 would likely operate at LOS F during the a.m. peak hour under 2025 conditions. The forecasted 2025 peak hour traffic volumes on U.S. Highway 50 at the County line are:

| | 2001 Volumes | No Project | Roadway Constrained | Environmentally Constrained | 1996 General Plan |
|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Westbound AM | 3,950 | 5,960 | 5,610 | 6,640 | 6,540 |
| Westbound PM | 1,730 | 3,780 | 3,720 | 4,220 | 4,200 |
| Eastbound AM | 1,620 | 3,400 | 3,310 | 3,810 | 3,780 |
| Eastbound PM | 3,900 | 5,710 | 5,370 | 6,360 | 6,300 |

The ultimate improvement concept for U.S. Highway 50 from Folsom to just west of Placerville is three mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane according to the *State Route 50 Transportation Concept Report* (Caltrans, 1998). Caltrans verified this recommendation in their June 11, 2003 comment letter on the El Dorado County General Plan DEIR. If this configuration were provided by 2025, LOS E or better operations would occur on U.S.

Highway 50 in both directions during peak hours. The City of Folsom and El Dorado County should work cooperatively with Caltrans to determine the extent, timing, and funding for U.S. Highway 50 mainline improvements after adoption of a General Plan in El Dorado County.

Chapter 7 of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (pages 7-7 through 7-9) provides a description of the regional traffic impacts due to growth within El Dorado County. It should be noted that congestion west of Folsom, and certainly more so as you approach the City of Sacramento, will be more heavily impacted by the growth policies of other jurisdictions such as the Cities of Folsom and Rancho Cordova and the County of Sacramento. As traffic that originated or ended in El Dorado County, moves through the areas west of Folsom, it becomes a decreasing percentage of the traffic on a particular facility the farther west that facility is located. The population numbers shown in Chapter 7 from the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) show how El Dorado County is only a small portion of the growth expected within the region.

Response to Comment 281-108 (EIR): Pages 5.7-25 through -26 of Volume 1 of the EIR discuss emergency response time goals established by the California Emergency Medical Services Authority. First-response entities must meet these standards, and their performance is regularly reviewed by CEMSA to determine compliance. Increases in emergency response times caused by increased development, including delays caused by traffic, can be addressed through the construction of new fire protection and emergency medical facilities in appropriate locations as the need for such facilities arises. The impacts associated with these new facilities and proposed mitigation measures are discussed under Impact 5.7-2 of the EIR. Under congested traffic conditions, emergency responders can generally utilize roadway shoulders as travelways. State fire safe regulations and County roadway design guidelines establish roadway width and design standards designed to ensure adequate fire and emergency response and evacuation capability.

Response to Comment 281-109 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-106. The commenter refers to a section of CEQA stating that economic or social changes of a project may be used to determine physical environmental impacts if there is a cause and effect. County staff is unaware of such a relationship here and the commenter has provided no evidence of one.

Response to Comment 281-110 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-69. The EIR acknowledges that expansion of the roadway system would accommodate new growth in the County. The impacts of that growth are analyzed in Chapter 5 (Volumes 1 and 2) of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-111: NOP scoping comments regarding surface water resources are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-708 through 281-745.

Response to Comment 281-112 (EIR): This comment reiterates information in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-113 (EIR): Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for the requested correction to page 5.5-11.

Response to Comment 281-114 (EIR): This comment reiterates information in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-115 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 211-3. The citation to Public Law 101-514 has been revised to reflect the correct subsection. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. Although there is no formal agreement regarding the distribution of the “Fazio water”, the EDCWA and west slope water providers have reached an informal consensus regarding the sharing of that future water supply equally (Hetland, Bill, El Dorado County Water Agency, personal communication with Peter Maurer, El Dorado County Planning Department, December, 2003). The statement that each district has the “opportunity to obtain an additional 7,500 afy” is accurate.

Response to Comment 281-116 (EIR): Comment 211-3 provided by EID clarifies that the percentage split of the water is not necessarily fixed at 50:50. In fact, the actual split of water between EID and GDPUD will be determined by each agency’s relative needs.

Response to Comment 281-117 (EIR): Page 5.5-18 has been revised in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document to clarify the status of the Fazio water supply EIS/EIR.

Response to Comment 281-118 (EIR): The determination as to whether all requirements for obtaining Fazio water have been met is within the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation. This is one reason why the EIR does not assume that any water other than firm water is available to meet future demands and why extensive mitigation is proposed in Subsection 5.5.1 of Volume 1 of the EIR. Please refer also to Master Response 20.

Response to Comment 281-119 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 211-4 and 281-117 for clarification on page 5.5-18 regarding the status of the Fazio water supply project.

Response to Comment 281-120 (EIR): The Federal Power Act requires FERC to give equal consideration to environmental quality in its licensing decisions. While the Act generally does not require the adoption of particular measures, proposed projects that are within national forests or other federal reservations are subject to Section 4(e) of the Act, which requires FERC to adopt conditions that are determined by the federal resource agency with jurisdiction over those lands to be necessary to protect those lands. Because Project 184 is located within national forest land, FERC is required to adopt proposed 4(e) conditions submitted by the Forest Service.

The April, 2003 settlement agreement referenced by the commenter constitutes an agreement among certain environmental groups, EID, the El Dorado County Water Agency, and State and federal resource agencies (including the Forest Service) as to specific protection, mitigation and enhancement measures to recommend to the Forest Service and FERC as license conditions, and to the State Water Resources Control Board as conditions of the water quality certification required by Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. The agreement is not binding on FERC (which is not a party to the agreement) and does not require the Forest Service to adopt the agreed conditions. However, in October, 2003 the Forest Service approved final 4(e) conditions consistent with the agreement. Accordingly, those conditions must be incorporated into the FERC license. In addition, as noted by the commenter, the comment period for the FERC EIS is closed. While the EIS does not constitute a final decision by FERC on the license, the staff recommendations reflected in the EIS are substantially consistent with the conditions proposed in the settlement agreement. Further, the agreement requires the parties to the agreement to comply with any of the agreed conditions which FERC declines to adopt based on a determination that it lacks jurisdiction to do so. Accordingly, if the Project 184 license is approved, the project will almost certainly be subject to the protection, mitigation and enhancement measures set forth in the settlement agreement.

The analysis of water supply in the EIR does not assume the availability of the 17,000 afy of new consumptive water from Project 184 approved by the State Board in Water Rights Permit 2112, either in the baseline water supply (existing conditions) or in determining potential shortages caused by future development. The EIR acknowledges that Permit 2112 water is likely to be needed to meet increased water demand, and analyzes the potential environmental impacts of providing that water. Although the analysis conservatively did not assume that those impacts would be reduced by any particular protection, mitigation and enhancement measures proposed in the settlement agreement, it is acknowledged that the impacts of obtaining that water supply (as described in Table 5.5-9 of Volume 1 of the EIR) would be lessened by such measures.

Response to Comment 281-121 (EIR): None of the listed projects are considered to provide water supply under the existing conditions for the EIR. Please refer to Response to Comment 211-3 for further detail. The EIR for the General Plan does not authorize construction of any of the listed projects. Therefore, they were not assumed as part of existing conditions. Rather, because increased water demand resulting from development anticipated under the proposed General Plan alternatives could require development of some or all of these projects, the potential impacts of the projects were analyzed as indirect impacts of General Plan adoption. Regarding Project 184, many of the legal issues were recently resolved (at the Superior Court level) in EID's favor. Nevertheless, EID will still require additional discretionary approvals and resolution of legal challenges before it can rely on Project 184 for consumptive purposes.

Response to Comment 281-122 (EIR): The EIR relied on the latest available water demand estimate (described in Appendix E of Volume 3 of the EIR), which utilized water demand factors for different urban and agricultural land use categories as one

assumption to estimate countywide demand for water supplies. Water demand factors differ within the County depending primarily on location, type of land use, and density of development. The water demand factors are defined in Figures 8 and 9 of Appendix E of Volume 3 of the EIR and were assumed not to change over time or by water year type for the reasons listed below:

- the water demand factors are not expected to vary much over time,
- recent building and water use trends are reflected in the water demand factors because these factors are based upon actual and recent water consumption data provided by the County's water purveyors, including recent consumption rates in three separate regions within the EID service area, and
- holding these factors constant helps define the incremental effects of future growth on water demand (future growth is by far the greatest influence on future water demand levels).

Since they are based on recent and actual water consumption rates, the water demand factors in Appendix E of Volume 3 of the EIR reflect typical and recent building sizes and densities in the study area, including the El Dorado Hills region. Even if slight differences in water demand factors were used for water supply planning purposes (and County staff feels the numbers used are sufficiently accurate), it would not change the conclusions of the water resources impact analysis. The project-specific impacts associated with development of additional water supplies were identified as a significant impact requiring mitigation, as described in Subsection 5.5.1 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-123 (EIR): The specific water demand conditions in single areas such as El Dorado Hills were not evaluated. The water resources impact analysis was focused on a system-wide (e.g., EID, GDPUD) assessment of potential impacts. Details of how EID will serve individual areas within its service area are beyond the jurisdiction of the County and the scope of a General Plan EIR. Nor would such an analysis have a bearing on the significance of the impacts evaluated. Please refer to Master Response 2. Please also refer to Response to Comment 281-122 which describes how project-specific impacts were treated.

Response to Comment 281-124 (EIR): The specific details of how EID operates its water delivery systems were not evaluated. The water resources impact analysis was focused on a system-wide assessment of potential impacts. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-123.

Response to Comment 281-125 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-123.

Response to Comment 281-126 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-123.

Response to Comment 281-127 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-123.

Response to Comment 281-128 (EIR): Potential changes in biota that may occur near surface ditches are described in Table 5.5-12.

Response to Comment 281-129 (EIR): For long-term water supply planning purposes, the availability of a reliable recycled water source is considered to be part of the supply when factoring whether there is sufficient water to meet demands. While it is true that recycled water is limited to the amount of wastewater inflow at treatment plants, it is not limiting for the purposes of impact analysis in the EIR because the current and foreseeable capacity for recycled water production is greater than its actual use. Virtually all water is less available during drought, yet it is still considered supply.

Response to Comment 281-130 (EIR): Current Deer Creek WWTP production and discharge to the creek, as stated on page 5.5-75 of Volume 1 of the EIR, is 2.5 mgd.

Response to Comment 281-131: This comment restates information in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-132 (EIR): The specific details of treated versus untreated agricultural deliveries were not evaluated for each water purveyor. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-124, which is applicable to GDPUD.

Response to Comment 281-133 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-134.

Response to Comment 281-134 (EIR): The water conservation section for GDPUD of the EDCWA Water Resources Development and Management Plan states that the district is in the process of lining and replacing ditches and improving operations that affect losses, which is estimated at 3,000 afy.

Response to Comment 281-135 (EIR): This comment reflects information in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-136 (EIR): This comment reflects information in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-137 (EIR): As stated on the Environmental Health Department website, the Environmental Health Division of the Department oversees the Small Water System Program, the objective of which is to ensure that all systems operating in the County are in compliance with the California Safe Drinking Water Act and related regulations. The Division issues permits, monitors water quality data and conducts routine inspections to verify compliance. There are some existing systems, i.e. Outingdale, Swansboro, and Strawberry are the responsibility of the El Dorado Irrigation District. Regarding any anticipated change with respect to these types of systems or the amount of water expected to be produced relative to future growth is information that cannot be projected with any sort of accuracy. This is due to the fact that the water is derived from fractures rather than aquifers and cannot be measured. Any projections would thus be speculative.

Response to Comment 281-138 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 211-3 and 281-121.

Response to Comment 281-139 (EIR): The best available information known to the General Plan team is contained in Appendix E of Volume 3 of the EIR and the El Dorado County Water Agency Water Resources Development and Management Plan, both of which were used in preparation of the EIR analysis. The more specific information requested by the commenter is not necessary to analyze General Plan water demand impacts.

Response to Comment 281-140 (EIR): Agricultural water demands are provided in Tables 5.5-5 through 5.5-8 and Appendix E of Volume 3 of the EIR to the level of detail that is appropriate for the regionwide assessment of demand and supply. Agricultural water demand was estimated based on recent trends in the types of crops planted in the County, particularly the increase in vineyard development (water use values of 1.3 feet per acre were assumed for vineyards). However, there is substantial uncertainty in forecasting future agricultural use and water demand. Table 5.5-1 shows a wide range of potential future agricultural water demands, reflecting substantial unknowns with regard to future agricultural use in the County. Please refer also to Volume 1 of the EIR, pages 5.5-29 to 30.

Response to Comment 281-141 (EIR): The EIR was based on agricultural water demand estimates provided as specified in footnote 2 in Table 5.5-1 of Volume 1 of the EIR, and this accounts for reasonable differences in water use rates among major crops. This table is based on input from all major water purveyors in the County and has been peer-reviewed by several professionals involved in water planning. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-140.

Response to Comment 281-142 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-141. It would be speculative to determine possible future expansion rates for vineyards based on unknown future economic conditions, and this type of analysis would not alter the conclusions of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-143 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 211-3.

Response to Comment 281-144 (EIR): The impacts of additional water supply development by GDPUD for the Fazio water supply are described in Table 5.5-10. Because the percentage split of the available supply between EID and GDPUD is not known, it is not possible to provide any additional details should GDPUD decide to access their share of this water supply by some other means.

Response to Comment 281-145: Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) has been modified; please refer to Response to Comment 211-5 and Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 281-146 (EIR): The commenter's support for the policies and mitigation measures identified for Impact 5.5-1(c) is noted. Regarding the statement on page 5.5-48 that firm yield from Project 184 for consumptive use is not assured, the commenter has not correctly interpreted the statement. The sentence is not referring to the priority of deliveries among municipal, industrial, and agricultural users. Firm yield (available for all uses including municipal, industrial, and agricultural) could be reduced from the projected 17,000 af/yr if the licensing agreement restricts the use in some way that limits full delivery to EID.

Response to Comment 281-147 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(c) and associated new policies are described under Impact 5.5-1 that put additional emphasis on water conservation strategies at the County level and requires the County to develop and implement a water use efficiency program for existing and new residential, commercial/industrial, and agricultural uses. EID is already implementing water conservation measures required by USBR for its water contracts for Central Valley Project water and additional conservation measures. Page 5.5-34 includes a description of ongoing negotiations EID is holding with real estate developers to promote use of dual plumbing for reclamation of household gray water.

Response to Comment 281-148 (EIR): The EIR addresses potential impacts from the development of firm yield water supply sufficient to meet future demands. The commenter's suggested treatment in the EIR of water supplies that have yet to be fully approved and/or developed and apportionment of Fazio water between EID and GDPUD would not alter the anticipated impacts of future development on water supply (except to treat Fazio water as existing rather than future supply). As stated in Response to Comment 211-3, potential impacts are evaluated using existing conditions that include only the existing firm yield supplies. The changes suggested by the commenter would not change the significance conclusion of Impact 5.5-2 or required mitigation. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-121.

Response to Comment 281-149 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-120 and 281-148.

Response to Comment 281-150: NOP scoping comments regarding water quality are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-746 through 281-764.

Response to Comment 281-151 (EIR): The comment is noted. The uncertainty of availability and water supply yield from fractured bedrock aquifers is discussed at length in the EIR on pages 5.5-62 through 5.5-65.

Response to Comment 281-152 (EIR): The commenter's suggestion that the County needs to adopt a new well ordinance is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during their deliberation on the General Plan and EIR.

Response to Comment 281-153 (EIR): As discussed on pages 5.5-62 through 5.5-65 of the EIR, there is a great deal of uncertainty regarding existing groundwater conditions due to the fact that all groundwater in El Dorado County comes from fractured rock. Mapping of this information to include in the General Plan as requested by the commenter has not been pursued because it has already been determined by experts that the information is not useful in the same manner as it is in water table situations such as those located in the Sacramento Valley Groundwater Subbasin (see Response to Comment 281-154). The amount of water passing through fractured rock varies greatly depending on connections between fractures. As a result, interference between neighboring wells is difficult or impossible to predict in advance. The best way to avoid such problems is large lot sizes. A 3- to 5-acre lot is adequate in most cases (California State Department of Water Resources, "Water Facts, Ground Water in Fracture Hard Rock" April, 1991).

Information regarding well performance is documented in the hopes of identifying problem areas and to serve as a basis for future studies as development applications are processed. However given the current state of knowledge in this area, maps of failing wells would not provide dependable information toward the prediction of possible future failings and could possibly be misleading to people who do not understand how fractured groundwater sources function geologically compared to groundwater tables. A map of these areas as requested by the commenter would not change the impact analysis for groundwater resources in the EIR and is not available for inclusion in the Response to Comments document.

Further, General Plan Objective 5.2.3 "Ground Water Systems" and associated policies of the No Project, and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and Policies PS-2d, and PS-2e of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives address the issue of proving that adequate groundwater supplies are available for future discretionary projects that rely on wells. In addition, existing County regulation pursuant to Section 15.16.120 of County Ordinance Code requires proof of adequate water supply as a condition of obtaining a building permit.

Response to Comment 281-154 (EIR): The commenter is partly correct regarding Placer County's groundwater mapping practices. A comparison of the two county's groundwater sources, however, is misleading. Unlike El Dorado County, not all sources of groundwater in Placer County are derived from fractured rock zones. The lower elevations of Placer County lie within the Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin, North American Subbasin, the boundaries of which are the Bear River to the north, the Feather River to the west and the Sacramento River to the south to Folsom Lake (California's Groundwater Bulletin 18, October 1, 2003). This Subbasin is closely monitored by the State Department of Water Resources (DWR), both in terms of quantity and quality. The information continually gathered by the DWR provides the source of the informational mapping available in the Placer County General Plan, as referenced by the commenter. Like El Dorado County, Placer County does not map detailed groundwater in the higher elevations to due potential inaccuracies and unpredictable fluctuations (Maisch, Placer County Water Agency, Director of Strategic Affairs, pers. comm., 2003).

Response to Comment 281-155 (EIR): The EIR, beginning on page 5.5-63, describes the primary hydrogeologic characteristics of the County's fractured hardrock aquifers. As noted, recovery of groundwater storage conditions is rapid following rainfall; impervious area is not a principal limiting factor to groundwater recharge in El Dorado County on a regional scale. In addition, as described in the EIR, the uncertainty associated with groundwater conditions is a specific factor supporting the conclusion that potential impacts from additional groundwater use are significant and unavoidable.

Response to Comment 281-156 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-155. Areas that rely on wells are generally rural/large lots where surface coverage is limited. Thus, impervious area is not a regionwide factor for limiting groundwater conditions. There is uncertainty associated with the other factors that affect groundwater conditions, and mitigation specifically for impervious areas is not recommended.

Response to Comment 281-157 (EIR): The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will consider the commenter's support for the new policies to address mitigation for potential groundwater impacts (i.e., Impact 5.5-3) as they deliberate on the General Plan and EIR.

Response to Comment 281-158 (EIR): Groundwater impacts of the General Plan are cumulative to El Dorado County and are therefore considered in Subsection 5.5.3. Because impacts are localized, the analysis is based on localized issues. It is unlikely that General Plan development would affect groundwater resources outside the County because of the fractured nature of the bedrock and isolated locations of groundwater; thus, groundwater impacts outside the County are not expected. Section 7.1 of Volume 2 of the EIR discusses the focus of the analysis, acknowledging that Chapter 5 addressed cumulative countywide impacts.

Response to Comment 281-159 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding sewage treatment are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-766 through 281-779.

Response to Comment 281-160 (EIR): The Deer Creek WWTP has tertiary treatment capacity for about 1.5 mgd of its existing permitted capacity.

Response to Comment 281-161 (EIR): Regarding Camino Heights WWTP capacity, please refer to Response to Comment 104-4, which describes that the plant currently has excess capacity and there are no plans to expand the facility. Regarding Rancho Ponderosa and Gold Ridge, neither was mentioned in the EIR because they are not consequential to the impacts of the General Plan. Rancho Ponderosa is a sprayfield/pond system for approximately 100 homes with no plans for expansion. Gold Ridge Forest is a leachfield that serves approximately 40 homes and has no plans for expansion. These are existing facilities that would be unaffected by any of the General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-162 (EIR): Silva Farms is a permitted biosolids land application facility located in southern Sacramento County. It is an active cattle ranch and the biosolids are land-applied where cattle feed crops are grown.

Response to Comment 281-163 (EIR): The comment refers to regulations pertaining specifically to land application of biosolids for reclamation into the soil as opposed to other disposal options (e.g., surface disposal, landfills, incineration). Biosolids from WWTPs are regulated by the RWQCB for a variety of allowable land application uses depending on the method of treatment that the biosolids underwent for reducing pathogens and vector attraction. Chemical content is another factor in the allowable land application uses of biosolids and would have been considered in the permitting for biosolids disposal at Silva Farms. In addition, the other disposal options available for biosolids make any analysis of future management operations speculative. For instance, biosolids are commonly disposed of at landfills in instances when land application does not occur, but they are a very small amount of the solid waste stream. Also, wastewater treatment plant operations undergo project-specific CEQA compliance for activities including their biosolids management program. Consequently, if methods change in the future, such as disposal at a landfill, this would be considered at that time. Given these factors, biosolids disposal is not considered a significant environmental issue associated with the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-164 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-163 for additional information regarding biosolids management. The potential for community resistance or changes in the regulations for land application of biosolids is not a major issue because biosolids can ultimately be disposed of at a landfill if needed (refer to page 5.6-22 of Volume 1 of the EIR, indicating that the Union Mine Landfill has capacity to accommodate sludge disposal under all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives through buildout).

Response to Comment 281-165 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding septic systems are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-780 through 281-796.

Response to Comment 281-166 (EIR): The constraints and limitations of Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (OWTS; also known as septic systems) are described in EIR Volume 1 (refer to pages 5.5-94 through 5.5-95 and 5.5-107) and discussion of Impact 5.5-8 (page 5.5-128). Potential failures of OWTS are largely a function of system age and maintenance. Consequently, the potential impact from increased reliance in the future on OWTS was found to be significant and Mitigation Measure 5.5-8 is identified.

Response to Comment 281-167 (EIR): There are several centralized OWTS in the County including the Greenstone development and mobile home parks. Maintenance for these types of systems are overseen either by Community Service Districts or, as is the case with mobile home parks, the State. All systems undergo the identical permit compliance processes through the County Environmental Management Department

(EMD) that individual OWTS undergo. In addition, they are required to be inspected on a routine basis.

Response to Comment 281-168 (EIR): The sentence is meant to describe that an annual fee is collected with property taxes for OWTS owners to provide funding for the facilities' operation. Commercial haulers also charge for individual pumping and hauling of septage to the facility.

Response to Comment 281-169 (EIR): A study has not been completed to evaluate "widespread failures" of existing septic systems or base land use designations because there is no evidence to support the conclusion that such failures are occurring. Further, the County substantially upgraded its ordinance in 1999 to provide a more state-of-the-art process for constructing OWTS, and this was the basis of analysis for General Plan development in the future.

Response to Comment 281-170 (EIR): A sentence has been added to page 5.5-77 to clarify that expansion of the Union Mine spray field will require CEQA compliance and coordination with RWQCB for required permit amendments. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 281-171 (EIR): A complete description of AB 885 (the relevant legislation) and the SWRCB regulation of County OWTS permitting authority is provided on page 5.5-102 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-172 (EIR): The potential impacts of increased numbers of OWTS are described under Impact 5.5-4 (starting on page 5.5-84) and Impact 5.5-8 (starting on page 5.5-128). A separate cumulative analysis for impacts of OWTS is not included because the impacts described for full buildout of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives essentially include the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable related projects that would contribute to the impact countywide at 2025 and buildout, which is cumulative.

Response to Comment 281-173 (EIR): Regarding the suggestion for additional management measures for Environmental Management Department to implement within the framework of Mitigation Measure 5.5-8, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will consider the suggestion when it deliberates on the final General Plan and EIR. Note that it is likely that other measures will be prescribed when OWTS regulations required by AB 885 are adopted, but it is not known what those regulations would require. Please also refer to Response to Comment 281-182.

Response to Comment 281-174 (EIR): Regarding the analysis of cumulative impacts from OWTS, please refer to Response to Comment 281-172.

Response to Comment 281-175 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding water quality are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-895 through 281-916.

Response to Comment 281-176 (EIR): The commenter is correct that there is no systematic countywide water quality monitoring program. However, the lack of significant water quality problems is based on the fact that there are several resource agencies and institutional mechanisms that serve as early-warning systems for major water quality problems. The RWQCB has authority over the Section 305(b) statewide water quality assessment program, EPA Clean Water Act Section 303(d) assessment of water quality limited segments program, Basin Plan review and associated designation of beneficial uses and water quality objectives, and implementation of Waste Discharge Requirement and NPDES permit systems for the major waste discharge activities within the County. Thus, the RWQCB is tasked with a number of programs that serve to maintain an understanding of the significant water quality issues within the region and implement controls when widespread water quality problems occur. No water body segments in the County (other than Lake Tahoe) have been identified by the State as water quality limited -- i.e., out of compliance with applicable water quality standards -- on the most recent (2002) 303(d) list.

Similarly, local agencies play a role including EMD that tracks public health problems and thus provides early warning for water-borne public health threats. EMD conducts routine public health inspections of public swimming pools and conducts routine water quality monitoring for public health concerns on the South Fork American River (refer to Response to Comment 281-213 for additional detail). The major water purveyors monitor water quality of the treated municipal water system pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water Act and associated amendments, and thus ensure that public health is protected from widespread contamination.

Regarding Hazel Creek Mine, the site is located about 15 miles east of Placerville and two miles southeast of Pacific House on Hazel Creek. The site was under a cleanup and abatement order from the RWQCB. Mine tailings near and within the creek and erosion were the main water quality threats. The mine owners implemented corrective measures and recently (July 2003) received a rescission of the cleanup order from the RWQCB (Rusert, pers. comm., 2003). Regarding water quality of the South Fork American River, El Dorado County EMD works with El Dorado County Parks and Recreation Department to conduct routine water quality monitoring in the South Fork American River pursuant to requirements of the River Management Plan (Novak, pers. comm., 2003). Monitoring has been conducted periodically since the late 1980s and routinely since 1995. Samples are currently collected for E. Coli bacteria (i.e., public health indicator organism) and basic physical/chemical constituents (i.e., temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, turbidity, and electrical conductivity). Five stations between Chili Bar and Salmon Falls are monitored two times per month from April through September and monthly from October through March. During the peak mid-July to mid-August period, E.Coli samples are collected five times in a 30-day period. The data have indicated generally acceptable water quality conditions (El Dorado County River Management Plan, Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report, September 2000).

Response to Comment 281-177 (EIR): Equestrian facilities have been mentioned on page 5.5-90 as an additional potential source of waste; see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. However, there have been minimal incidents of water quality problems from equestrian operations in the County (Silva, pers. comm., 2003) and the impact analysis and mitigation measures are consistent for the potential water quality impacts from horses. The EIR is not encyclopedic, nor is it intended or required to be. It is, however, focused on the overall impacts of the General Plan on the environment as required by CEQA. Please refer also to Master Response 2.

Response to Comment 281-178 (EIR): Regarding runoff from irrigation tailwater, please refer to Response to Comment 281-30. The SWRCB's new conditional waiver program for agricultural discharges is described on page 5.5-102 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-179 (EIR): The SWRCB's new General Waste Discharge requirements program for small wineries is described on page 5.5-103 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-180 (EIR): The County does not track water hardness levels in groundwater. Hardness is a chemical parameter associated with scale production and is not a direct public health-related water quality parameter. The County has not used its financial resources to track these types of concentration patterns in groundwater.

Response to Comment 281-181 (EIR): The limitations of county soils for OWTS are pointed out in the section referenced by the commenter. References to the El Dorado County soil survey are not necessary, as site-specific conditions are the most important issue when siting a septic system. The County standards for OWTS were submitted to the RWCB for consideration. The County's standards for OWTS are described on pages 5.5-105 through 5.5-107 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-182 (EIR): As described on page 5.5-77 of Volume 1 of the EIR, there are currently 25,525 parcels on the west slope that use septic systems. The great majority of these systems were constructed prior to 1999 when the new septic ordinance (Ordinance No. 4542) was passed. The majority of these systems are not up to the standards specified in the new ordinance. The County does not have verified evidence that older systems have lead to groundwater contamination. The County has a voluntary water testing program and has not received reports of significant water quality concerns associated with septic systems in groundwater from well owners.

As described in the EIR (see, particularly, Volume 1 page 5.5-102), the State is in the process of developing regulations for septic systems, as required by AB 885, passed by the legislature and signed into law in 2000. As part of this process, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) conducted a voluntary well test program in El Dorado (and Yuba) County. The SWRCB tested 158 wells in El Dorado County. The results of that study were recently presented to city and county environmental health officials in the

state, including representatives from El Dorado County EMD, at the California Conference of Directors of Environmental Health in early December, 2003. SWRCB reported positive tests for coliform and traces of soaps/detergents in a third of the wells, *E. Coli* bacteria in five wells and elevated levels of nitrogen in 14 wells. The staff of the SWRCB has stated an opinion that septic systems are the most probable source of these constituents.

The information reported by SWRCB does not describe the methodologies used to collect and analyze the data. The data is not consistent with past data collected by the County, which has not identified any significant problems with water quality in wells. In addition, the SWRCB data does not indicate whether any of the wells in which water quality problems were detected were constructed on parcels with septic systems designed in accordance with Ordinance No. 4542. At this time, the SWRCB information is not considered conclusive. In response to the information, County EMD staff has initiated a program to test individual private wells throughout the County. EMD will evaluate the data it receives and determine what future actions, if any, are needed to protect public health.

The General Plan EIR examines the impacts of new development that would be required to comply with Ordinance No. 4542. The EIR concludes that there would be a significant impact and recommends mitigation (see Mitigation Measure 5.5-8). As described above, the County will continue to determine if the data from the SWRCB, coupled with the County's own testing program, indicates a groundwater contamination problem from existing wells that requires additional action to protect public health. Further, as stated in the EIR (Volume 1, page 5.5-130), County regulations for the siting of new septic systems will be required to comply with any State standards developed through the AB 885 regulations.

Response to Comment 281-183 (EIR): The section is correct as written. The failing systems were detected based on system performance indications, not identifiable surface water or groundwater quality contamination. The County detected the problem situations and sewer systems were then required for those areas.

Response to Comment 281-184 (EIR): The underground storage tank (UST) regulations and associated County programs are described in Section 5.8 of Volume 2 of the EIR, Public Health and Safety. The regulation referenced is the federal requirement to eliminate all substandard single-wall USTs at fueling stations; the deadline for compliance was December 22, 1998.

Response to Comment 281-185 (EIR): The word "exceeding" in the context used means that the water quality was better than the secondary water quality standard.

Response to Comment 281-186 (EIR): Existing County General Plan Policy 7.1.2.3 requires Grading Ordinance provisions for erosion control to be imposed on all development projects. This policy is embodied in the existing Building Department policy, "Erosion Control for Site Development," which specifies erosion control measures for all

development irrespective of the size of the disturbed area (URL: www.co.el-dorado.ca.us/building/PDF/Policies/Technical/Erosion_control.pdf). The number of projects that disturb less than 250 cubic yards, and thus would not require a grading permit, is not known and depends on the site-specific development proposed. These types of projects could include everything from a backyard landscaping project, to grading for a livestock pen, to creating a flat spot to park a boat or RV. County staff indicate that such small projects rarely pose an erosion problem (Mueller, pers. comm., 2003). In addition, the County building inspectors have the legal authority to require, and occasionally impose, project-specific control measures if they feel that a specific development situation, even on grading projects of less than 250 cubic yards, needs to address an imminent erosion or runoff problem. Regarding ministerial development, Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) would extend to ministerial projects the same General Plan/environment conditions and considerations as applied to nonministerial development.

The commenter is correct that as of March of 2003, the threshold to require an NPDES permit was reduced from five acres to one acre of ground disturbance. The commenter's presumption that projects not requiring a grading or other permit from the County would be exempt from this requirement is not correct, however. The requirement for coverage by a NPDES permit applies to all construction projects meeting the federal threshold.

In addition, once the NPDES requirements are triggered for a project, those requirements also apply to subcomponents of that project. As an example, in the case of a one acre project that proposes to subdivide and build four homes on ¼ acre lots, the NPDES requirements would extend to the home construction on each of the created lots. In addition, single family home construction is exempt from the grading ordinance because it is regulated under the building permit process. The County Building Department plan checks, and inspects the grading associated with single family home construction.

Given the above, and the other local, State, and federal regulations currently in effect, general grading that is below the County's grading permit thresholds, and outside of a regulated wetland or riparian zone, would have a less-than-significant impact on water quality.

Response to Comment 281-187 (EIR): A statement indicating that Lake Tahoe is on the SWRCB list of impaired water bodies within the State of California will be added to the errata section. Section 5.14 of the EIR addresses existing conditions and environmental impact analyses for the Tahoe Basin. Please see pages 5.14-1 through 5.14-51 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Regarding water quality in the lake, please see both Table 5.14-1 (page 5.14-7) and pages 5.14-16 through 5.14-19, which address the myriad issues affecting water quality of the lake. The Hazel Creek Mine is located on the west slope, which has no listed water segments on the 303(d) list. There is no mention of the mine in the 303(d) listing. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-176 for information on the Hazel Creek Mine.

Response to Comment 281-188 (EIR): The comment is noted. The regulations are correctly described.

Response to comment 281-189 (EIR): The Hazel Creek Mine is an historic gold mine located near Hazel Creek approximately 1.5 miles east (upstream) from Jenkinson Lake. Limited mining occurred prior to the 1900s. Additional mining occurred from 1948 to 1949 and from 1985 to 1987. The mine operated under El Dorado County Special Use Permit S81-86, approved on December 17, 1981 and Special Use Permit S85-37, approved on June 27, 1995. Gold ore was brought to the surface to be crushed and ground in a ball mill and then gravity separated. The sand-sized tailings of country rock comprising schist and quartzite were slurried to settling ponds. Subsequent chemical analysis of the tailings ponds showed elevated levels of soluble lead. A potential for adverse impacts to water quality in adjacent Hazel Creek would be possible if eroded material were to enter the watercourse. The mining site is located within the 100-year floodplain.

In 1997, the Executive Officer of the RWQCB, Central Valley Region, issued Cleanup and Abatement Order (CAO) No. 97-712, requiring the property owner to complete an assessment of the wastes and to clean up and close the site. Subsequent to that effort, the RWQCB adopted Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) Order No. 98-153. The closure plan called for consolidation of the tailings away from Hazel Creek above the 100-year floodplain. The material was placed in a clay cap barrier for containment (closure unit). A program of monitoring and reporting was also required of the closure unit and Hazel Creek. On June 25, 2003, the RWQCB conducted an inspection of the mine site and rescinded CAO No. 97-712, finding the site satisfactorily closed. The mine site is to continue to be maintained and monitored through the post-closure period in accordance with WDR Order No. 98-153.

Response to Comment 281-190 (EIR): It is acknowledged that the SWRCB deliberations on the conditional waiver for agriculture were controversial, and that the waiver has been challenged in litigation (both by environmental organizations seeking full waste discharge permitting for agricultural discharges, and by agricultural interests challenging the imposition of conditions on the waiver). The outcome of that litigation is uncertain. Assuming the waiver is upheld in its current form, the conditions of that waiver will at a minimum provide a greater level of regulatory protection against agricultural runoff than previously existed, and would help reduce runoff from both existing and future agricultural activities. It is possible that the adopted requirements for agricultural activities could be strengthened or weakened as a result of the litigation. However, as discussed in Response to Comment 281-30, the severe agricultural runoff problems of the Central Valley are not present in El Dorado County, and no water bodies in the west slope of the County have been identified by the State as impaired. Accordingly, the outcome of the litigation would not substantially affect the conclusions of the EIR regarding the significance of runoff impacts discussed under Impact 5.5-6.

Response to Comment 281-191 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-186, 281-219, and 281-10. When violations of the County Grading, Erosion, and

Sediment Control Ordinance are brought to the attention of staff, usually through the receipt of a complaint, an investigation is conducted, and appropriate enforcement actions are initiated. On occasion this includes a request to the staff of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, to assist County Staff in bringing about an enforcement action against the violator. In most instances County staff can obtain compliance with the Grading Ordinance without the involvement of RWQCB staff. In some instances, complaints go straight to the RWQCB and County staff only becomes aware of the violation after RWQCB staff have taken some action. Staffs of both agencies have a very cooperative working relationship, and the shared goal of protecting the water quality within El Dorado County.

The commenter's suggestion that the Grading Ordinance should apply to projects that disturb less than 250 cubic yards of soil is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate on the General Plan and EIR.

Response to Comment 281-192 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 104-6 and 104-10.

Response to Comment 281-193 (EIR): The County has authority to regulate OWTS serving up to 100 residential units. If the use of the septic system by more residential units is proposed, then the RWQCB oversees the design and permitting of the treatment system. The SWRCB's new General Waste Discharge requirements program for small wineries is described on page 5.5-103 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-194 (EIR): The Cool Village project referred to by the commenter was reviewed and approved by the RWQCB, whose definition of soil is consistent with the County's definition as set forth in County Ordinance No. 4542, Private Sewage Disposal System, dated November 24, 1999.

Response to Comment 281-195 (EIR): The effectiveness of regulations and policies depends on enforcement. The EIR generally assumes that the policies and implementing regulations adopted by the County will be enforced.

Response to Comment 281-196 (EIR): AB 885 is discussed on page 5.5-102 of Volume 1 of the EIR. It is not known if these regulations, when adopted, will alter the County's regulatory scheme for OWTS. Draft regulations have not been made available for public review and the Notice of Preparation of the EIR required to implement new regulations has not been released. Based on this timing, it can be assumed the regulations are not on track for a January 1, 2004 adoption.

Response to Comment 281-197 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-757 through 281-760.

Response to Comment 281-198 (EIR): Regarding a specific incident of well mud release to the environment, the County does not have the resources to detect every

incident. Regarding education for drilling contractors, all drilling contractors must be licensed and bonded and knowledgeable regarding the regulations that govern their business. They can be held liable for violations of existing law. Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-194 and 281-195.

Response to Comment 281-199 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-10, 281-186, 281-191, 281-219.

Response to Comment 281-200 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 280-102 for a discussion on grading on slopes. The commenter's support for the prohibition of grading on slopes that exceed 30 percent is noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-201 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-10, 281-186, 281-191, and 281-219. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment representing the commenter's position on enforcement of the Grading Ordinance, and the reduction of permit thresholds, are noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-202 (EIR): The comment regarding the significance conclusions reached for Impact 5.5-6 is noted. County staff disagrees with the commenter. There are no regulations governing most of the individual homeowners practices (e.g., improper disposal of dog waste) for the potential pollutant sources mentioned in the comment. However, natural waste assimilation processes in the environment (e.g., decay, exposure to the environment, dispersal, incorporation into soil) serve to greatly reduce the potential transport and concentrations of these materials to offsite transport. If this were not the case, the County would be experiencing both surface water and groundwater quality problems and there is no evidence such urban pollutants are resulting in these problems. As to details of BMPs, page 5.5-97 through 5.5-109 of Volume 1 of the EIR describe a myriad of BMPs required by the various regulations; listing them all in this EIR would cover hundreds of pages but would not change the impacts. Please see the referenced documents for additional and more specific details.

Response to Comment 281-203 (EIR): Please see Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(b) as applied to the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and policies under Goals CO-1 and CO-3 for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. These measures and policies address the need for waterway setbacks, and minimization of impervious surfaces.

Response to Comment 281-204 (EIR): The commenter's suggestion for improved site design to incorporate natural drainage measures is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors when they deliberate on the General Plan and EIR. Please refer also to Response to Comment 108-23.

Response to Comment 281-205 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment representing the commenter's position on compact development, are noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-206 (EIR): The commenter's support for incorporating natural drainage as part of conditional use approvals is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors when they deliberate on the General Plan and EIR. Please refer also to Response to Comment 108-23.

Response to Comment 281-207 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment representing the commenter's position on the increase in surface water pollutants from additional wastewater treatment plant discharges, are noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-208 (EIR): Regarding analysis presented in the EIR on potential water quality impacts of increased OWTS in the County, please refer to Responses to Comments 281-166 and 281-167. Regarding the suggested additional multiple measures that should be included in mitigation for Impact 5.5-8, these suggestions are substantially similar to what the County already requires in the ordinance adopted in 1999.

Response to Comment 281-209: Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-208 and 281-210.

Response to Comment 281-210 (EIR): The commenter's suggestion for "tighter" monitoring of OWTS siting criteria is noted. The most important "gap" identified in the EIR is the lack of a monitoring program and one has been added by Mitigation Measure 5.5-8. No other mitigation is recommended.

Response to Comment 281-211: Please refer to Response to Comment 281-210.

Response to Comment 281-212 (EIR): The commenter's support for Mitigation Measure 5.5-8 is noted. The measure details, including recommended frequency, were developed in coordination with County Environmental Management Department.

Response to Comment 281-213 (EIR): Information on water quality impacts from recreational activities includes monitoring and inspection programs for public health protection at public swimming pools and at designated swimming beaches in lakes and reservoirs on an as-needed or complaint basis. Additional monitoring requirements for public beaches are expected to be issued by the State as well within a year (Silva, pers. comm., 2003). As noted in Response to Comment 281-176, the County's monitoring program on the South Fork of the American River for public health has detected only a

few incidents of elevated bacterial conditions and no outbreaks of disease. The monitoring data that have been collected and the absence of substantial evidence of impairment or public health problems in the west slope portion of the County thus support the conclusions of the EIR regarding the water quality impacts associated with recreation activities.

Response to Comment 281-214 (EIR): The water quality problems mentioned by the commenter regarding human wastes along the Rubicon Trail or from rafters on the South Fork of the American River all represent illegal waste disposal activity. It is difficult to identify the extent of impacts from future illegal activities as this requires extrapolation of limited data. These incidents are considered incidental and temporary and would not change the conclusions of the impact analysis. As described under Impact 5.5-9, the RWQCB did address the Rubicon Trail problem, which demonstrates that the problem was addressed by the existing enforcement systems available. The commenter is correct that swimming occurs at Jenkinson Lake, and EID facility.

Response to Comment 281-215 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding water quality are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-895 through 281-916.

Response to Comment 281-216 (EIR): Storm drainage infrastructure generally consists of those facilities necessary to control and convey storm waters through a given area, watershed, jurisdiction etc. in a safe manner that minimizes adverse impacts on surrounding properties. Infrastructure can consist of any number facilities, including piped storm drainage systems, open channels, cross culverts, dams, levees, detention facilities, drainage ditches, roadside gutters, and in some instances, natural stream channels when they are located within a developed area and are part of a comprehensive area-wide storm drainage system. The watersheds listed in the EIR contain varying degrees of development, and therefore different types of infrastructure. Storm drainage infrastructure has existed in some areas of the County since the early parts of the last century or beyond. Storm drain systems in Placerville, Diamond Springs, El Dorado, Georgetown, and other communities have been in place for many years, while facilities in the communities of Cameron Park, and El Dorado Hills have been in place since the 1960s, and new facilities are being constructed today in conjunction with subdivision development currently occurring in those areas. As stated above, when a natural creek such as New York Creek in El Dorado Hills becomes a component of the comprehensive area wide storm drainage system, it can be considered a part of the overall infrastructure. Natural streams in undeveloped areas of the County would not typically be considered part of the County's storm drainage infrastructure.

Response to Comment 281-217 (EIR): As discussed in Response to Comment 281-186, federal stormwater permitting requirements apply to all construction projects meeting the federal threshold, regardless of whether a permit is required from the County. Most ministerial projects require a permit of some sort, and as long as the ministerial project complies with the prescriptive standards established through federal, and state law, and local ordinance, the project may go forward. Many building permits,

commercial grading permits, encroachment permits, septic system permits, well permits, etc are ministerial. The fact that a project is ministerial does not mean it does not have to obtain a permit and comply with all applicable laws and regulates. In addition, federal and state water quality requirements prohibit non-stormwater (polluted) discharge regardless of the need for a permit governed by the SWRCB or local codes.

Response to Comment 281-218 (EIR): The Regional Water Quality Board and the County have separate and distinct authority as described in the EIR. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-10 and 281-219.

Response to Comment 281-219 (EIR): The existing County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance requires grading permits for development if certain thresholds are exceeded, including the grading of more than 250 cubic yards (cy) of material, the denuding of more than 10,000 square feet of surface on ten percent or steeper grade, or the creation of unstable or erodible slopes. These are typical thresholds for grading ordinances. The EIR determined that the grading ordinance is generally effective in eliminating the significant erosion-related impacts of development, except in the case of steep slopes (which are not fully protected) and agricultural development (which is largely exempt). The proposed mitigation would remedy these problems by generally prohibiting disturbance on slopes of 25 percent or greater, and requiring grading permits for agricultural grading activities. The permit requirement for agricultural activities would apply in cases where one acre or more of undisturbed vegetation is disturbed (see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comment document for a revision to the policy presented in the DEIR). This threshold corresponds with the threshold used for stormwater permits under the Federal Clean Water Act for small construction sites. Soil disturbance of less than one acre is considered to have less-than-significant impacts. Accordingly, a lower threshold for agricultural activities was not necessary.

The commenter correctly notes that within the Lake Tahoe Basin, projects involving more than three cubic yards of excavation or fill require a permit from TRPA. The Basin is subject to more stringent requirements than elsewhere because of the severity of the threat that development-related erosion and resultant nutrient loading poses to the quality of Lake Tahoe. A similar threshold for the west slope portion of the County is not required to mitigate erosion-related impacts to a less-than-significant level and therefore was not proposed as mitigation.

With regard to the issue of grading permits in asbestos prone areas, please refer to Response to Comment 281-10.

Response to Comment 281-220 (EIR): The commenter reiterates information in the EIR regarding the Carson Creek, New York Creek, and the Deer Creek drainage basins.

Response to Comment 281-221 (EIR): Severe storms have occurred over the area of El Dorado County now known as Cameron Park for many millennia, and presumably will

continue to do so into the future, causing high flows in Deer Creek, that may periodically overtop the channel banks. Since urbanized development has been occurring in that area since the 1960s, instances of localized flooding have occurred that have resulted in some property damage. In the 1980s the Soil Conservation Service conducted a hydrologic study of the Cameron Park area that identified those areas along Deer Creek and its tributaries that would be subject to flooding during a 100-year storm event. In the mid 1990s the County commissioned additional hydrologic and hydraulic analyses in the Cameron Park area to further refine the original SCS study. As a result of these studies, the County has conditioned discretionary development projects in the Cameron Park area that fall within the Deer Creek watershed to incorporate mitigation measures that reduce post project peak runoff levels to no greater than pre-project conditions. Since this policy has been in effect, a number of detention basins and other storm drainage improvements have been constructed in the Deer Creek watershed. Those improvements, however, cannot eliminate flooding from the Cameron Park area, particularly given the extent of pre-existing development. Rather, they are designed to prevent new discretionary development from increasing the existing flood risk.

Response to Comment 281-222 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-221.

Response to Comment 281-223 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-221.

Response to Comment 281-224 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment representing the commenter's position on 100-year floodplains, are noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-225 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-335 and 281-340.

Response to Comment 281-226 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-221. Control of peak storm flows from new discretionary development does not mean that no flooding will occur in the future in El Dorado County. Floods will continue to occur occasionally in the County, but as new discretionary development occurs, existing provisions in the "County of El Dorado Drainage Manual" will require that increases in storm runoff are appropriately mitigated.

Response to Comment 281-227 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment representing the commenter's position on design features to reduce impervious surfaces, are noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-228 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment representing the commenter's position on measures to contribute to improved groundwater recharge, and cleaner runoff through natural filtering of pollutants by

vegetation and soil, are noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-229 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding solid waste are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-798 through 281-811.

Response to Comment 281-230 (EIR): The Materials Recovery Facility programs and other Environmental Management Department programs are publicized via advertisements in several of the local newspapers; flyers distributed at special events; flyers given to waste generators during CUPA inspections; and on the Environmental Management Department website.

Response to Comment 281-231 (EIR): A materials recovery facility has not been proposed for the Georgetown area. A transfer station has been proposed; however, a location for this facility has not been determined.

Response to Comment 281-232 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment suggesting that future materials recovery facility sites be selected as soon as possible to avoid conflicts in land use, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-233 (EIR): The question concerning costs for disposal at the Lockwood Regional Landfill and sensitivity to transportation costs does not appear to be relevant to the conclusions in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-234 (EIR): The commenter's questions about the use of German technology to improve recycling rates and its effect on trucking of the residue to Lockwood are beyond the scope of a General Plan EIR.

Response to Comment 281-235 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-233.

Response to Comment 281-236 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the County should look into technology announced by the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-233.

Response to Comment 281-237 (EIR): The commenter's request for a detailed analysis of the constitution of the County's waste stream now and in the future is beyond the scope of a General Plan EIR.

Response to Comment 281-238 (EIR): The Environmental Management Department estimates that 15 to 20 percent of the County's waste stream is generated by construction and demolition activities. Adoption of the Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling

Ordinance will enable the County to directly promote and monitor the recycling of this waste stream.

Response to Comment 281-239 (EIR): The Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on September 23, 2003. This ordinance will serve to increase the diversion of construction and demolition debris materials from landfills to assist the County in reaching the State-mandated goal of 50 percent diversion.

Response to Comment 281-240 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-230. The location of permanent hazardous waste drop off sites is provided in the County's website.

Response to Comment 281-241 (EIR): The commenter's suggestion to require waste collection franchisees to distribute information on hazardous waste collection is acknowledged and has been forwarded to the franchisees. Household hazardous waste information should now be periodically distributed with garbage bills. In addition, information on permanent facilities will also be contained in Environmental Management Department advertisements for other events.

Response to Comment 281-242 (EIR): Small quantity hazmat generators in the County cover a broad range of enterprises that are not susceptible to generalized description. Page 5.6-34 in Volume 1 of the EIR provides examples of CESQGs (e.g., dental offices, photo labs), but by definition these do not include large producers of hazardous materials. The specific nature of the small quantity hazmat generators does not affect the analysis of the impact associated with hazardous materials being analyzed in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-243 (EIR): The average citizen participates in the programs referenced by the commenter by transporting items such as computer monitors, fluorescent bulbs and household batteries to a temporary collection event or permanent collection facility. The facilities and events are continually promoted by the County (e.g., the Environmental Management Department website at www.co.el-dorado.ca.us). The portion of household batteries captured by these programs is estimated to be 70 percent. In addition, they are also sorted out at the MRF.

Response to Comment 281-244 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-310 through 281-329.

Response to Comment 281-245 (EIR): As with other instances of illegal activity (e.g., speeding, zoning violations), the County Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials Division has established policies and procedures for addressing illegal dumping. These include mandatory waste collection in certain areas of the County, a litter collection program along roadways and in other areas, and a complaint process through which members of the public can identify locations where dumping is taking place.

SW/HM staff indicates that approximately 100 complaints per year are received through this program, most of which relate to complaints about illegal deposits of garbage on private property (Johnston, Dave. Manager, Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials Division, Environmental Management Department, County of El Dorado, October 30, 2003 – telephone conversation with Debra Lilly of EDAW regarding illegal dumping of household waste). These complaints are responded to by Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials Division staff members through visits to the individual parcels and, in some cases, through Court-ordered abatement actions. Existing Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials Division policies and procedures are successfully addressing incidents of illegal dumping, and no additional abatement measures are needed. No changes to the DEIR are necessary.

Response to Comment 281-246 (EIR): The information requested by the commenter is not available. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-245.

Response to Comment 281-247 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-245.

Response to Comment 281-248 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-245. The commenter is referred to Chapter 8.42 of the County Code (Solid Waste Management Ordinance) for a description of penalties for illegal dumping.

Response to Comment 281-249 (EIR): The County currently has a vehicle abatement program funded through the Sheriff's Department. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-245.

Response to Comment 281-250 (EIR): Pages 5.6-27 and 5.6-28 of Volume 1 of the EIR provide an analysis of recycling activities in the County. The commenter's request for additional analysis of current programs is beyond the scope of this EIR. As stated in the EIR (Impact 5.6-2), there is ample available landfill capacity to accommodate the County's future needs.

Response to Comment 281-251 (EIR): The County currently has agreements with five franchises. The City of Placerville and El Dorado Hills also have franchise agreements (expiring in 2013 and 2015, respectively). The County's Waste Management agreement expires in 2012. The other four County franchise agreements expire on December 31, 2004. At contract renewal, during franchise agreement oversight and through the resolution of the notice of default with Waste Management, curbside pickup of additional materials is continually being expanded. Expansion efforts include the use of special blue bags, blue bins and a three cart collection system.

Response to Comment 281-252 (EIR): Negotiations to resolve the problem stated by the commenter and the notice of default have progressed significantly and continues to be addressed. The County has recently required the installation of a camera monitoring system at the Materials Recovery Facility in Diamond Springs. The County will soon have the ability to view live footage from these cameras at the Placerville office.

Response to Comment 281-253 (EIR): The commenter is referred to Section 5.8 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Impact 5.8-4 analyzes impacts due to development on known, suspected and unknown contaminated sites. The County currently maintains a list of known contaminated sites. Policy 6.6.1.2 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative require consultation with the Environmental Management Department to identify State-listed contaminated sites prior to issuance of building permits. Policies HS-7a and HS-7b require upkeep of a database and consultation as required in Policy 6.6.1.2. Proposed revisions in the EIR would strengthen these policies (i.e., have the policies applicable on any ground-disturbing activity). Please also refer to Response to Comment 281-248.

Response to Comment 281-254 (EIR): The commenter is directed to page 5.6-45 of Volume 1 of the EIR, under "Electricity Supplier," fifth sentence, which states as follows: "PG&E no longer owns all of its facilities, having sold some recently as a result of legislative deregulation."

Response to Comment 281-255 (EIR): As the commenter notes, Forebay Reservoir is now owned by the El Dorado Irrigation District. Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for the correction that addresses this error.

The issue of potential placement of a PG&E substation in the vicinity of Pine Hill is beyond the control of El Dorado County. If PG&E were to construct a substation, CEQA analysis would be completed by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). As the lead agency, the CPUC would be required to evaluate the project's potential effects on rare plants at the time the analysis is conducted. If the substation would ultimately result in the ability to serve more residences than currently projected, increases in land use density would require a General Plan amendment and subsequent environmental review by the County.

Response to Comment 281-256 (EIR): As the commenter notes, page 5.6-42 describes PG&E's current plans for future natural gas distribution in El Dorado County. This is currently the only information that is available regarding the potential expansion of natural gas distribution. Whether and when PG&E expands its natural gas facilities will depend upon the CPUC's determination of needed expansion projects and PG&E's business practices. If the company were to expand its natural gas facilities, the CPUC would be responsible for completing CEQA analyses on expansion projects and the County would comment as a responsible agency. The CPUC has stated that it intends to conduct an overall evaluation of California's gas infrastructure to ensure that the State's natural gas needs will be met over the next few years. Preliminary information available on the CPUC's internet website indicates that the CPUC is in the process of developing outlook information through 2016 (<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/static/industry/gas/gas+workshop.htm>).

Response to Comment 281-257 (EIR): An analysis of the merits of underground installation of propane tanks in areas of high fire hazard is not necessary for this EIR. All propane tank installations are required to meet applicable fire codes. In addition, Policy HS-2c of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives would prohibit all new development in high or very high wildland fire hazard areas, unless it can be demonstrated that the hazard can be reduced to a moderate level or better as determined by the local fire protection district and CDF.

Response to Comment 281-258 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the EIR only considers the mix of large and small electricity generation plants typical of the current system rather than the so-called “distributed” system of the future, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-259 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the County should consider Zoning Ordinance changes to support residential fuel cell installations, solar energy installations and small neighborhood generating facilities, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-260 (EIR): The commenter’s request for analysis of the California Community Choice Law applying to electrical service does not relate to the environmental impacts of the project and is not within the scope of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-261 (EIR): Placement of large propane storage tanks would be subject to a special use permit as well as federal, State and local regulations designed to ensure safety. The California Public Utilities Commission’s Utilities Safety Branch conducts a safety audit for each propane system every five years to ensure compliance with federal pipeline safety regulations. While the possibility of sabotage of propane tanks in El Dorado County cannot be ruled out, it is considered remote at best. There is no reason to believe tanks in the County would be a target, or that any act of sabotage would be successful. CEQA does not require analysis of impacts that are too speculative for evaluation.

Response to Comment 281-262 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-261.

Response to Comment 281-263 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-59 and 281-346.

Response to Comment 281-264 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment describing the problems with above ground utilities, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-265 (EIR): The commenter is referring to PG&E Rule 20A that provides funding for the undergrounding of existing overhead utility lines. Under that rule there is an involved process for establishing undergrounding districts, details of which are available through PG&E. The County Department of Transportation has engaged in the creation of these districts in the El Dorado Hills area, and has been successful in getting PG&E to underground their facilities in conjunction with several of the County capital improvement projects. This mechanism is utilized whenever possible to achieve the undergrounding of utilities in conjunction with road improvement projects.

Response to Comment 281-266 (EIR): The issue of extending private services such as DSL into the more rural areas of the County is not relevant to the conclusions in the EIR, as it does not relate to environmental impacts.

Response to Comment 281-267 (EIR): The Sheriff's Department currently has a substation in Georgetown.

Response to Comment 281-268 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that starting to undo the sprawling development patterns would address the problem of long response times for law enforcement personnel, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-269 (EIR): The State Fire Safe regulations, applicable to all residences in the County, have a provision requiring addresses on residences.

Response to Comment 281-270 (EIR): Measure PS-L of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and PS-K of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative require consultation with the Sheriff's Department on development applications. Policy HS-2e of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative would prohibit the creation of new gated communities. The same policy in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative discourages new gated subdivisions.

Response to Comment 281-271 (EIR): The commenter's opinion regarding ways to address law enforcement problems is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-272 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the Court system (as it relates to law enforcement) is in need of adequate facilities, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-273 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-371 through 281-387.

Response to Comment 281-274 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding emergency medical services are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-681 through 281-685.

Response to Comment 281-275 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment supporting proposed Mitigation Measures under Impact 5.7-2, but disagreeing with the “less-than-significant” impact determination, are noted for the record. The commenter does not state what significant unmitigated environmental impacts could result (long response times are not, themselves, environmental impacts).

Response to Comment 281-276 (EIR): The *Traditional Neighborhood Development Street Design Guidelines*, Institute of Transportation Engineers, October 1999 provides useful guidance for developing urban neighborhood streets but not rural low-density residential streets such as those in El Dorado County. Page 4 of the ITE guidelines states the following related to applicability:

“These guidelines are intended for TND (traditional neighborhood development) neighborhoods with both attached and free-standing buildings. These neighborhoods also share mixed residential and commercial uses and fairly wide-ranging levels of individual lot density, from about 1 to 40 or more dwelling units (du) to the acre (neighborhoods within a TND typically vary densities within the project, with the overall residential project density in the United States averaging six to ten dwelling units/acre; approximately 25 percent more in Canada).”

Residential subdivisions in El Dorado County usually occur at a density much lower than one unit per acre and do not contain a mix of uses or a variety of density. The high-density residential land use designation in the General Plan alternatives has a density range of one to five units per acre and the medium-density residential land use designation has a density range of 0.2 to one unit per acre. The ITE guidelines are intended for more urbanized areas and would not directly apply to most subdivisions in El Dorado County without first making major changes to the land use pattern.

However, the EIR does propose as mitigation new policy requiring that new streets and improvements to existing rural roads necessitated by new development be designed to minimize visual impacts, preserve rural character, and ensure neighborhood quality to the maximum extent possible consistent with the needs of emergency access, on street parking, and vehicular and pedestrian safety. See Mitigation Measure 5.3-2. This policy would be implemented through a revision of the existing road width standards in the County Design and Improvement Standards Manual to allow for narrower streets and roadways.

Response to Comment 281-277 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter’s position on designing roads for increased safety and on the General Plan and the EIR, are noted for the record and will be considered by

the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Additionally, all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives call for revisions to the County's Design and Improvements Manual and Standard Plans and enforcement of these revised standards. This is an Implementation Measure in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives – Measure TC-C. It is implied in the policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives – Objective 3.1.2 and Policy 3.1.2.1. These revisions would also address roadway safety needs.

The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment recommending the use of fire-resistant materials and construction techniques in high fire hazard areas and discouraging the current sprawling development pattern (Alternative 12 could begin the process), are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-278 (EIR): Responses to all of commenter's scoping comments are provided herein. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-686 through 281-694 for scoping comments on schools.

Response to Comment 281-279 (EIR): The first paragraph under "Schools and Childcare Facilities", page 5.7-33 of Volume 2 of the EIR, refers to the percentage of all school-age children (20.38 percent). The figure in the second paragraph (18.42 percent) refers to children attending public schools.

Response to Comment 281-280 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 77-4 through 77-6.

Response to Comment 281-281 (EIR): School districts are independent jurisdictions from El Dorado County. They are responsible for establishing developer fees (see discussion on pages 5.7-34 through 5.7-39 of Volume 2 of the EIR) as well as for constructing new schools. For responses concerning school district issues, please refer to Comment Letter 77.

Response to Comment 281-282 (EIR): The issue of the Buckeye Union Elementary School District's consideration of asbestos contamination in identifying potential school sites is a school district issue and not within the scope of the analysis conducted in the General Plan EIR.

Response to Comment 281-283 (EIR): The issue of the Camino School District's decisions concerning constructing a new school is a school district issue and not within the scope of the analysis conducted in the General Plan EIR. For responses concerning school district issues, please refer to Comment Letter 77.

Response to Comment 281-284 (EIR): The issue of the Indian Diggings School District's handling of its overcrowding problem is a school district issue and not within the scope of the analysis conducted in the General Plan EIR. For responses concerning school district issues, please refer to Comment Letter 77.

Response to Comment 281-285 (EIR): The issue of Latrobe School District's decisions concerning constructing a new school is a school district issue and not within the scope of the analysis conducted in the General Plan EIR. For responses concerning school district issues, please refer to Comment Letter 77.

Response to Comment 281-286 (EIR): The issue of Mother Lode School District's imposition of Level One development fees is a school district issue and not within the scope of the analysis conducted in the General Plan EIR. For responses concerning school district issues, please refer to Comment Letter 77.

Response to Comment 281-287 (EIR): The questions posed by the commenter concerning private schools and homeschooling are not environmental issues and are therefore not addressed in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-288 (EIR): The questions posed by the commenter concerning eligibility for school day care and funding sources are not environmental issues and are therefore not addressed in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-289 (EIR): The additional mitigation measures proposed by the commenter to mitigate incompatibility impacts associated with development and expansion of school facilities are noted for the record. The County can and has used the development agreement process to require set-asides for school facilities and will continue to do so when the opportunity exists. Please refer to Response to Comment 280-81. However, the County cannot require developers to enter into development agreements. They are contracts entered into voluntarily between a developer and a local government entity. Development Agreements are authorized but not required by State law. The General Plan Alternatives contain policies requiring bicycling and walking to be considered in the school siting process. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-82. With respect to asbestos, Policy 6.7.6.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and Policy HS-10a of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, require new facilities in which sensitive receptors will be located (including schools) be sited away from significant sources of air pollution. Please also see Response to Comment 281-10 and 281-219.

Response to Comment 281-290 (EIR): A proposal for relocation of the main library has not been approved by the Board of Supervisors. Analysis of relocation of County government offices would be the subject of future environmental documents and is not within the scope of the General Plan EIR.

Response to Comment 281-291 (EIR): The commenter inquires regarding library funding which has no direct CEQA implications. The EIR correctly focuses on the potential impacts of new library construction that could result from General Plan buildout. Please see Section 5.7 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-292 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating every effort should be made to site and design libraries to be accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-293 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding parks and recreation are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-1016 through 281-1031.

Response to Comment 281-294 (EIR): The opinion expressed in the comment regarding the organization of the EIR is noted for the record. Impacts to open space with biological value are discussed in Section 5.12 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-295 (EIR): The commenter notes that the EIR addresses parks and open space within the County's jurisdiction. Regarding consistency with the open space plan provisions of the Planning and Zoning Law, please see Response to Comment 299-5 and 281-544.

Response to Comment 281-296 (EIR): Exhibit 5.7-4 in Volume 2 of the EIR (a map of developed parks and recreation facilities) identifies El Dorado Irrigation District's Sly Park facility. A description of this facility appears on page 5.7-68, under "Other Recreation Providers."

Response to Comment 281-297 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding the County trails system are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-1026 through 281-1031.

Response to Comment 281-298 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 17 and Response to Comment 281-74.

Response to Comment 281-299 (EIR): As stated in Objective 9.1.1 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative and Policy PR-1a of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the County's stated primary role is for the provision of regional parks. Policy PR-1b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative calls for provision of a minimum of five acres per thousand residents of County-owned parkland.

Response to Comment 281-300 (EIR): As noted by the commenter, a Notice of Preparation was recently issued for an Environmental Impact Report for the Bass Lake

Regional Park. Analysis of biological impacts will be a part of that document. Analysis of the project-specific impacts of a park is beyond the scope of the General Plan EIR.

Response to Comment 281-301 (EIR): Proposed Mitigation Measure 5.7-5 would add a new policy for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives requiring establishment of a countywide development fee program to adequately fund park and recreation improvements. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-303.

Response to Comment 281-302 (EIR): Information regarding the extent to which the County has used development agreements over the last 20 years to augment parkland shortages in the past is not necessary to the analysis of impacts to parkland from future development. To the extent parks were built through development agreements or any other mechanism, those parks are treated in the EIR as part of the existing setting. Table 5.1-4 in Volume 1 presents the acreage of parks and open space provided in each of the specific plans that govern projects comprising existing commitments in the County.

Response to Comment 281-303 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment that the proposed mitigation for Impact 5.7-5 would not reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Policy PR-4b and Implementation Measure A of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, and Mitigation Measure 5.7-5 for the other Alternatives, require the preparation and adoption of a Parks Master Plan. Current deficits in parkland would be one of the many issues dealt with in this Plan. Mitigation Measure 5.7-5 would require that a countywide fee program be established to provide the additional funds needed to acquire, develop and maintain park land pursuant to the Master Plan, at a level that will attain minimum neighborhood, community and regional park standards. The amount of the fee would include needs for land acquisition that are unmet by Quimby Act funding (e.g., because of ministerial development). The periodic adjustments called for by the measure would account for, among other things, the possible increase in land costs noted by the commenter.

Impact 5.7-6 addresses potential land use incompatibilities between newly developed parks and recreational facilities and the surrounding land uses. Mitigation Measures 5.1-3(b) and 5.1-3(d)—not 5.3-1(d), as mistakenly identified in the table on page 5.7-83 of Volume 2 of the EIR—would reduce this potential to a less-than-significant level by requiring a land use compatibility review for all ministerial and discretionary projects that would identify and avoid possible incompatibilities between these uses. Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for changes to page 5.7-83.

Response to Comment 281-304 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment supporting the use of top and side shielded lighting in the proposed Bass Lake Regional Park, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the Bass Lake Regiona

Park project. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-63 through 281-66, and 281-300.

Response to Comment 281-305 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 253-15.

Response to Comment 281-306 (EIR): Currently, there is joint use of many school facilities, particularly in El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park. Policy PR-4d in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative encourages joint use agreements with other public entities.

Response to Comment 281-307 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-302. An analysis of the County's use of conditions of approval and Development Agreements to dedicate trails for past projects is not necessary to assess the impacts of future development. The County has in the past used conditions of approval to acquire trail easements. Goal PR-3 in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and Objective 9.1.2 of the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative relate to development of trails and bikeways.

Response to Comment 281-308 (EIR): A detailed list of all dedicated trails and easements for trails acquired by the County as a result of discretionary projects is beyond the scope of the General Plan EIR. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-307.

Response to Comment 281-309 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that human health and safety presents another strong argument for changing the past development patterns in the County, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please also refer to Responses to Comments 281-69 through 281-110.

Response to Comment 281-310 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding hazardous materials are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-883 through 281-886.

Response to Comment 281-311 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-240 through 281-253.

Response to Comment 281-312: The information on the number of hazardous waste handlers in the County was obtained from EPA's Envirofacts Data Warehouse, which compiles information on all generators, transporters, treaters, storers, and disposers of hazardous waste that are required to provide information about their activities to State environmental agencies. The handlers listed by EPA included more than just Large Quantity Generators (LQGs) and Small Quantity Generators (SQGs), and thus the numbers of LQGs and SQGs do not add up to the total of 130 handlers. An example of listed handlers that are not LQGs and SQGs is a transporter of hazardous materials. Also many handlers in the EPA's Envirofacts Data Warehouse, such as new handlers, have yet to be classified as LQGs and SQGs.

The criteria used to differentiate between entities that must report their hazardous waste inventories and usage and those that are not required to report, as stated in the regulations pursuant to the Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, are different from the criteria established by the regulations pursuant to California's Business Plan Act (please see page 5.8-2 of Volume 2 of the EIR). In other words, the Federal RCRA pertains to fewer types of hazardous wastes than do the California's laws and regulations; thus the County Environmental Management Department is required to track generators of certain hazardous wastes that the EPA is not required to track. For this reason, the number of generators reported in EPA's Envirofacts database are different from California's ENVISION database.

Response to Comment 281-313 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-883. As described on page 5.8-15 of Volume 2 of the EIR, the California Office of Emergency Services is responsible for implementing the provisions of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) under Assembly Bill 2185 (passed in 1987). This bill authorizes local government agencies (in El Dorado County, the Environmental Management Department) to oversee emergency planning and community right-to-know programs related to hazardous substances, materials, and waste. Statewide information collected through required reporting programs is compiled by DTSC into several lists and databases that are available for review or can be consulted by the public (e.g., Cortese List, CalSites database). Information about the locations of specific site that use, contain, or generate these materials can be obtained from a variety of sources, including the County Planning Department, DTSC, OES, and often realtors.

Because this information is available to the general public through other means, and because the information changes frequently and would quickly become obsolete and misleading, the information is not provided in the General Plan or General Plan EIR. To clarify the availability of information on hazardous materials sites, Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document contains additional language added to page 5.8-15 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-314 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-230 and 281-240.

Response to Comment 281-315 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-241.

Response to Comment 281-316 (EIR): A slight decrease in waste received from 2001 to 2002 did occur; however, the percentage of households participating in the program continued to increase even during that period. The reason for the decrease in total household hazardous waste received during that period is not known, although it may simply reflect normal variations in the amount of such waste produced annually. The household hazardous waste collected in 2002 to 2003 increased dramatically (by about 60 percent) to 889,014 pounds. This increase is attributed to increased load screening efforts at the MRFs. The incorrectly numbered footnote in Table 5.8-1 will be corrected in

the Response to Comments document. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 281-317 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-229 through 281-253.

Response to Comment 281-318 (EIR): Section 5.8 of Volume 2 of the EIR (Human Health and Safety) addresses the potential for development of the General Plan to result in impacts from routine use of hazardous materials (Impact 5.8-1); illegal disposal of hazardous waste (Impact 5.8-2); accidental release of hazardous materials (Impact 5.8-3); and exposure to hazardous waste resulting from new development on known, suspected, and unknown hazardous waste sites (Impact 5.8-4) under the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. Because the analysis addressed full development of the General Plan, the cumulative increase in countywide hazardous waste resulting from future development under each alternative was analyzed. That stated, as indicated on page 7-12 of Volume 2 of the EIR, hazardous materials impacts are generally site-specific in nature; thus, the increase in illegal disposal of hazardous wastes and related impacts resulting from increased development within the County would not be expected to have effects that are cumulative with those resulting from waste generated outside of the County.

Response to Comment 281-319 (EIR): The portions of the Hazardous Waste Management Plan pertaining to the siting of a hazardous waste disposal facility in the County do not need to be updated. Efforts to increase the amount of proper hazardous waste disposal described in the Plan are ongoing. The Plan was superseded by the Integrated Waste Management Plan, which included the Household Hazardous Waste Element, adopted in 1995. In addition, Implementation Measure HS-E of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative require the County to maintain and update the Waste Management Plan.

Response to Comment 281-320 (EIR): As stated by the commenter, there are currently three identified Superfund sites within the County. The former Bennett Sculpture Foundry site, at 4505 Greenstone Road, Placerville, has been cleaned. The responsible parties funded that cleanup. The Lake Tahoe Basin site is a Laundromat near the Intersections of U.S. Highway 50 and State Route 89. That area has widespread perchloroethylene groundwater contamination. The lead agency in this remediation is the Lahontan Region of the Water Resources Control Board. A third site has been identified in the Eldorado National Forest. However, no other information about this site has been found. From the location description, it appears to be located in the Georgetown Ranger District. A conversation with staff at the District revealed that the District is unaware of any site in this area (2003 telephone conversation with John Jue, Resource Officer, Georgetown Ranger District, U.S. Forest Service).

Response to Comment 281-321 (EIR): The California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939) required counties to prepare countywide integrated waste management

plans (CIWMP). The CIWMP for El Dorado County includes a Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE), which expanded on the programs described in the previous plan in effect, the Hazardous Waste Management Plan. The HHWE recommends three courses of action including (1) continued and expanded one day collection events; (2) load checking at disposal sites and MRFs; and (3) recycling and waste exchange. At the time the CIWMP and HHWE were adopted, the Environmental Management Department conducted two household hazardous waste collection events each year. Currently, six are conducted each year. Load checking at the MRFs continues to divert significant quantities of household hazardous waste from the landfills. Oil, batteries, latex paint, fluorescent lights, oil filters, antifreeze, and cathode ray tubes are all recycled. Many items in original containers are exchanged. In addition, there are now three permanent household hazardous waste collection facilities, 21 oil collections sites and an annual marina/bilge oil event. The CIWMP (including the HHWE) is on file with the Environmental Management Department.

Response to Comment 281-322 (EIR): Updating of the CHWMP, which would take place under all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, would ensure that the most current information is being used during the planning process as it relates to hazardous materials and hazardous waste issues. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment expressing disagreement with the less-than-significant impact conclusion for Impact 5.8-1, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The commenter offers no information to support the assertion that the EIR conclusions are incorrect. The mere updating of a plan does not necessarily suggest a current plan is causing environmental effects, and no information is offered here to suggest so. The policies in Alternatives #2 and #3 calling for an update of the CHWMP to reflect regulations adopted since the CHWMP was prepared would improve the effectiveness of the plan, but are not required to reduce hazardous waste exposure impacts to a less-than-significant level. The existing CHWMP, together with federal, State and local regulations, are adequate to minimize exposure risks.

Response to Comment 281-323 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-230.

Response to Comment 281-324 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-318 regarding the cumulative nature of this impact and how it is addressed in the EIR. Note that the EIR acknowledges this impact; pages 5.8-34 through 5.8-27 of Volume 2 describe that each alternative would result in additional growth that would be expected to result in increased illegal disposal of household hazardous waste in proportion to the increase in development in the County. The impact is considered significant under each alternative. Please also refer to Response to Comment 281-318.

Response to Comment 281-325 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 280-84.

Response to Comment 281-326 (EIR): The commenter suggests an additional mitigation measure requiring hazardous materials haulers to travel only at night. The

legal authority of the County to impose a curfew on the transport of hazardous materials is at best limited. For example, the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982, as amended by the Tandem truck Safety Act of 1984 (49 U.S.C. Section 31111 et seq.) preempts State laws that would prohibit trucks and trailers meeting national standards from traveling on national network highways. The Hazardous Materials Transportation Uniform Safety Act of 1990 (49 U.S.C. Section 5101 et seq.) preempts State and local regulation of certain aspects of hazardous waste transportation inconsistent with federal regulations. Some courts have held curfews on hazardous waste transport to be inconsistent with federal regulations prohibiting unnecessary delay of hazardous materials transport. Accordingly, a curfew was not proposed as mitigation.

Response to Comment 281-327 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-257.

Response to Comment 281-328 (EIR): Real estate disclosure laws already require sellers to disclose any known contamination on the property. Proposed Mitigation Measure 5.8-4 would require remediation of contamination prior to construction of new development on suspected contaminated sites.

Response to Comment 281-329 (EIR): The commenter points out that revised Policy 6.6.1.2 and HS-7b on page 5.8-50 of Volume 2 of the EIR contain inconsistent language regarding the persons required to prepare reports on potentially contaminated sites. The language in Policy HS-7b will be changed to “Registered Environmental Assessor” to be consistent with Policy 6.6.1.2. See Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for this modification. Please also refer to Response to Comment 281-328.

Response to Comment 281-330 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding flooding are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-860 through 281-882.

Response to Comment 281-331 (EIR): Please see Response to Comment 162-31 for information about the Silver Lake dam failure inundation zone and its relationship to the Caples Lake dam failure inundation zone. Also, please see Response to Comment 280-94 regarding Finnon Lake.

The list of dams presented on page 5.8-53 is not intended to be a complete accounting of all dams in El Dorado County. Caples Lake is included in the discussion because the majority of its inundation area is in El Dorado County.

Ownership of Jenkinson Reservoir has been transferred from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). EID has taken over maintenance of the dam failure emergency plans for the facility, including dam failure inundation zone mapping, which was originally completed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mapping of potential inundation areas associated with the Mormon Island auxiliary dam has been completed and is on file with OES. The Promontory Environmental Impact Report included a mitigation measure requiring development of an evacuation plan

for that project area, which is also on file with the County Office of Emergency Services (OES). Though the auxiliary dam is under federal jurisdiction, the OES would assist the Federal Dam Safety Office with any dam failure emergency.

In response to this comment and others (162-31, 280-84), the County has revised the information presented in the draft General Plan alternative documents. The language now refers to all dams within the County and under the jurisdiction of DSOD, which maintains dam safety information for each structure rather than referring only to the dam failure inundation zones that have historically been considered. By making this change, more areas potentially subject to flooding would be considered during project review. Please see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for the proposed revision.

Response to Comment 281-332 (EIR): The dam failure inundation and emergency response information for Cameron Park Lake and Jenkinson Reservoir on file with the DSOD is the most current information available. The Planning Department has access to the same information. Discretionary projects near Sly Park Creek and Camp Creek below its confluence with Sly Park Creek would be evaluated for potential flood hazards, including those associated with dam failure. The revised General Plan documents identify Jenkinson Reservoir as having a dam failure inundation zone (see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document).

As noted in Response to Comment 281-331, Mormon Island auxiliary dam is under the jurisdiction of the federal government. However, the OES has an evacuation plan and dam failure inundation information on file. Because development associated with The Promontory has already been evaluated for dam failure inundation issues, there is no need for further future mitigation for potential dam failure inundation hazards below the Mormon Island auxiliary dam.

Response to Comment 281-333 (EIR): The design and construction of new small dams that fall below the threshold of the jurisdiction of the State Division of Safety of Dams are regulated under the County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control ordinance, and are reviewed and inspected by the Department of Transportation.

Response to Comment 281-334 (EIR): The anecdotal statement that a car was swept downstream in Knickerbocker Creek during a storm event does not make the Creek a flood-prone area under the definition utilized by FEMA under the National Flood Insurance Program. Flood Insurance Rate Map 060040-0175 B lists that portion of El Dorado County as an area of “minimal flooding.” That does not mean that areas of localized flooding do not occur, but that the potential for widespread flooding, and the requirement for mandatory flood insurance does not exist. The commenter is directed to www.fema.gov for a detailed discussion on the FEMA flood hazard-mapping program. The County uses the FEMA maps when reviewing building permit applications on properties adjacent to major creeks in flood-prone areas to verify that buildings are located out of the 100-year floodplain. Applicants on discretionary projects don't rely on the FEMA maps; they are required to submit hydrologic analysis as part of the submittal

package that specifically identifies the 100-year water surface elevation for any drainages that affect, or are affected by the project. In areas of the County that have experienced urbanized development, and have demonstrated flooding problems, detailed hydrologic and hydraulic studies have been performed to identify the 100-year water surface elevations, and delineate those areas that would be subject to inundation during a 100-year storm event. Those studies may be conducted by federal, State, or local agencies, or may be done by a private organization. When one of those studies is performed, and meets the requirements of FEMA, it will be incorporated into their latest flood hazard maps. Studies of this sort have been conducted on portions of the Hangtown Creek, Deer Creek, New York Creek and Carson Creek watersheds, to name a few.

Response to Comment 281-335 (EIR): The determination of floodplain criteria as a mechanism of controlling building standards, and/or allowable building location, is a means of controlling risk. The current generally-accepted standard utilized in the FEMA National Flood Insurance Program is the 100-year floodplain. This represents the area of inundation that would be expected to result for a storm event that has a one percent chance of occurring in a given year, or conversely, a storm event that would occur on average of once every 100 years. In most instances this is deemed to be a reasonable, adequate and readily achievable level of protection for inhabited areas. With some facilities, a 10-year level of protection may be adequate, for instance when the use is seasonal, and the facility can be readily flood-proofed, or by its nature is not adversely effected by periodic inundation, such as park facilities, boat launching ramps, summer homes etc. In other instances such as major urban areas protected by levees from major river systems, or critical facilities such as national defense installations, or major dams, a level of protection of 500 years, or 1000 years may be considered to be appropriate. The report cited by the commenter is referencing the latter situation when it makes reference to locations like Marysville, Yuba City, and Sacramento. These are urban areas in flat valley locations within the potential floodplains of major river systems that have experienced major flooding in the past, and are currently protected against flooding by a system of levees and bypass weirs. The circumstance in El Dorado County is significantly different. The foothill and mountainous terrain of El Dorado County leads to fairly narrow and well-defined stream channels, high flow velocities, and limited expanse of flood-prone area. With the exception of the American, Cosumnes, and a few other rivers that touch the County, the watershed areas are small when considered on a statewide basis. Also, the flatter valley areas within El Dorado County that have been developed are situated on local creeks, not on the major river systems. For those reasons, and the fact that the 100-year floodplain is the nationally recognized standard for FEMA, El Dorado County has incorporated that into its ordinance code. As mentioned above, however, facilities such as jurisdictional dams located within the County are designed to safely accommodate storm events in the 500-year to 1000-year range.

Response to Comment 281-336 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 280-84.

Response to Comment 281-337 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-334 for a discussion on the FEMA National Flood Insurance Program, and associated FIRM

mapping. Copies of the FIRM maps are available at the County offices for viewing, or can be viewed or purchased through the FEMA web site.

Response to Comment 281-338 (EIR): The commenter's reference to "previously mentioned omitted dams" is assumed to refer to the dams listed in Comment 281-331. The dams included in the data on Table 5.8-5 of Volume 2 of the EIR are all located in El Dorado County, as indicated by the data in the table headings. Cameron Park Lake Dam, Jenkinson Lake Dam and Finnon Lake Dam are all among the 59 dams shown in the table. Please refer, also, to Responses to Comments 281-331 through 281-337.

Response to Comment 281-339 (EIR): The commenter's position on the adequacy of the FEMA flood hazard maps is noted for the record, and the commenter's attention is directed to Responses to Comments 281-334, 281-335, and 281-337.

Response to Comment 281-340 (EIR): The commenter's disagreement that protection from only the 100-year flood (rather than a larger event) is less than significant is noted for the record. The 100-year flood is a standard benchmark for flood protection planning and determining the significance of flood-related impacts under CEQA. Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines is an initial study checklist and is commonly used to determine if the impacts of a project have the potential to be significant. One of the questions on the checklist is "Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard map?" Another question is "Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure which would impede or redirect flood flows?" While these standard significance thresholds may not be sufficient to analyze flooding impacts in certain urbanized areas of the state, this is not the case in El Dorado County. Please see Response to Comment 281-335.

Response to Comment 281-341 (EIR): Exhibit 5.8-1A in the EIR, Volume 2, depicts flood hazard areas in the County based on 1996 FEMA data and newer data (2003) obtained by EDAW. Please also refer to Response to Comment 281-335 regarding the update of FEMA maps. Policy CO-3c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires buffers from water features. Implementation Measure CO-C requires the preparation of a riparian setback ordinance. Provision of specific standards within an ordinance would be more appropriate than providing these standards within the General Plan itself.

Response to Comment 281-342 (EIR): Determinations if parcels are within a floodplain are made on ministerial permits (e.g., for building permits). Standards for structures partially within specific flood zone areas are contained in the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance that is currently in the process of being updated.

Response to Comment 281-343 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment supporting proposed Mitigation Measure 5.8-6(a) prohibiting creation of new parcels entirely within a dam failure inundation area, and if the measure is not adopted, to ensure that disclosure is made to potential buyers, are noted for the record and will be

considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-344 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-335.

Response to Comment 281-345 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-59 through 281-62.

Response to Comment 281-346 (EIR): The commenter disagrees with the conclusion of the EIR that health and safety impacts from wireless phone facilities are less than significant. Wireless phone antennas produce a form of nonionizing radio-frequency (RF) radiation (technically different than the electromagnetic fields or “EMFs” produced by power lines), to which people near the antennas may be exposed. The consensus of the scientific community, both in the US and internationally, is that the power from mobile phone base station antennas is far too low to produce health hazards as long as people are kept away from direct access to the antennas. FCC regulations governing mobile phone antennas are considered to be extremely conservative, and typical exposures have been found to be far below those standards. Accordingly, there is no basis for revising the EIR’s significance conclusion. For more information, please refer to *Cellular Phone Antennas (Mobile Phone Base Stations) and Human Health*, Moulder, J. PhD, on the Medical College of Wisconsin website (<http://www.mcw.edu/gcrc/cop/cell-phone-health-FAQ/toc.html>). It should be noted that federal law preempts local governments’ authority to regulate wireless towers based on health and safety concerns. Accordingly, the County could not adopt the mitigation measures proposed by the commenter (see Comments 281-62 and 281-347) to the extent they relate to health and safety concerns. The discussion of mobile phone antennas on page 5.8-75 of Volume 2 of the EIR has been revised to clarify the distinction between RF radiation and EMFs. Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 281-347 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-62 and 281-346.

Response to Comment 281-348 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding naturally occurring asbestos are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-887 through 281-894. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-349 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-350.

Response to Comment 281-350 (EIR): The best available information concerning areas where geologic conditions favor the formation of asbestos bearing materials is a report and accompanying map produced by the California Department of Conservation (DOC) California Geological Survey, called *Areas More Likely to Contain Natural Occurrences of Asbestos in Western El Dorado County, California*, 2000 (Open-File Report 2000-02).

Exhibit 5.8-2 of Volume 2 of the EIR is based on the DOC map. The purpose of this map is to provide information to local, State and federal agencies and the public as to where natural occurrences of asbestos bearing materials may be found, not whether these materials are present or absent in bedrock or soil associated with a particular parcel of land. This determination can only be made during a detailed site-specific examination of the property.

A discussion of occurrences of tremolite associated with both serpentinite and nonserpentinite rocks can be found on pages 8 and 10 of the DOC report respectively. In addition to serpentinite, other rock types containing tremolite/actinolite asbestos are carbonates, metamorphic rocks such as schists and igneous rocks. These rocks are most likely found along faults or within fault zones that traverse them. The number of documented occurrences of tremolite-actinolite asbestos is lower for these rock types than for tremolite found in serpentinite formations. However, since serpentinite also usually occurs near faults or within fault zones, the areas identified most likely to contain each of these types of asbestos would overlap. Further information can be found on page 3 of the DOC report. This contains an exhibit that illustrates the locations of ultramafic rocks and faults in El Dorado County where serpentine rock and asbestos may occur, including nonserpentinite areas where tremolite asbestos may be present, particularly near faults. In addition, as discussed on pages 11 and 12 of the DOC report, two specific areas of contact metamorphosed carbonate with tremolite asbestos potential were identified and are shown with symbols on the map for El Dorado County. One of these sites is located just north of the south fork of the American River near the northeast contact of the Pine Hill intrusion. The other is located near the Cosumnes Copper mine. Additional study is recommended by the DOC in both of these areas to evaluate the habit and extent of tremolite and actinolite.

The correlation between asbestos and health risks is well known but cannot be calculated directly. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-464 regarding the County's ordinance controlling grading, excavation, and construction activities relating to asbestos. County public health officials, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors take into account many sources of information in making decisions regarding public health and safety concerns, including the dangers of developing on land with possible asbestos exposure. The concerns and opinions expressed by the commenter about the County's need to establish acceptable background levels of mesothelioma are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-351 (EIR): As explained in Response to Comment 281-350, the EIR was prepared using the best available information on asbestos exposure. New research is constantly being conducted into public health issues, and the results of that research will be taken into account by County public health officials and the Board of Supervisors in making land use decisions. Please also refer to Response to Comment 281-465. In addition, Mitigation Measure 5.8-9(b) requires a site-specific geologic review

conducted by a qualified geologist for projects located in areas of possible asbestos exposure. Such a site-specific review could appropriately include more detailed information about specific health risks. The concerns and opinions expressed by the commenter about the need to include policies about tremolite in the General Plan are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-352 (EIR): The impact analysis for asbestos exposure in the EIR focuses on dust-generating activities such as grading, mining, and use for surface applications because the health risks associated with asbestos involve inhalation of asbestos particles into the lungs. Residential uses were the focal point of the discussion because, as a general rule, following the completion of construction, nonresidential uses have a larger percentage of impermeable surfaces than do residences. However, each individual residential or nonresidential project on soils likely to contain asbestos would undergo a geologic review to evaluate site-specific conditions and risks involving asbestos. Also, in response to this and other comments submitted on the DEIR, the mitigation measures relating to asbestos have been clarified. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-453 and see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for revisions to Section 5.11, Air Quality. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-353 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) requires that all discretionary and ministerial projects of 120 square feet or larger undergo a General Plan conformity review to ensure compliance with all applicable General Plan policies. This would include the vast majority of projects in the County, including projects too small to qualify for a grading permit. Thus, the commenter's concerns about unregulated asbestos exposure would be addressed and the circumstances identified in the comment would be brought to the attention of the appropriate decisionmakers before the specific project is approved. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-354 (EIR): The County does not use the 1974 soils survey maps as the base of information in identification of asbestos prone areas. As discussed in Response to Comment 281-350, the best available information regarding asbestos prone areas is contained in the DOC report and associated map, *Areas More Likely to Contain Natural Occurrences of Asbestos in Western El Dorado County*. Exhibit 5.8-2 of Volume 2 of the EIR is based on the DOC map. The DOC prepared this map in order to provide information to local, State and federal agencies and the public as to where natural occurrences of asbestos bearing materials may be found. The map is not intended to show site-specific presence of absence of these materials. This determination can only be made during a detailed site-specific examination of the property. Available information and knowledge is not sufficient to allow site-specific prediction of asbestos occurrences. However, the County can and does use this map to identify general areas where further soil studies are warranted. Please refer to Responses to Comment 281-10, 281-219,

281-350, and 281-352 for further discussion of existing and proposed County procedures regarding asbestos exposure.

Response to Comment 281-355 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-10, 281-219, 281-350, and 281-352 for a discussion of the location of likely asbestos-prone areas in the County (including tremolite), and the EIR's proposed measures to minimize asbestos exposure caused by future development. The County does not have information regarding potential asbestos exposure that may have occurred during construction projects in the past. As noted in Response to Comment 281-354, the County currently uses the 2000 DOC report and associated map of *Areas More Likely to Contain Natural Occurrences of Asbestos in Western El Dorado County* in identifying asbestos prone areas and does not rely on the 1974 soils survey maps.

Response to Comment 281-356 (EIR): As stated in Response to Comment 281-464, the County has approved Ordinance 4548, adopting the CARB asbestos content level as a "permissible asbestos level" in the County. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-453 regarding the addition of Mitigation Measure 5.11-3(e), which requires an assessment of post-construction exposure to asbestos before project approval. In addition, Mitigation Measure 5.8-9(c) requires a public information program to notify the public about the health risks of asbestos exposure. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-357 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.8-9(b) requires a geologic review for all projects requiring a building or grading permit that would be located on soils with potential asbestos exposure; because Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) requires a General Plan conformity review for all discretionary and ministerial projects, the County would be aware of most projects taking place on such soils. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-358 (EIR): The commenter provides suggestions for elements that should be included in the Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan, required under Ordinance 4548 (please refer to Response to Comment 281-464). Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-359 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-453 regarding the proposed Mitigation Measure 5.11-3(e), which would add a new policy to the General Plan regarding post-construction asbestos exposure. In addition, Mitigation Measure 5.8-9(c) requires that the public be provided with information about nearby potential for asbestos exposure. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-360 (EIR): Proposed Mitigation Measure 5.8-9(c) for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives would create a new policy establishing a property deed notification program relating to naturally occurring asbestos. In addition, the proposed implementation measure would require the County to adopt a Naturally

Occurring Asbestos Disclosure Ordinance. Notification would be required for property transfers in areas covered by the mapping, including purchases from builders. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-361 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-360. The specific requirements for disclosure would be determined when the proposed implementing ordinance is adopted. Such requirements may include distinguishing between tremolite and other forms of asbestos, if warranted based on the state of knowledge regarding the different forms of asbestos at the time the ordinance is adopted. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-362 (EIR): The commenter's questions concerning the actions of the Rescue School District in connection with a proposed school sites are beyond the scope of the General Plan EIR. The school district is an independent jurisdiction. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-363 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that oversight of asbestos-related issues should be done by someone with expertise in these issues, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Mitigation Measure 5.8-9(b) provides that the required inspections be performed by a California-registered geologist knowledgeable about asbestos-containing formations. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-364 (EIR): Proposition 65, the Safe Drinking Water Act and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, was enacted as a ballot initiative in November 1986. The Proposition was intended by its authors to protect California citizens and the State's drinking water sources from chemicals known to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm, and to inform citizens about exposures to such chemicals. The Act requires the governor to publish, at least annually a list of chemicals known to the State to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity. In response to Proposition 65, the California Air Resources Board has issued an ongoing notice to the inhabitants of El Dorado County regarding the potential of asbestos related exposure. In response to this notice, the County Building Department, in cooperation with the Environmental Management Department, enforces the requirements set forth in the Air Pollution Control District's *Prescriptive Standard - Fugitive Dust Prevention and Control and Contingent Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan*. Every building permit application within the County includes a handout with this information regardless of location. The intent of this Prescriptive Standard is to insure that adequate dust control and asbestos hazard mitigation measures are implemented during all phases of project construction and operation, including any soils that require capping or soils moved offsite. Such soils are regarded and managed as hazardous substances. It's also important to note that building permits

are required for such outdoor construction items that may involve grading activity such as swimming pools, retaining walls over four feet in height, and fences over six feet and thus subject to scrutiny regarding asbestos potential in the soils. In addition, an Implementation Measure was added to each of the four equal-weight Alternatives, under Impact 5.8-9: Public Exposure to Asbestos, that requires the Department of Transportation and the Air Quality Management District to consider posting a "Hazardous Conditions" sign at the work site if the site has been determined to contain harmful levels of asbestos material. Proposition 65 is thus adhered to with regard to asbestos in El Dorado County.

Response to Comment 281-365 (EIR): Requiring a conformity review for projects of 120 square feet or 250 cubic yards of grading would encompass the vast majority of projects likely to be undertaken in the County. The alternative implementation measure identified in the mitigation provides adequate level of detail about the information to be provided by the applicant to ensure that the impact could be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-366 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment supporting Mitigation Measure 5.8-9(b) but stating that at this point the effectiveness cannot be judged, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-10, 281-219, and 281-351 through 281-353 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-367 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment supporting Mitigation Measure 5.8-9(c) and stating that potential buyers must be notified of the severe hazard presented by amphibole asbestos, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10, 281-219, and 281-361 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-368 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.8-9(d) is intended to keep the Board of Supervisors informed of the latest information regarding asbestos. Mitigation Measure 5.8-9(c) requires a public information program that would provide the same types of information for the general public. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-369 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 216-27, 281-289, 281-10 and 281-219.

Response to Comment 281-370 (EIR): Asbestos hazards resulting from construction are related to the ability of airborne particles to be inhaled into the lungs. Air quality policies and mitigation that require control of fugitive dust on construction sites and application of the Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan required under County Ordinance

4548 would require that dust be controlled, minimizing the hazard to neighboring properties. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-371 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding fire protection are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-651 through 281-668.

Response to Comment 281-372 (EIR): The figure provided in the EIR for average number of fires and acreage burned in the County in recent years is based on data collected between 1981 and 2001. The Cleveland fire occurred in 1992. Therefore, it is included in the acreage burned that was used to calculate annual averages.

Response to Comment 281-373 (EIR): The factual information provided by the commenter about a fire in 1934 is appreciated and noted for the record. The information does not alter the conclusions regarding wildland fire hazard conducted in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-374 (EIR): The commenter provides opinion on historic logging activities that may have contributed to the present potential for catastrophic fire. This information is noted for the record. It does not alter the impact analysis on wildland fire hazard conducted in the EIR.

The opinion expressed in this comment endorsing the statement on page 5.8-111 of Volume 2 of the EIR that allowing substantial population growth into severe and high fire hazard areas increases fire risk, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-375 (EIR): These requirements are contained in several documents including, but not limited to, the County's Design and Improvements Standards Manual, the various building codes, and State and federal laws and requirements.

Additionally, all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives call for revisions to the County's Design and Improvements Manual and Standard Plans and enforcement of these revised standards. This is an Implementation Measure in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives – Measure TC-C. It is implied in the policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives – Objective 3.1.2 and Policy 3.1.2.1. These revisions would also address fire safety needs.

Response to Comment 281-376 (EIR): In general, a small portion of the roads in the "developed" parts of the County do not meet the current standards although the County has not calculated the exact mileage of such roads. As outlined in Response to Comment 281-377, the County Capital Improvement Program coupled with improvement and mitigation requirements of new development addresses reconstruction of existing roads to meet the requirement in place at the time of construction or reconstruction.

Response to Comment 281-377 (EIR): There is currently no formal retrofitting program in place beyond the County's existing Road Improvement Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The General Plan does not propose any changes to that CIP other than the roadway improvements described in the Circulation Element of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-378 (EIR): The County has adopted the 2000 Fire Code and this is used in reviewing structures for building permits. Information on the applicable codes for construction in the County is posted on the Building Department website and available at the Building Department office. Please also refer to Responses to Comment Letter 265.

Response to Comment 281-379 (EIR): The list of "Communities at Risk" in the National Fire Plan, which includes certain urban wildland interface areas in the County, is informational only and is consistent with the EIR's analysis of fire hazards in the County.

Response to Comment 281-380 (EIR): The staff disagrees that enforcement has been "lax." The standards are enforced with every new building permit, and on a complaint basis with existing development.

Response to Comment 281-381 (EIR): The commenter's request to evaluate water storage requirements/compliance is beyond the scope of the General Plan EIR. Proposed Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives would require review of any structure over 120 square feet. Mitigation Measure 5.8-10(b) would preclude development in areas of high and very high wildland fire hazard unless the risk can be reduced as determined by the appropriate fire protection district. The need for water storage on individual properties could be determined through one of these processes on a case-by-case basis.

Response to Comment 281-382 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-381.

Response to Comment 281-383 (EIR): As stated, fire fees are collected at the building permit state, and therefore apply to both ministerial and discretionary development. In addition, discretionary development projects are circulated to fire districts for review and comment. Districts may request additional fees or contributions to purchase of equipment to mitigate the impacts of development projects.

Response to Comment 281-384 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-656 and 281-657.

Response to Comment 281-385 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-378.

Response to Comment 281-386 (EIR): Local fire suppression is not provided by El Dorado County. It is provided by CDF and special districts which have separate and

distinct authority for fees and services. Note that Senate Bill 1049 (Chapter 741, Statutes of 2003) imposes an annual Fire Protection Benefit Fee on parcels within CDF State Responsibility Areas. Residents will pay \$70 per parcel in 2004 (assessed via property tax bill) and \$35 per parcel annually in subsequent years.

Response to Comment 281-387 (EIR): The County building permit process provides for inspection to ensure compliance with fire safe regulations prior to permit issuance or occupancy. This includes the requirement for water storage where hydrants are absent.

Response to Comment 281-388 (EIR): The proposed new policy under Mitigation Measure 5.8-10(b) precludes development in areas of high and very high fire hazard unless that hazard is reduced to a moderate or better level, as determined by the fire protection district. This hazard reduction would presumably include architectural modifications as suggested by the commenter.

Response to Comment 281-389 (EIR): Analysis in the EIR determined that Impact 5.8-10 is significant and unavoidable and describes the general nature and location of the hazards (see Exhibits 5.8-3 and 5.8-4 in Volume 2). This information is sufficient for adequate consideration of significant impacts and mitigation for development allowed by the General Plan. Quantification of the exact numbers of parcels within high and very high fire hazard areas would not alter this conclusion.

Response to Comment 281-390 (EIR): A detailed description of fire history and other factors relating to the wildland fire hazard are contained in Volume 2 of the EIR, pages 5.8-106 through 5.8-123.

Response to Comment 281-386A (EIR): A detailed analysis of the manner in which the proposed Safety Elements fulfill statutory purposes is beyond the scope of the General Plan EIR. The analysis of fire hazards in Section 5.8.5 includes discussion of the role of the proposed General Plan policies in reducing fire hazard and risk.

Response to Comment 281-387A (EIR): Implementation Measure HS-B in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative requires the County to work with the local fire safe councils, U.S. Forest Services and CDF to develop and implement a countywide Wildfire Safety Plan.

Response to Comment 281-388A (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-389 through 281-426.

Response to Comment 281-389A (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding geology and soils are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-917 through 281-931; avalanche, in Response to Comment 281-853; and earthquake, in Responses to Comments 281-859 and 281-860.

Response to Comment 281-390A (EIR): The County has adopted the 2001 version of the California Building Code, which is the most recent version of the Code.

Response to Comment 281-391 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment proposing a mitigation measure requiring prompt adoption of changes to the California Building Code, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-392 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the calculations of the Resource Conservation District should be considered in reviewing areas susceptible to landslide and avalanche, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-393 (EIR): As presented in the draft General Plan and EIR documents, the term “avalanche” is intended to describe snow slides. Such slides may pick up debris (e.g., trees, rocks) as they travel, but are primarily comprised of snow and ice. The text on page 5.9-10 of Volume 2 has been revised to clarify the meaning of “avalanche”. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

The commenter questions whether structures could ever be constructed withstand an avalanche. Like flood events, avalanches can be described as “interval” events, though historically it has been very difficult to calculate avalanche return intervals (i.e., the average time between events) (LaChapelle, Edward R. Avalanche Hazard Forecaster, Wasatch National Forest. 1966. Encounter probabilities for avalanche damage. Alta Avalanche Study Center Miscellaneous Report No. 10, downloaded from <<http://www.avalanche.org/~moonstone/zoning>>). The Placer County Code (Section 12.40.060) currently requires that buildings proposed in avalanche hazard areas must be designed so that they are safe under anticipated loads and conditions of an avalanche. According to the Placer County Building Department, only one building permit has been issued for a structure pursuant to this code section (Jenkins, Ed. Placer County Building Department, electronic mail communication with Sue Lee, Senior Planner. November 19, 2003). To date that structure has not been subjected to an avalanche. Literature regarding avalanche damage indicates that new structures can be designed and constructed in a manner that would allow them to be safe for specific intervals (e.g., a 30-year return interval) (LaChapelle 1996; Giraud, Richard. 1994. The Allen residence, a mountain dream home destroyed by avalanches—an example of poor land-use planning, Sundance, Utah, downloaded from <<http://www.avalanche.org/~moonstone/zoning>>), though there are no national standards for such construction (Jenkins pers. comm.). The literature indicates that the greater the protection, the more costly the engineering and construction costs. In many cases, engineering requirements are likely to make avalanche protection infeasible (this is particularly true in areas that experience avalanche activity annually or oftener). In cases such as these, the best approach is to prohibit the construction of structures (LaChapelle 1996). The effectiveness and economic feasibility of design and construction measures, siting, avalanche fencing, and other measures to

mitigate avalanche risk in a particular case will depend on a number of site-specific factors, including topography, parcel size, and the nature and degree of the risk at the location at issue.

As presented in the draft General Plan document, Policy 6.3.2.3 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives requires the development of an Avalanche Overlay Zone, stating that structures in avalanche susceptible areas must be designed to withstand the expected forces of an avalanche event.

The EIR recognized the need to require studies for all areas subject to avalanche risk, not just areas within the future avalanche overlay zone, for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. Mitigation Measure 5.9-2(b) requires the preparation of a project specific study and the application of mitigation, if the avalanche hazard can be mitigated. The measure also clarifies that if the hazard cannot be satisfactorily mitigated, then the project cannot be approved. The same policy is proposed as Policy HS-4b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. Mitigation Measure 5.9-2(b) and Policy HS-4b will ensure that no new habitable structures subject to an avalanche hazard are constructed unless the hazard can be avoided or the applicant can affirmatively demonstrate the feasibility and effectiveness of design or other measures to mitigate the hazard.

Response to Comment 281-394 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-393.

Response to Comment 281-395 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that avoidance of avalanche-prone areas is the most appropriate mitigation for these geological hazards, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-393 and 281-394. NOP scoping comments regarding snow avalanche are addressed in Response to Comment 281-853.

Response to Comment 281-396 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment supporting extending review of ministerial project in terms of avalanche-prone areas, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-397 (EIR): The commenter notes that the discussion on erosion in the EIR and quantification of slopes greater than 25 percent presents challenges in development.

Response to Comment 281-398 (EIR): The last paragraph of Impact 5.9-4 addresses the potential for erosion throughout the County. There was no table included specifically or by reference in the 1996 General Plan EIR entitled "Table of Maximum Slopes for Different Soil Types. Table V-7-1, "El Dorado County Soil Characteristics" of the 1996 General Plan DEIR included a column of "Slope Range" which does not indicate a maximum slope, but offers rather a typical slope range for the listed soil types.

The potential for soil erosion is considered with each project application. The Resource Conversation Districts (RCDs) are included in project review as a responsible agency, and their comments on individual projects are considered during project approval.

The County is in the process of developing and implementing a Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) in accordance with the Federal Clean Water Act and the California State Water Resources Control Board Regulations. Development and implementation of the SWMP would render this impact less than significant.

Response to Comment 281-399 (EIR): Implementation Measure CO-A directing review of the County Code does require amendment of the Code as necessary to accomplish provisions for applicant funded monitoring of erosion control. Because this requirement is not itself a policy but implements the erosion-related policies in the proposed General Plan, it was included as an implementation measure.

Response to Comment 281-400 (EIR): The Department of Transportation has primary responsibility for implementation of the Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance. The Building Department may assist in enforcement of this Ordinance where grading is associated with individual single-family building permits (ministerial projects).

Article 9, "Enforcement" of the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance* authorizes Suspension and Revocation of the Permit (15.14.670), and provides that violations of the Ordinance is a misdemeanor (15.14.690) "...punishable by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars (\$500) or by imprisonment in the County Jail for not more than six (6) months, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

Upon discovery of a violation, those provisions contained in said Article 9 are implemented.

The standards contained in the *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance*, and by reference, the *County of El Dorado Drainage Manual*, have been incorporated into the County's Tentative Storm Water Management Plan (TSWMP). The TSWMP will guide the County's operations in attaining compliance with the Federal Clean Water Act and State Water Resources Control Board regulations. During development of the TSWMP, a commitment was made to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to review the standards, and update them, if necessary, to ensure that the requirements of the RWQCB are adequately addressed.

Response to Comment 281-401 (EIR): The commenter does not identify any specific violation, so a specific response is not possible. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-400.

Response to Comment 281-402 (EIR): In compliance with NPDES requirements, the County has submitted a Tentative Storm Water Management Plan to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board for review and approval. Implementation measure

CO-A of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus", and the Environmentally Constrained Alternatives call for updating the County Code with respect to ongoing applicant-funded monitoring of grading and erosion control measures. This implementation measure will identify any adjustments to the Grading Ordinance necessary to bring it into conformance with new NPDES storm water management requirements.

Response to Comment 281-403 (EIR): The commenter's support for the proposed policy regarding development on 25 percent slopes is noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The commenter notes that slopes of less than 25 percent can also present constraints to development, depending on soil type and susceptibility to erosion. The proposed General Plan alternatives all contain policies that would minimize erosion caused by projects, including those that are below the 25 percent threshold [see, e.g., Policies 7.1.2.2, 7.1.2.3 (No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives); Policies CO-1b, -1c, and 12a (Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives)]. The requirements of the County's Grading Ordinance, Building Code, Design and Improvement Standards Manual, and Hillside Guidelines, as well as (for discretionary projects) review of erosion control plans by the applicable Resource Conservation District, would all further reduce erosion impacts on slopes less than 25 percent. Please also refer to Response to Comment 281-404.

Response to Comment 281-404 (EIR): The 25 percent slope standard is used in the proposed mitigation measures because development of slopes greater than this are typically susceptible to relatively high rates of erosion. However, this standard is conservative. Development on some soil types may be possible at greater slopes without a risk of significant erosion impacts. Natural slopes for many of the different soil types identified in the Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California are as steep as 70 percent, on stable hillsides. Natural slopes for the various soil types tend to represent a good indicator of slope stability for that particular soil type. In addition, development on slopes greater than 25 percent, regardless of soil type, is not uncommon. Engineering solutions to stability and erosion issues are generally available for most slopes, although erosion hazards and the costs of mitigating them increase with greater slopes. For subdivisions and large commercial developments, geotechnical reports are prepared that address issues of slope stability for the specific project location.

Response to Comment 281-405 (EIR): The RCD does not make specific recommendations as to the adequacy of various soil types to serve as sites for septic systems. The Soil Conservation Service "Soil Survey El Dorado Area, California" gives indications of septic system capability on a very broad-brush basis. Current County regulations require that, on a site-specific basis, suitability for use as a septic system site is based upon actual field investigation and a percolation and soil mantle test performed by a qualified professional.

Response to Comment 281-406 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment representing the commenter's position on precluding grading activities during the rainy season without effective mitigation to prevent offsite sedimentation, are noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-407 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment representing the commenter's position on conversion of sloping timbered land to agricultural uses are noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(c) would require agricultural grading activities over one acre or more to obtain a grading permit.

Response to Comment 281-408 (EIR): Conversion of timberlands to agricultural use would require approval of both a timber harvest plan and timber conversion permit, which are by statute the responsibility of the California Division of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF). The County is provided an opportunity to comment on proposed plans, but approval authority rests with CDF. The rezoning of TPZ land to an Agricultural zoning designation is a discretionary action within the County's authority, but if the timbered land has an existing zoning that would allow agriculture, the conversion would occur under the authority of CDF. Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(c) requires a grading permit (and appropriate erosion control mitigation) in instances where more than an acre of vegetation/soil disturbance will occur. The County, however, retains the same regulatory and approval authority over the agricultural use it would have elsewhere in the County. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-36 and Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 281-409 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-10 and 281-219. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment representing the commenter's position on Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(c) are noted for the record, and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. The objections to the size threshold are also noted. Given that grading permits for these activities have not been required in the past and that there is no intent to interfere with routine clearing activities, a one-acre threshold was determined by County staff to be balanced.

Response to Comment 281-410 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-10 and 281-219. With regard to the comment that single-home builders may not recognize serpentine substrate when preparing a parcel for building, please refer to Response to Comment 281-18.

Response to Comment 281-411 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-210, 281-219, and 281-351 through 281-353.

Response to Comment 281-412 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-10, 281-219, and 281-351 through 281-353. The concerns and opinions expressed in the

comment stating that unless all grading will be done by permit, there should be much lower thresholds for grading on serpentine and tremolite, is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-413 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-353 and 281-357.

Response to Comment 281-414 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment stating that the County should keep track of grading permits issued to parcels with serpentine soils, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-415 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-186 regarding the established threshold for grading permits in the County.

Response to Comment 281-416 (EIR): Under current County practices, as set forth in agreements with the Resource Conservation Districts, every development application that has the potential for ground disturbance is sent to the NRCS for review and comment on erosion control. Recommendations received from the district are incorporated into conditions of approval and grading/erosion control requirements imposed by the Planning Department and Department of Transportation. The NRCS does not typically review proposed septic systems. Soil testing for expansive soils and other construction-related concerns are submitted by an applicant for review by DOT or the Building Department, depending on the nature of the application. Funding for NRCS review is covered by a portion of the application fee for applicable development proposals.

Response to Comment 281-417 (EIR): The commenter describes hazards in the County due to abandoned mining sites.

Response to Comment 281-418 (EIR): The referenced figure, Exhibit 5.9-7, is intended to show only those mines in El Dorado County for which the State Department of Conservation has assigned a Mine Identification Number. A complete listing of recorded mines or mining sites is available from the El Dorado County Planning Department. That list includes the 16 mines listed on Exhibit 5.9-7 as well as a number of other closed mining sites, including the Hazel Creek Mine. It is acknowledged that there are numerous abandoned mines, many of which are unmapped and/or unknown. Because of this, it is not possible to map all of the abandoned mines in El Dorado County nor was this determined to be necessary information to complete the impact analysis.

The map referenced by the commenter, which is titled "Exploration and Mining Activity", is a map that is maintained by the El Dorado County Planning Department. That map was not included in the DEIR for the previous General Plan, but was mentioned. That map shows the Hazel Creek Mine site, which has been reclaimed. Please refer also to

Responses to Comments 281-176, 281-189, and 281-900 for information on the Hazel Creek Mine site.

Response to Comment 281-419 (EIR): The comment regarding the continuing role of the State Mining and Geology Board on County mining issues is noted.

Response to Comment 281-420 (EIR): On June 14, 2001, the State Mining and Geology Board (SMGB) assumed lead agency status for administration of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA, Act, Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 2710, et, seq.) with regard to all mines subject to SMARA located within the County pursuant to PRC Section 2774.4. The County retains all permitting authority over the existing mining operations and proposed mining activities, whether or not the particular mining operation is subject to the provisions of SMARA. With respect to ensuring that a mining operation is in compliance with its adopted reclamation plan, the SMGB conducts an annual inspection of each mine. In addition, the SMGB reviews the financial assurance estimate to ensure that the amount is sufficient to perform reclamation in the event that an operator fails to perform.

Response to Comment 281-421 (EIR): The last revision of the County's *Surface Mining and Reclamation Ordinance*, County Code Chapter 8.36, was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on October 24, 2000 (Ordinance No. 4567). The State Mining and Geology Board formally adopted Resolution No. 2000-15 on December 4, 2000, certifying that the County's revised Ordinance is in accordance with State Policy.

Response to Comment 281-422 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-420.

Response to Comment 281-423 (EIR): The Mineral Resource overlay is designed to protect the availability of mineral resources including construction aggregate. Please refer also to Response to Comment 280-113 and Master Response 21.

Response to Comment 281-424 (EIR): The Environmentally Constrained Alternative is the only alternative to list Agricultural Lands as a compatible designation with the MR overlay because it is the only alternative with a separate Agricultural Lands designation. The other alternatives contain an Agricultural District overlay designation. Compatibility of lands within the overlay with MR would be determined by the base designation for those lands.

Response to Comment 281-425 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 280-113 and 281-424. Only a portion of the construction aggregate used in El Dorado County is produced in the County. Per capita use of this mineral resource also varies. Because of these factors, it is difficult to estimate the depletion rate from the existing reserves. The Department of Conservation, State Geological Survey estimates the depletion of these minerals from currently-permitted sources could range from nine years if 100 percent of the aggregate came from in-county sources at a use rate of 7.5 tons per-person per-year

to 37 years if 25 percent comes from in-county sources and the rate is five tons per-person per-year (DOC 2001).

The Agricultural designation is not the only means of identifying and protecting mineral resources. The primary method of protection is the utilization of the –MR overlay, contained in each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, as well as application of the Natural Resource designation. Specific policies contained in each alternative relating to mineral resources provide specific protection of the resources, and limitations on noncompatible uses. These include Policies CO-2a through CO-2d and CO-2f in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, and Policies 2.2.2.6, 7.2.1.1, 7.2.1.2, and 7.2.2.1 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Mineral Resource zones identified by the Department of Conservation (MRZ-2a and MRZ-2b) are identified on a new exhibit (CO-1) provided in each of the alternatives as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. The Land Use Diagrams identify the –MR overlay where mineral resources are provided a higher level of protection from noncompatible use conflicts.

Response to Comment 281-426 (EIR): The potential impact to mineral resources is that they would be unavailable for extraction (see page 5.9-36 of the EIR, Volume 2). Mitigation Measures 5.9-5(a) and 5.9-5(b) would ensure that adoption of the General Plan would not affect availability of these resources. There would therefore be no impacts from the General Plan, on a project or cumulative basis, on mineral resource availability. The commenter argues that progressive exhaustion of mineral resources through their use is a cumulative impact, but does not explain what this would be an impact to. This argument would suggest that mineral resources should be preserved, but this would make them inaccessible, which would be a significant impact under CEQA. The General Plan does not do this.

Response to Comment 281-427 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding water quality are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-846 through 281-852.

Response to Comment 281-428 (EIR): The EIR does not defer setting a baseline standard. The thresholds contained in the EIR are based on those obtained from the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G. In accordance with these thresholds, impacts would be considered significant if they failed to meet the applicable noise standards already adopted by local agencies or applicable standards of other agencies. Existing regulatory noise standards are discussed in Subsection 5.10.1 of Volume 2 of the EIR. The standards used for analysis of project-related impacts are based, in part, on those recommended by the State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, as summarized in Table 5.10-4 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-429 (EIR): The analyses of noise-related impacts contained in the EIR are based on the land use compatibility noise levels recommended

by the State of California's "General Plan Guidelines." As noted by the commenter, the maximum "normally acceptable" noise level recommended by the State of California for land use compatibility pertaining to residential land uses is 60 dBA CNEL. These noise compatibility standards were developed in an effort to ensure consistency with the recommended noise exposure levels defined in the Federal EPA for the protection of public health and welfare, obtained from the U.S. EPA publication entitled "Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety" (March 1974), and the State Sound Transmission Control Standards for multifamily housing. Both of these sources recommend an interior noise exposure level of 45 dBA CNEL. Assuming an average exterior-to-interior noise reduction of 15 dBA with windows open, the maximum allowable 60 dBA CNEL exterior noise standard would provide for an interior noise environment of 45 dBA CNEL for residential land uses. The General Plan Guidelines also identify 65 dBA CNEL as the maximum normally acceptable standard for hotels, and 70 dBA CNEL as the maximum normally acceptable standard for schools, nursing homes and hospitals. The land use compatibility standards recommended by the State of California Guidelines for General Plans are considered reasonable for the protection of public health and welfare. It should be noted that these land use compatibility standards, including the 60 dBA standard for residential land uses, are included in most General Plans throughout the State.

The commenter also references noise standards recommended by other agencies, including those recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO). The most recent report released by the World Health Organization (WHO), entitled "Guidelines for Community Noise Exposure" (1999) recommends an exterior noise exposure level of 55 dBA L_{eq} during the daytime hours (i.e., 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.) and 50 dBA L_{eq} during the nighttime hours (i.e., 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.). When taking into account the penalties imposed by the CNEL standard for noise occurring during the evening and nighttime hours (see EIR Volume 3, page 5.10-3), the 60 dBA CNEL/ L_{dn} standard is essentially equivalent to a continuous noise source averaging 55 dBA during the daytime hours and 50 dBA during the nighttime hours. Whereas the CNEL standard incorporates a "penalty" for noise generated during the noise-sensitive evening hours (i.e., 7 p.m. to 10 p.m.) no corresponding reductions in noise exposure are recommended by the WHO for this same time period.

With regard to the aircraft noise contours identified by the commenter, both commercial and public airports operating under a permit from the Caltrans Aeronautics Program are required to comply with both the State Aeronautics standards governing aircraft noise and also all applicable legislation governing the formation and activities of the local Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). The function of the ALUC is, among other things, to develop a Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) for noise compatible land use in the immediate proximity of the airport based on noise-exposure standards developed specific to aircraft operations. Noise-related impacts associated with aircraft operations were analyzed in comparison to existing as well as anticipated future year CLUP contours. The Draft General Plan includes numerous policies to minimize impacts to

county residents and to ensure that development in the vicinity of public airports occurs in accordance with the CLUP.

Response to Comment 281-430 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-431.

Response to Comment 281-431 (EIR): The “Land Use Noise Compatibility Guidelines” promulgated by the State of California, Governors Office of Planning and Research (OPR) identify ranges of noise levels considered “normally acceptable”, “conditionally acceptable”, and “normally unacceptable” for general land use classifications. The maximum “normally acceptable” noise exposure levels were developed, based (in part) on data obtained from the U.S. EPA for the protection of public health and welfare. Adjustment factors are included in the OPR Guidelines to account for the noise control goals of the community, the particular community’s sensitivity to noise, and their assessment of the relative importance of noise pollution. These adjustment factors include corrections to account for noise associated with urban, suburban, and rural communities. The State of California “General Plan Guidelines” do not include recommended thresholds for analyzing increases in ambient noise levels. Recently prepared guidelines developed by other agencies for the analysis of noise, including the California Department of Transportation’s “Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol” (1998) and the Federal Highway Administration’s “Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance” (1995), both of which have been issued since the date of preparation for the previous General Plan EIR, define a substantial increase in ambient noise levels as increases ranging from 10 to 15 dBA. For purposes of assessing substantial increases in ambient noise levels attributable to a proposed project, Caltrans is currently recommending a threshold of 12 dBA L_{eq} . By comparison, the five dBA threshold used in the EIR’s analysis for determination of substantial increases in ambient noise levels, which is slightly above the level considered to be perceptible, is conservative and is, therefore, considered a reasonable threshold for the analysis of increases in ambient noise.

Response to Comment 281-432 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-429 for discussions pertaining to noise-related thresholds used in the analysis and Response to Comment 281-433, which addresses maximum allowable noise levels at cemeteries.

Response to Comment 281-433 (EIR): This comment pertains to the noise standards recommended for various land use designations, as presented in the Draft General Plan.

The exposure of noise-sensitive land uses to noise generated by stationary (e.g., fixed or nontransportation) noise sources is addressed in EIR, Volume 2, Section 5.10.2, Impact 5.10-3. The State General Plan Guidelines identify 75 dBA CNEL as the maximum normally acceptable standard for cemeteries. No change to the EIR or draft General Plan alternatives is recommended.

Response to Comment 281-434 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-435 and 281-436.

Response to Comment 281-435 (EIR): The 60 dBA CNEL traffic noise standard is considered reasonable for reasons discussed in Response to Comment 281-429. As noted in the EIR, the traffic noise contours presented in the EIR do not reflect local or site-specific conditions, such as intervening terrain or changes in roadway elevations. Variations in terrain, vehicle characteristics, and roadway conditions can greatly influence traffic noise contours. Consequently, given the complexities involved with modeling traffic noise levels, the 60 dBA traffic noise contours presented in the EIR were selected for purposes of representing bands of similar noise exposure and are not intended to represent absolute lines of demarcation. Even when taking into account site-specific conditions, prediction accuracy may be within the range of +1-5 dB, depending on distance from the roadway. Therefore, as noted in the EIR, evaluation of traffic noise levels, including assessment of noise contour distances from area roadways and land uses affected, would occur on a project-by-project basis, as development occurs and in accordance with CEQA. Such assessments would take into account the site-specific data, such as local terrain, vehicle characteristics, and roadway conditions, to more accurately characterize and predict traffic noise levels and associated noise impacts.

The existing number of homes within the approximate 60 dBA contour mapped in the EIR is not readily available, and is not necessary to determine the impacts of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The extent of residentially-designated lands within the contour is shown on Exhibits 5.10-8 through 5.10-15. Regarding the 55 dBA and 50 dBA contour lines, this information is not known and also not relevant to defining impacts. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-429.

Response to Comment 281-436 (EIR): Assuming that all other variables are equal, changes in the number of lanes would have little effect on overall noise contour distances, given that traffic noise levels are largely dependent on overall traffic volumes and vehicle characteristics. For instance, assuming that all other parameters are equal, the addition of one or two additional travel lanes would result in an extension of the traffic noise contours at a distance roughly equal to the width of the lane added, assuming that the new lanes are constructed along the outer edge of the roadway as opposed to within the center median. The addition of lanes constructed within the center median would have little effect on noise contour distances. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-435 for additional discussion related to this issue.

Response to Comment 281-437 (EIR): As noted in the EIR, evaluation of traffic noise levels, including assessment of noise contour distances from area roadways and land uses affected, would occur on a project-by-project basis, as development occurs and in accordance with CEQA. Such assessments would take into account the site specific data, such as local terrain, vehicle characteristics, and roadway conditions, to more accurately characterize and predict traffic noise levels. The County noise standards and Mitigation Measures 5.10-2(a) and 5.10-2(b), pertaining to transportation noise, have been developed for the purpose of protecting residential and other uses from noise

impacts. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-435 for additional discussion related to this issue.

Response to Comment 281-438 (EIR): There are various factors that can influence traffic noise, including variations in vehicle and roadway characteristics, and traffic noise propagation. To account for recent changes in vehicle type percentages on area roadways, including the increased popularity of SUVs, the vehicle type percentages contained in the traffic model were adjusted, based on year 2001 California Department of Motor Vehicle registration data for El Dorado County. Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-435 through 281-437, 281-439, and 281-442 for additional discussion related to this topic.

Response to Comment 281-439 (EIR): The assessment of traffic noise was conducted in accordance with CEQA guidelines for existing and future year scenarios. Consistent with established guidelines and methodologies developed by the California Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration for the analysis of traffic noise, the traffic volumes used in the noise analysis were obtained from the traffic analysis prepared for this project. To account for recent changes in vehicle type percentages on area roadways, including the increased popularity of SUVs, the vehicle type percentages contained in the traffic model were adjusted, based on year 2001 California Department of Motor Vehicle registration data for El Dorado County. No trend analyses forecasting vehicle use by type, based on historic or projected future demands or popularity, have been identified for traffic noise modeling purposes by either the Federal Highway Administration, California Department of Transportation, State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, or El Dorado County and it would be speculative to do so, especially given circumstances such as recent rises in fuel prices and public pressure to shift from use of SUVs.

Response to Comment 281-440 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-439.

Response to Comment 281-441 (EIR): The recommended thresholds for increases in traffic noise levels are designed to afford increased levels of protection to residential land uses located in areas that exceed the land use compatibility noise standards. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-431. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding reducing the significance threshold to three dBA are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-442 (EIR): Although many studies have been conducted, some of which have demonstrated short-term improvements in traffic noise, there is currently some dispute with regard to the long-term noise benefits of this product. Studies pertaining to the long-term noise-reduction benefits and durability tests, including feasibility of use within colder climates, associated with the application/use of this product are ongoing. Consequently, the use of rubberized asphalt is currently not considered by either FHWA or Caltrans as an approved method of mitigating traffic noise. Rubberized

asphalt is also more expensive than standard paving materials and may require more frequent maintenance, further adding to the cost. However, the County will evaluate the feasibility and effectiveness of this material as its relative benefits are better understood. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-443 (EIR): The EIR recognizes that such sources can be a source of nuisance noise. Mitigation Measure 5.10-3 includes a new policy that requires the County to develop a noise control ordinance for the purposes of controlling noise associated with sources of nuisance noise.

Response to Comment 281-444 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-427 through 281-443 for responses pertaining to noise standards.

Response to Comment 281-445 (EIR): Noise-related impacts will vary by project, dependent on various project-specific parameters, including site conditions and facility designs. Consequently, noise-related impacts associated with these facilities cannot be accurately assessed at this time. Evaluation of noise impacts associated with possible future water and wastewater plants for water purveyors, would occur on a project-by-project basis, in accordance with CEQA. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a) would ensure noise is considered on each development project; Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b) would ensure incompatible land uses are avoided; Mitigation Measure 5.10-3 establishes noise criteria for considering and reducing significant noise levels.

Response to Comment 281-446 (EIR): Commercial and public airports operating under a permit from the Caltrans Aeronautics Program are required to comply with both the State Aeronautics standards governing aircraft noise and also all applicable legislation governing the formation and activities of the local Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). The function of the ALUC is, among other things, to develop a Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) for noise-compatible land use in the immediate proximity of the airport based on noise-exposure standards developed specific to aircraft operations.

It is important to protect the public from exposure to unacceptable noise levels, including noise generated by aircraft operations. The General Plan includes numerous policies to minimize aircraft noise impacts to county residents and to ensure that development in the vicinity of public airports occurs in accordance with the CLUP. Policy 2.2.2.5 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative describes the County's intent to coordinate with other jurisdictions on consistency of adjacent land uses. Mitigation Measure 5.1-1 in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing, adds a similar new policy to the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. These policies would address airport impacts and would ensure that the County coordinates with neighboring counties to minimize aircraft noise impacts to county residents.

Response to Comment 281-447 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-567 and, for NOP comments, refer to Responses to Comments 281-812 through 281-845.

Response to Comment 281-448 (EIR): Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for revisions to page 5.11-1 of Volume 2. These revisions provide additional information regarding air quality problems in El Dorado County and are consistent with the conclusions in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-449 (EIR): Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for revisions to the ozone discussion on page 5.11-4 of Volume 2. This information does not change the conclusions of DEIR.

Response to Comment 281-450 (EIR): Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for revisions to the particulate matter discussion on page 5.11-6 of Volume 2. This information does not change the conclusions of DEIR.

Response to Comment 281-451 (EIR): Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for revisions to the toxic air contaminants discussion on page 5.11-9 of Volume 2. This information does not change the conclusions of DEIR.

Response to Comment 281-452 (EIR): Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for revisions to the asbestos discussion on page 5.11-9 of Volume 2. This information does not change the conclusions of DEIR.

Response to Comment 281-453 (EIR): Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for revisions to the toxic air emissions impact discussions on page 5.11-40 of Volume 2. As a result of this comment, mitigation has been clarified.

Response to Comment 281-454 (EIR): Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for revisions to the discussion of air quality attainment on page 5.11-10 of Volume 2. This information does not change the conclusions of DEIR.

Response to Comment 281-455 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-458.

Response to Comment 281-456 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-458.

Response to Comment 281-457 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-458.

Response to Comment 281-458 (EIR): The text was intended to include NO_x, which includes multiple forms of nitrogen oxide pollutants, rather than nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for relevant changes and changes related to CARB measurements on page 5.11-18 of Volume 2. This information does not change the conclusions of DEIR.

Response to Comment 281-459 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-461.

Response to Comment 281-460 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-461.

Response to Comment 281-461 (EIR): As noted in the EIR (Volume 2, Impact 5.11-1), the rankings (i.e., S₁ to S₄) are based on the number of dwellings units, nonresidential development, and other supporting infrastructure proposed under each alternative. This ranking, even if construction emissions could be accurately quantified, would remain unchanged. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-462.

Response to Comment 281-462 (EIR): According to the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District's CEQA Guidelines, URBEMIS is not appropriate for calculating emissions associated with plans. CARB's "area source emission methodologies" refers to an inventory of existing emissions, and would not be useful in predicting emissions from construction in the future. CARB's "area source emission methodologies" refers to an inventory of existing emissions, and would not be useful in predicting emissions from construction in the future. Short-term construction emissions cannot be accurately modeled due to variations in project and density characteristics. Using AP-42 emission factors to calculate construction-related emissions would require detailed information such as the amount (cubic yards) of soil to be imported and/or exported on each project site; type and number of pieces of equipment operating at any one time; distance (miles) traveled by employees and haul trucks on paved and unpaved roads to each job site; weight, speed, and wheel number for each piece of equipment, etc. This type of information is too detailed for a General Plan-level of assessment. Any assumptions surrounding these types of calculations would be speculative. In addition, they would not define the impact (determined to be significant) any more clearly or accurately than the EIR already does. The amount of emissions generated depends on how much and what type of construction is taking place simultaneously (e.g., number of residences, subdivision/mass grading vs. single lot development, park development, commercial structures) and where the construction is located. While each project type can be calculated individually (and even on individual projects there is tremendous day-to-day/month-to-month variability), any assumptions concerning the above would be speculation.

One approach that the El Dorado County AQMD (and most air quality management districts) emphasizes for the assessment of construction-generated emissions is the implementation of effective and comprehensive control measures rather than detailed quantification of construction emissions. Thus, the El Dorado County AQMD requires that all feasible control measures, which are dependent on the size of the construction area and the nature of the construction operations involved, shall be incorporated and implemented. The various models and techniques suggested can all be used, but they are relevant only on an individual project basis. As explained above, County staff does not agree that construction emissions can be accurately quantified on a General Plan level.

Response to Comment 281-463 (EIR): Revised Policies 6.7.7.1 (for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives) and HS-10c (for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives), required under Mitigation Measure 5.11-1, would apply updated AQMD mitigation to both long-term and short-term (e.g., construction-related) air quality impacts. Although the County’s Grading Ordinance applies to projects involving 250 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance, this mitigation measure would apply to all projects as a result of Mitigation Measures 5.1-3(a) and 5.1-3(c), which require a General Plan conformity review for ministerial projects. Thus, AQMD recommendations for restricting fugitive dust would be considered for all projects, not just those subject to the Grading Ordinance. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10 and 281-219 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-464 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-350 and 281-354 for a discussion regarding the issue of nonserpentinite tremolite. Refer to Responses to Comments 281-10, 281-219 and 281-364 for discussions of existing and proposed County procedures and safeguards regarding asbestos.

Response to Comment 281-465: The discussions on pages 5.11-26 through 5.11-35 do not say the alternatives would conflict with the Sacramento Area Regional Ozone Attainment Plan. The EIR concludes the alternatives have the “potential” to conflict with the attainment plan, or “may be in conflict” with the attainment plan. The distinction is important. The air quality attainment plan includes air emissions budgets for pre-cursors to ozone: reactive organic gasses (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x). These budgets are applied to the areas of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District that are in nonattainment with the ozone standard, and this area includes the nonLake Tahoe Basin areas of El Dorado and Placer counties, Sacramento and Yolo counties, and parts of Solano and Sutter counties. The ROG budget is 31.32 tons/day and the NO_x budget is 61.35 tons/day. If the nonattainment areas produce pollutant loads below this limit, the region will be in attainment with the air quality attainment plan, also known as the State Implementation Plan (SIP). Modeling that was performed for the SIP when it was last updated (1994) shows that the region will attain ozone standards in 2005, 2015, and 2025, which are the horizon years in the current SIP. The current SIP is set to expire in 2005. Development in El Dorado County was assumed in the SIP to be consistent with growth levels that would occur under the 1996 General Plan (which was in draft form at the time the SIP was adopted), as discussed on page 5.11-14 of Volume 2 of the EIR (Garry, Gordon. Manager of research and Analysis, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Sacramento, CA, December 3, 2003—telephone conversation with Gary Jakobs of EDAW regarding how air quality attainment in the Sacramento region is determined).

As shown in Table 5.11-7 of Volume 2 of the EIR, the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives would produce by 2025 between 4.76 tons/day and 6.85 tons/day of ROG (depending on alternative) and between 1.66 tons/day and 2.00 tons per day of NO_x. These levels, if they occur as forecasted in the EIR, would be part of the overall regional inventory of ROG and NO_x when considering regional attainment. As can be seen,

however, El Dorado County is just one of many jurisdictions in the regional equation of whether SIP attainment would be achieved.

Overall attainment of the SIP and air quality standards for ozone within the region is complex and has become more so in recent years. As referenced on page 5.11-13 of Volume 2 of the EIR and according to the Sacramento Air Quality Management District:

“Our clean air plan (also called the State Implementation Plan, or SIP), was adopted in 1994 in compliance with the 1990 Amendments to the Federal Clean Air Act. At that time, our region could not show that we would meet the federal standard by 1999. In exchange for moving the deadline to 2005, the region accepted a designation of “severe nonattainment”, with additional emission requirements on stationary sources, in exchange for extra time to meet the standard. While the region has made significant progress in reducing ozone (see discussion below), a problem has arisen with regard to another Federal Clean Air Act requirement. The region’s transportation plan must ‘conform’, or show that it does not harm the region’s chances of reaching the ozone standard. Regions with a SIP, such as ours, have a ‘motor vehicle emissions budget’ (MVEB) tied to the SIP. Transportation planners must analyze the emissions anticipated from transportation plans and transportation improvement programs and ensure that they remain within the SIP’s emissions budget (this is called demonstrating conformity). If we do not update the Plan, conformity will lapse and transportation funding can be withheld from all but exempt projects.

Due to litigation in other parts of the country, the Federal Highway Administration has become sensitive to the issue of applying the most current vehicle fleet information to a region’s transportation conformity analysis. The current SIP’s fleet information is about 10 years old. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is the agency responsible for demonstrating transportation conformity in our region. SACOG estimates that applying the most recent fleet data to our existing models would result in a conformity lapse.

The State Air Resources Board, SACOG, U.S.EPA and FHWA have negotiated approval to use the 1994 vehicle fleet data through December 31, 2002. After that time, conformity findings can be made only if the new fleet data is used. This means that the transportation plans and transportation improvement programs now in place for our region, as well as 21 other air districts in the state, cannot be changed until the region has a new clean air plan. The Sacramento region, unlike others in the state, was not planning to update the SIP before our attainment deadline (2005) when the new FHWA requirements were announced.” (Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District website, December 3, 2003, www.airquality.org/cleanairplan/index.shtml)

The SIP is now in the process of being updated, and a new emissions budget for the nonattainment areas of the region is scheduled to be approved by the US EPA in February 2005. This would be the final step in adoption of a new SIP.

The EIR used the correct, updated fleet mix (which assumes a much higher mix of sport utility vehicles) and this is the basis for the emissions estimates included in Table 5.11-7 of Volume 2.

In summary, the 1996 General Plan was the assumed General Plan used for the SIP when it was adopted in 1994 and which showed air quality standards attainment in 2005, 2015, and 2025. Each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives would produce levels of development at or below the 1996 General Plan level. The current SIP is being updated, with a scheduled adoption/implementation date in February 2005. The updated SIP will account for a different vehicle mix than the 1994 SIP. The El Dorado County General Plan EIR used the updated vehicle mix in its modeling of air emissions for each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. Because there is not certainty with respect to the future SIP, the role that any of the alternatives will play in potential attainment of the SIP cannot be known at this time. However, none of the General Plan alternatives being considered by the County are inconsistent with the assumptions used in past air quality attainment planning conducted for the region.

Response to Comment 281-466 (EIR): Tables 5.11-5 and 5.11-6 of Volume 2 of the EIR show current and projected emissions in the County. Table 5.11-7 shows projected incremental increases in emission levels associated with each alternative. All constituent emissions are projected to increase above current levels. Several mitigation measures are included to reduce emissions in the future (see Mitigation Measures 5.11-2[a] through 5.11-2[e] as applied to each alternative). With respect to regional air quality planning, please refer also to Response to Comment 281-465.

Response to Comment 281-467 (EIR): Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for additional mitigation that addresses the use and impacts of wood heaters (pages 5.11-36 and 5.11-37 of Volume 2 of the EIR).

Response to Comment 281-468 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 481-467.

Response to Comment 281-469 (EIR): Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for changes to Mitigation Measure 5.11-2 (pages 5.11-36 and 5.11-37 of Volume 2 of the EIR).

Response to Comment 281-470 (EIR): Please refer to General Plan policies concerning air quality. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-469.

Response to Comment 281-471 (EIR): The commenter suggests that the County should encourage a “green preference” in requiring County contractors to use lower-emission heavy-duty vehicles. As it is not currently part of the County’s contract policy,

mitigation measures recommended in the DEIR have been revised to clarify this for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. See Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for these changes.

Response to Comment 281-472 (EIR): The commenter requests the local Air Quality Management District (AQMD) be reviewed to see if effectiveness can be improved. As described in the EIR, page 5.11-9 through 5.11-18 of Volume 2, the function of the El Dorado County AQMD is overseen by the California Air Resources Board as set forth in the Federal Clean Air Act. Several progress reports measuring the effectiveness of the District are in place, most notably, the milestone reports required under the Federal CAA, which were completed for the Sacramento Area in 1996, 1999 and 2002. If the District has not performed as required, these milestones reports would demonstrate where improvements may be necessary.

Response to Comment 281-473 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-475.

Response to Comment 281-474 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-475.

Response to Comment 281-475 (EIR): Neither State nor federal law prohibits the adoption of a General Plan based on projected exceedences of air quality standards. Ongoing exceedences and the absence of an adequate attainment plan could, however, result in the loss of transportation funding, more stringent stationary source requirements, and other penalties. Standards are established for a variety of reasons, most important of which is reasonable protection of public health. Exceedance of standards is not a legal violation.

Response to Comment 281-476 (EIR): The opinion expressed in the comment is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 281-477 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-475.

Response to Comment 281-478 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding biological resources are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-932 through 281-966.

Response to Comment 281-479 (EIR): These comments generally recite the conclusions of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-480 (EIR): These comments generally recite the conclusions of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-481 (EIR): These comments generally recite the conclusions of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-482 (EIR): These comments generally recite the conclusions of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-483 (EIR): The high mountain lakes referred to by the commenter are located above 6,000 feet on lands managed by the USFWS that are outside of the jurisdiction of the County. Nevertheless, please refer also to Response to Comment 253-30. The comment is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 281-484 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 253-31.

Response to Comment 281-485 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 253-20 and 253-33.

Response to Comment 281-486 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-487.

Response to Comment 281-487 (EIR): The efforts of the American River Conservancy to protect habitat for special-status plants are commendable.

Response to Comment 281-488 (EIR): The first sentence under the heading "Special-status Wildlife" on page 5.12-17 is revised; the number 51 will be replaced by the number 52. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 281-489 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-487.

Response to Comment 281-490 (EIR): The commenter restates information in the EIR. No change or further response is necessary.

Response to Comment 281-491 (EIR): The commenter restates information in the EIR. No change or further response is necessary.

Response to Comment 281-492 (EIR): The commenter restates information in the EIR. No change or further response is necessary.

Response to Comment 281-493 (EIR): The commenter restates information in the EIR. No change or further response is necessary.

Response to Comment 281-494 (EIR): The pre-existing parcel map was considered in evaluating both direct and secondary impacts on biological resources. In addition to land use intensity groupings, the No Project Alternative (2025) impact analysis is based on the assumptions that are used to forecast the number of pre-existing parcels that will be developed during the 2025 time horizon. The No Project Alternative (Buildout) analysis is based on the assumption that all developable pre-existing parcels will be developed. The analysis for the other alternatives was based on the potential modifications to the pre-existing parcel map based on Land Use Diagram designations. The existing parcel layer was also considered when assessing potential secondary impacts as identified in the first paragraph on page 5.12-36 of Volume 2 of the EIR. An overview of existing parcelization

as it relates to protection of biological resources under General Plan policies is provided in the first paragraph on page 5.12-40.

Response to Comment 281-495 (EIR): The commenter restates information in the EIR. No change or further response is necessary.

Response to Comment 281-496 (EIR): Wildlife mortality caused by vehicular collisions and birds colliding with windows could be considered a secondary impact associated with the increased urbanization allowed under the General Plan. The EIR identifies secondary impacts on wildlife and wildlife habitat as potentially significant. Although a number of examples of potentially significant impacts are provided in the first paragraph on page 5.12-36 of the EIR, this is not intended to be an exhaustive list as there are numerous other examples of impacts on wildlife and wildlife habitat expected to result from implementation of the General Plan. Hindrance of wildlife movement due to fencing is discussed in the last paragraph on page 5.12-90. Regarding the relationship between surface water and groundwater pumping, most groundwater pumped in El Dorado County is found in fractured bedrock recharged primarily by precipitation, rather than by surface water, and most is used for domestic purposes at a rate that would not be expected to substantially affect any surface flows. Please see the discussion of groundwater in Section 5.5 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-487A (EIR): The footnote in Table 5.12-4 (page 5.12-38 Volume 2 of the EIR) is in error and has been revised. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 281-488A (EIR): The figures were obtained using a geographic information system (GIS). GIS is a tool whereby layers of information can be graphically overlaid. The GIS used in this EIR can be used to analyze a variety of environmental features including habitat type. A GIS layer was developed that included a map of all land use intensity groupings (as described on pages 5.12-34 and 5.12-35 of Volume 2 of the EIR) for each alternative. The map (i.e., GIS layer) was then combined with the habitat layer (as described on pages 5.12-1 and 5.12-2) and then the GIS was queried for the amount of habitat within each land use intensity grouping. With the exception of habitat layers which were created by the California Department of Forestry (CDF) and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), the methods used for this analysis were developed independently by the County.

Response to Comment 281-489A (EIR): The amount of oak woodland habitat lost per year in El Dorado County since 1990 has not been quantified and the County does not have the resources to make an accurate determination of annual oak woodland loss. While this data would, if available, give some perspective on the recent annual rate of oak woodland loss, it does not define how development of any of the alternatives may affect oak woodland loss in the future. Rather, the EIR analyzes this impact using the remaining oak woodlands as the baseline, and assessing the impact of future development on that remaining habitat (see particularly Table 5.12-4).

Response to Comment 281-490A (EIR): The County is not currently sponsoring or participating in programs related to the detection of Sudden Oak Death Syndrome (SODS).

Response to Comment 281-491A (EIR): The Integrated Hardwood Range Management Program (IHRMP) did not provide input in development of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-492A (EIR): The findings of the Harris and Kocher study referenced by the commenter are discussed in the EIR on pages 5.12-40 to 5.12-41 of Volume 2. Several mitigation measures are proposed to address the impacts identified in the EIR and by the commenter, including the development of an INRMP, requiring a no-net-loss policy for important habitat, strengthening the retention standards to eliminate the “replacement” option, providing funding opportunities for preserving important habitat, development of an oak tree protection ordinance, and requiring a General Plan consistency process for ministerial projects. Please refer to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 281-493A (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-494A.

Response to Comment 281-494A (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-489A. The available data on agricultural conversion in the County does not include information on the amount of habitat type converted. As discussed in the EIR, agricultural conversion of oak woodland currently occurs with little, if any, regulatory oversight. This Response to Comments document proposes additional mitigation that would require mitigation for agricultural conversion of important oak woodland habitat. Please refer also to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 281-495A (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 281-496A (EIR): As noted in Response to Comment 280-8, not all of the development agreements covering the approximately 14,500 units of existing commitments were approved after 1996. The land use forecast prepared for the EIR estimates the projected number of future units that would be developed as existing commitments and remaining capacity, rather than the acreage of those parcels that would be developed. If no discretionary development were allowed (i.e., the No Project Alternative scenario), approximately 14,900 units of remaining capacity could be approved ministerially at buildout, of which approximately 6,800 would be expected to develop through 2025. The EIR acknowledges the potential impacts arising from ministerial development not subject to General Plan consistency review and proposes a new policy that would require General Plan consistency review for most ministerial development. See Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a). In addition, a number of the proposed policies and mitigation measures would apply to both ministerial and discretionary development.

Response to Comment 281-497 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-499.

Response to Comment 281-498 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-499.

Response to Comment 281-499 (EIR): Please refer to Master Responses 5 and 18.

Response to Comment 281-500 (EIR): The General Plan identifies areas of potential future mining by utilizing the –MR overlay designation for all lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers with valuable mineral resources, as identified by the California Geological Survey. Please refer to the more detailed discussion in Master Response 21. Note that such identification would not alter the significance of the impact of mining on biological resources, nor would it change the proposed mitigation prohibiting mining on land designated for open space. Should the County adopt Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(h) the Land Use Diagrams would need to be revised to avoid the conflict between Open Space and mineral resource extraction. One exception occurs in the Texas Hill Reservoir “take area,” which is designated Open Space but also includes a portion of the –MR overlay. This open space designation is unique when compared to other Open Space designated lands. Please refer also to Response to Comment 210-13.

Response to Comment 281-501 (EIR): Important habitat for migratory deer includes that which is identified as critical habitat CDFG and as defined on 5.12-23 of the EIR and mapped on Exhibit 5.12-7. See Appendix E.2 of this document. The term "critical habitat" was replaced with "important habitat" in Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(d) on page 5.12-56 in the EIR to avoid possible confusion with the term "critical habitat" as defined by ESA. Protection of habitat from migratory deer is of concern to CDFG and thus warrants classification as an important habitat. Although annual grassland is not specifically included on the list of important habitats, the County has the option of expanding the definition of important habitats beyond those listed on page 5.12-56. In addition, the County could acquire parcels that include annual grassland provided they meet the conservation objectives outlined in the INRMP habitat acquisition component.

Response to Comment 281-502 (EIR): The EIR acknowledges that the mitigation would reduce impacts to biological resources, although not to a less-than-significant level. The comment is consistent with this conclusion.

Response to Comment 281-503 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 253-49 for information on the INRMP. The monitoring component of the INRMP as described on page 5.12-58 of Volume 2 of the EIR would be considered long-term monitoring. It is acknowledged that young "replacement" oaks do not have the same biological importance as older trees. As discussed in Master Response 18, the intent of Option B is to require preservation of existing habitat, and Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(f) has been revised accordingly. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. It should be noted that planting oaks is not without value. When successful, it can enhance wildlife habitat and reduce the effects of habitat fragmentation especially in areas where oak seedling recruitment is low. Because it may take decades for a similarly-

functioning replacement stand to be obtained, the proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures do not rely on replacement as a primary protection strategy. However, replacement is used to augment canopy protection and woodland preservation policies.

Response to Comment 281-504: In preparing the DEIR, the recommendations proposed by CDFG and others in the scoping process were considered and some were incorporated into the General Plan alternatives and proposed mitigation measures. In some cases different measures are proposed. CDFG has provided comments on the proposed policies in the General Plan alternatives and EIR mitigation measures, including those relating to oak woodland protection, and response to those comments are provided in this Response to Comments document. Please refer generally to Responses to Comment Letter 253. Regarding the issue of 15-gallon replacement trees, please refer to Response to Comment 253-51.

Response to Comment 281-505 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-500.

Response to Comment 281-506 (EIR): This comment summarizes information presented in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-507 (EIR): This comment summarizes information presented in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-508 (EIR): This comment summarizes information presented in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-509 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 253-29.

Response to Comment 281-510 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-511.

Response to Comment 281-511 (EIR): The County currently participates in the El Dorado County Noxious Weed Group (NWMG), which began in 1998 as a coordinated approach to identify sites, develop responses, and educate the public in more effectively reducing or eliminating noxious weed infestations. The base document of the NWMG is a Memorandum of Understanding, which is signed by 20 area organizations, businesses, and agencies in an effort to coordinate weed work and education throughout the County. As a member of the NWMG, the County (as well as many other signatories) is responsible for public education such as that suggested by the commenter. The suggested addition of a requirement for the steam cleaning of heavy equipment to reduce the transportation and introduction of noxious weed seeds would be most appropriately addressed by the NWMG. The draft General Plan documents and EIR include a number of considerations that could be used to address noxious weeds, such as the retention of existing native vegetation, habitat protection, and habitat restoration.

Response to Comment 281-512 (EIR): The comment regarding the availability of nontechnical information about noxious weeds is noted for the record. As mentioned in Response to Comment 281-511, specific measures to address noxious weeds, may be developed as part of the INRMP. The Planning Commission will consider the cost and benefit of public education along with other methods of minimizing the spread of noxious weeds during development of the habitat management component of the INRMP (see page 5.12-58 of Volume 2 of the EIR). The comment regarding the use of the herbicide transline is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 281-513 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-515.

Response to Comment 281-514 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-515.

Response to Comment 281-515 (EIR): Table 5.12-5 was included in the EIR to help organize and present the data most relevant to the analysis of impacts. The EIR addresses impacts collectively for all special-status species based on proposed land use intensity. An attempt was made to obtain all publicly-accessible information on special-status species occurrences as part of this analysis. Absence of a certain special status species from the list does not indicate required attention to preserving their known habitat, but simply indicates that higher intensity uses are not proposed in areas of known occurrences of that species. The mitigation in the EIR is not species-specific; the County will prioritize protection of special-status species based on input from USFWS, CDFG, and species experts.

Response to Comment 281-516 (EIR): Several occurrences of foothill-yellowed legged frog from the CNDDDB are shown in Exhibit 5.12-6. Occurrences of red-legged frog are not shown because the CNDDDB does not make specific information publicly available for this species. Table 5.12-5 has been revised to clarify this. Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 281-517 (EIR): The General Plan Land Use Diagrams have been updated to reflect the most currently available ownership of lands within the –EP overlay/Pine Hill Preserve. The Cameron Park unit has been added. Please refer also to Master Response 20.

Response to Comment 281-518 (EIR): The commenter's support for the INRMP and no-net-loss policy for important habitat is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 281-519 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 281-520 (EIR): The commenter's opinion regarding regulatory requirements and protection of species of concern are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 281-521 (EIR): The commenter's desire that any INRMP is scientifically sound and include adaptive management is consistent with County goals for the same.

Response to Comment 281-522 (EIR): It is acknowledged that widening U.S. Highway 50 would be expected to increase vehicular mortality of terrestrial wildlife. As noted on page 5.12-90 of the EIR, U.S. Highway 50 already limits north-south wildlife movement in western El Dorado County and that increased roadways and traffic resulting from new development would exacerbate impacts on wildlife movement. North-south connectivity of oak woodland habitat in particular is discussed on page 5.12-39.

Response to Comment 281-523 (EIR): Neighboring counties have not been approached to discuss a multicounty regional corridor. The idea of a regional corridor is only in the conceptual phase and was not contemplated prior to the initiation of the EIR. It was anticipated that serious discussion of the concept would not begin until after approval of the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-524 (EIR): The conclusions in the EIR are supported by the analysis on pages 5.12-99 and 5.12-100. The primary reason for the conclusion that a 40-acre parcel size limitation would not be included as mitigation is because the large majority of critical deer herd habitat is on land designated as Natural Resource, which limits development to 40 acres or 160 acres/du. The EIR discloses the difficulties of adequately protecting movement corridors and concludes that impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. Please refer to Response to Comment 299 -3.

Response to Comment 281-525 (EIR): The mitigation in the EIR could be used as a foundation developing specific measures that would address the concerns of the commenter regarding facilitating movement opportunities for wildlife. Specifically, the habitat acquisition component of the INRMP (Mitigation Measure 5.12-1[d]), described on page 5.12-56 of the EIR and applicable to all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives) would give priority to acquiring parcels that preserve natural wildlife movement corridors such as crossing under major roadways (e.g., U.S. Highway 50 and across canyons). The habitat management component of the same measure identifies construction of roadway under- and overcrossings that would facilitate movement by terrestrial wildlife as a potential management action of the INRMP. Mitigation Measure 5.12-3(b) on page 5.12-98, which is also applicable to all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, would add lands that have high wildlife value and provide connectivity and thus, provide opportunities for wildlife movement to the -IBC overlay.

Response to Comment 281-526 (EIR): Existing terrestrial wildlife populations subject to vehicular mortality on a regional basis are not specifically examined in the EIR. Systematic wildlife surveys have not been conducted for El Dorado Hills or other regions where substantial urban growth is expected. However, an in-depth analysis of existing wildlife populations is not necessary to evaluate this impact as required by CEQA. Please

see Master Response 2 regarding the required level of detail for a General Plan and EIR. Mitigation Measure 5.12-3(c) has been identified on pages 5.12-98 and 5.12-99 of Volume 2 the EIR to reduce wildlife vehicular mortality resulting from construction of four- and six-lane roadways. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-525 for a description of other mitigation in the EIR that would reduce impacts on wildlife movement.

Response to Comment 281-527 (EIR): The mitigation in the EIR provides an opportunity for the County to address concerns about fencing that represents a physical barrier to wildlife movement. Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(e), required for all discretionary projects that would disturb or fragment important habitat, would require mitigation that would mitigate the impact of fencing – limiting the type/amount of fencing would be a potential avenue for reducing this impact. Mitigation Measure 5.12-3(b), which would apply the -IBC overlay to lands identified as having high wildlife habitat values, would require that development within this overlay district not hinder wildlife movement. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors may decide to consider measures to reduce impacts associated with fencing in their deliberations on the General Plan. The comment on existing homes is noted for the record. Existing problems serve as the existing environmental conditions against which impacts of the project are measured, as required by CEQA.

Response to Comment 281-528 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-530.

Response to Comment 281-529 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-530.

Response to Comment 281-530 (EIR): A detailed analysis of the set asides for each of the developments identified by the commenter is beyond the scope of this EIR. The existing habitat setting in the County is discussed in Section 5.12 of Volume 2 the EIR in an adequate level of detail for a General Plan EIR (please refer to Master Response 2). The proposed policy and mitigation measures would require development projects to mitigate impacts to sensitive habitat based on habitat value and not simply physical constraints.

Response to Comment 281-531 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-533.

Response to Comment 281-532 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-533.

Response to Comment 281-533 (EIR): The commenter's opinion stating a preference for requiring applicants to use U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS's) wetland criteria for delineating wetlands rather than U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) criteria is noted for the record. Throughout California and the U.S., the ACOE definition for wetlands is more widely accepted and used more frequently than the USFWS definition for identifying wetlands for purposes of wetland protection and mitigation. Under the ACOE definition, an area is considered a wetland if three parameters are present: hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology. The USFWS definition is

broader, applying whenever one or more of the three parameters is present. The ACOE wetlands definition generally encompasses those wetland areas with the greatest biological value. In El Dorado County, under the USFWS wetlands definition, a greater amount of land would qualify as wetlands; however, not all of that land would include sensitive or important habitat, or even necessarily be considered natural habitat. For example, under the USFWS definition, it is possible that low-lying or over-watered landscaped areas subject to ponding during the growing season could qualify as wetlands. Mandatory buffers for such areas were not considered necessary or appropriate. The overall protection of sensitive habitat in El Dorado County is not expected to be substantially diminished by electing to define wetlands using ACOE methods. Other proposed policies and mitigation measures directed specifically at protecting important habitat and sensitive species would address potential impacts to areas that do not meet ACOE wetland definition but nevertheless have a high biological significance.

Response to Comment 281-534 (EIR): It has not been determined if any particular ephemeral streams would be included as important habitat as defined in Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(d) or in the database of important surface water features as described in Mitigation Measure 5.12-4(b). It is acknowledged that ephemeral streams can support important biological resources and in some cases may constitute important habitat. The determination of the specific resources to be included in the INRMP inventory and surface water database would be part of the implementation of that mitigation measure.

Response to Comment 281-535 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 238-2.

Response to Comment 281-536 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 281-537 (EIR): It is anticipated that the important surface water features database will be developed as part of the important habitat inventory. As noted in the implementation plans for the General Plans for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative (page 270) and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative (page 267), this inventory is expected to be completed within five years of General Plan adoption.

Response to Comment 281-538 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-539.

Response to Comment 281-539: It is acknowledged that increasing public access to areas where sensitive habitat is located can adversely affect biological resources. However, when properly planned, controlling public access can also be used to effectively reduce impacts on biological resources by limiting potentially damaging unauthorized access. The policies in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives to encourage new points of public access to water bodies would not allow indiscriminate access, and is intended to be applied in a manner consistent with policies in the proposed alternatives calling for the protection of biological resources.

Response to Comment 281-540 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-541.

Response to Comment 281-541 (EIR): Using native plants from a local genetic source would not substantially reduce significant impacts on biological resources as described in Section 5.12 of the EIR. Including a requirement for the use of plants from a local genetic source for restoration projects could affect the feasibility of such projects by increasing the costs. As a result, the scale of some restoration projects may need to be reduced or other cost saving measure may need to be implemented that would result in the project being less effective at restoring the overall biological value. The comment is noted and the suggestions of the commenter will be considered further if Measure CO-P is adopted.

Response to Comment 281-542 (EIR): Please see Responses to Comments 281-967 through 281-973.

Response to Comment 281-543 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-544.

Response to Comment 281-544 (EIR): The commenter suggests subcategorizing uses allowed under the Open Space (OS) designation and placing a subscript identifier based on the subcategory (e.g., Open Space with an emphasis on preservation of natural resources would be OS_{nr}). The commenter also suggests that this would also be more useful than having both the OS and Natural Resource (NR) designations.

As presented, the General Plan land use designations (and land use overlays) are intended to provide overall guidance on suitable land uses. The type of detail referred to by the commenter would be more appropriately addressed through the subsequent zoning of OS and NR parcels. For example, the County could develop a special recreational facility or recreational lands-based zone district that it could apply to OS or NR lands intended to provide for recreational opportunities or a special natural resource preserve zone district that it could apply to lands subject to permanent protection, such as publicly owned properties that are rare plant habitat.

The commenter states that there is a contradiction in allowing mining and agriculture on lands designated OS. In Policy 7.6.1.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policy CO-11b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, it is stated that open space land can be utilized to identify lands containing important mineral deposits. The OS designation may appropriately be applied to parcels currently under agricultural production, particularly if such parcels are the subject of a permanent conservation easement that allows for ongoing agriculture. Finally, application of the OS designation to lands having important mineral resources and to lands under agricultural production is consistent with policy direction provided in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives (see Policy 7.6.1.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policies CO-11a and CO-11b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives).

Regarding future mineral resource extraction on lands carrying the OS designation, the EIR contains a mitigation measure that would discourage the application of the Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay to OS parcels (Mitigation Measure 5.12-1[c]) due to potential land use incompatibilities. The EIR does not identify agricultural production on OS parcels as an incompatible use.

Response to Comment 281-545 (EIR): The commenter correctly states that the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives Land Use Diagrams do not include the Non-Jurisdictional Lands (-NJ) overlay that is contained on the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives Land Use Diagrams. As noted on page 3-35 of Volume 1 the EIR, the -NJ overlay has not proved to be a valuable land use tool, largely because of the regular changes in ownership of parcels identified with the overlay. Whether or not parcels are designated as -NJ, the administering agency still has land use authority for such parcels. It should be noted that the -NJ land use overlay is not used as the sole designation on any of the Land Use Diagrams, and is used in conjunction with a base land use designation on the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives Land Use Diagrams.

The commenter notes that some parcels owned by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) are inappropriately identified for development, though the commenter does not identify the specific parcels. Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document contains documentation of land use designation changes to some BLM parcels that have recently been acquired as part of the Pine Hill Preserve. The BLM has also commented on how its lands should be designated. Please refer to Master Response 20.

Response to Comment 281-546 (EIR): This comment is noted and will be considered by County staff in developing implementation programs. Please refer to Response to Comment 299-5 regarding consistency with open space plan requirements.

Response to Comment 281-547 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-548 through 281-563.

Response to Comment 281-548 (EIR): Statements made regarding prehistoric settlement patterns are based on broad assessments of early Native American land-use practices. Although exceptions to any such "rule" can and do occur, in general, prehistoric habitation and activity areas in El Dorado County, and throughout California, tend to occur on well-drained landforms in the immediate vicinity of potable water. Archaeological studies conducted within El Dorado County and the locations of documented prehistoric sites confirm this tendency. A statistical breakdown would not alter the conclusions in the EIR regarding impact significance or the need for mitigation. Although planning efforts in El Dorado County have not specifically addressed the cultural resources sensitivity of particular landforms, all development proposals that require an environmental impact analysis under CEQA include assessments of the potential for impacts on cultural resources.

Response to Comment 281-549 (EIR): The discrepancy between the text and the entries in Table 5.13-1 is due to a typographical error. The correct number is eight and the corrections are shown in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 281-550 (EIR): The official repository of information regarding documented cultural resources (NRHP/CRHR eligible or otherwise) in El Dorado County is maintained by the North Central Information Center (NCIC) at California State University, Sacramento. The data maintained by the NCIC is available on a confidential basis to qualified researchers or agencies and can be accessed through a formal information request and adherence to a confidentiality agreement.

Response to Comment 281-551 (EIR): The correct name of the "County Pioneer Cemetery Commission" listed in the Volume 2 of the EIR on page 5.13-10 is the "El Dorado County Pioneer Cemeteries Commission." This Commission is a California 501(3)(c) Non-Profit Public Benefit Corporation, not affiliated with the County of El Dorado. The eleven-member Cemetery Advisory Committee was created in 2001 by the Board of Supervisors to protect and promote the public health, safety and general welfare by preserving and enhancing cemeteries; to approve clear, fair, appropriate, and effective regulation for their use; to ensure appropriate treatment of Native American burial sites; compile and record cemetery information, records, and historical data; and to identify and pursue funding for all of these activities. Additional language will be added to this page to clarify the groups involved in promoting the County's history. Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document for changes to the DEIR text.

Response to Comment 281-552 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-551.

Response to Comment 281-553 (EIR): The Cultural Resources Preservation Commission was created pursuant to a policy in the 1996 General Plan for dealing with a wide range of cultural resources issues, including protection of the County's numerous resources. The County determined that continuing with the Commission was not appropriate until a new General Plan was in place to provide policy direction on cultural resources preservation. All of the proposed General Plan alternatives include policies on cultural resources; the manner in which the new General Plan would address the issue will depend on the alternative that is ultimately adopted. Please refer to the description of the alternatives. In addition, proposed Mitigation Measure 5.13-1(c), if adopted, adds a new policy for the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternative (and a revised policy for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative) requiring preparation of a cultural resources ordinance. Components of the ordinance would include provisions for buffers and setbacks; definition of the County's significant resources; formulation of project review guidelines and development of a sensitivity map. The Board of Supervisors will consider cultural resource policy options in its deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-554 (EIR): The incident that the commenter describes was an inadvertent error and appears to have been an incident as it has not been repeated.

There is currently no review process comparable to that outlined in Mitigation Measure 5.13-1(a) (which calls for adoption of the conformity review process set forth in Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a)). Previously ministerial development projects in the County have had no cultural resources analysis.

The commenter notes that only those resources presently on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) would be subject to treatment as significant cultural resources under the environmental review process outlined in Mitigation Measure 5.13-1(a). Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document contains clarification to page 5.13-19 to incorporate cultural resources determined likely NRHP/CRHR eligible by the environmental review field investigator.

Response to Comment 281-555 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.13-1(b) and the associated new policy refer to undocumented cultural resources in the context of the review process intended to apply to ministerial projects in the County. Currently, documented cultural resources consist of those prehistoric and historic sites, features, and artifacts currently documented in the files of the NCIC and not those potentially recorded through the review process discussed in Mitigation Measure 5.13-1(a). In addition, the review process could identify areas particularly sensitive for containing significant cultural resources (e.g. low-slope ground, water courses, river terraces) not identified during the project area investigation (e.g. subsurface archaeological materials). Once identified, such areas may be monitored during project-related ground disturbing activities thus increasing the possibility that previously undocumented cultural resources will be noted prior to disturbance (see Mitigation Measure 5.13-1(c): Adopt a Cultural Resources Ordinance). This measure would be applied to ministerial projects through the conformity review process set forth in Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a).

Response to Comment 281-556 (EIR): Eligibility standards for the CRHR and NRHP are fairly broad, open to considerable interpretation, and not necessarily as restrictive as the comment implies. The most inclusive of the criteria allows for CRHR/NRHP listing based on the potential of a resource to retain important scientific information (Criterion d for the NRHP and Criterion 4 of the CRHR). It is under these criteria that many sites (prehistoric in particular) are found eligible for CRHR/NRHP listing. In such cases, evidence for intact subsurface archaeological contexts is adequate for a finding of significance and possible eligibility for CRHR/NRHP listing. Cultural resources such as sparse, un-stratified prehistoric lithic scatters or ephemeral early 20th century refuse deposits usually do not retain the ability to provide important scientific information and, as such, are typically not eligible for CRHR/NRHP listing. Such resources, once documented, are not provided further levels of protection under CEQA or the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

Although preliminary recommendations for resource eligibility can be made by qualified professional cultural resource specialists, the final determination and register listing of sites is made by the Office of Historic Preservation (for the CRHR) or the Keeper of the

NRHP. The time required to complete the listing process can vary, although it usually ranges in terms of months.

During the period between nomination of a resource and actual listing on the NRHP, if the resource is under federal administration (ownership or other form of oversight), it could not be adversely affected without proper mitigation. Penalties can apply if a public agency's undertakings destroy or alter the resource in a way that would preclude NRHP listing. Similarly, if the property is owned by or otherwise under public agency administration, cultural resources nominated for or already listed on the CRHR also cannot be adversely affected without implementation of mitigation measures approved by the OHP. However, privately owned cultural resource properties can only be nominated for NRHP/CRHR listing with the resource owner's consent and such properties can be altered or destroyed without legal consequences. That being said, once a development proposal is submitted, it would be subject to the mitigation measures outlined in the EIR, so significant impacts would thereby be avoided.

Response to Comment 281-557 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 5.

Response to Comment 281-558 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in this comment are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan and the EIR. Applying standard setbacks from documented historic or prehistoric cemeteries could reduce potential impacts to interments in some instances, but this is dependent on cemetery condition, accuracy of any associated documentation, and physical setting. In some cases, setbacks in excess of 100 feet would be appropriate and in others less would be suitable. Furthermore, a standard setback or buffer may deprive individual land owners of the reasonable use of their property without a demonstrable benefit to documented or unrecorded interments or cemetery features.

Regarding the commenter's suggestion that development proposals adjacent to cemeteries should be required to include an archaeological assessment of cemetery boundaries, such studies would be provided for under Mitigation Measure 5.13-1(a).

Response to Comment 281-559 (EIR): Referring to architectural style and not construction style in Policy 7.5.2.2.B on page 5.13-20 is sufficient. Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document contains the revised mitigation measure.

Response to Comment 281-560 (EIR): This comment implies that elaborate architectural styling was restricted to urban settings and that such contexts were present only in Placerville as opposed to the unincorporated portions of the County. Towns such as Diamond Springs, El Dorado and Coloma, although far smaller now than they were during the middle of the 19th century, exhibit many examples of elaborate architecture as opposed to unadorned vernacular designs. While vernacular architecture does tend to be more common in rural areas, buildings located in rural settings were often constructed in the architectural styles prevalent in their day (e.g., Gothic Revival, Italianate or Eastlake

["Victorian"] in the mid-late 19th century) and can be found in unincorporated areas of El Dorado County. In addition, although Victorian and Victorian-influenced architecture was the norm in the latter decades of the 1800s, by the early 1900s, this style had generally fallen out of favor. Vernacular construction was still common but reactionary architectural styles (e.g. Arts and Crafts and Craftsmen styles or simplified Queen Anne designs) began to influence both rural and urban building plans and characterized much of the construction of the early 20th century.

Response to Comment 281-561 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-553.

Response to Comment 281-562 (EIR): Various resources and organizations are available to assist private landowners preserve and protect historic structures. The General Plan EIR, however, is not an appropriate venue for providing this information. The opinions and concerns expressed in this comment are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 281-563 (EIR): Promotional activities that encourage cemetery visitation in El Dorado County are an economic and social concern and not an environmental issue. Nevertheless, the opinions of the commenter regarding the encouragement of historic cemetery-related tourism in the County are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 281-564 (EIR): NOP scoping comments regarding economic development are addressed in Responses to Comments 281-1032 through 281-1054.

Response to Comment 281-565 (EIR): The potential impacts stated by the commenter as possible results of economic development proposed in economic development policies in the General Plan are analyzed for all four Alternatives in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-566 (EIR): The staff does not believe this constitutes a CEQA issue; however, in the 1996 General Plan Alternative Objective 10.1.5 addresses this opportunity and in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives Implementation Measure ED-A addresses this issue.

Letter 281 -- Notice of Preparation Comments

The following comments were provided by the commenter previously when the NOP was released. They do not address the contents of the EIR. The comments were written prior to the drafting of the EIR and address the commenter's desire to have the EIR cover certain items. These comments were all reviewed and considered in the scope and content of the EIR. The responses to these comments (Comments 281-567 through 281-1071) refer to the sections in the EIR where these issues were addressed or, if not addressed in the EIR, briefly explain why not.

Response to Comment 281-567 (EIR): Regarding Volume 2 of the 1996 General Plan, please see Master Response 8. The analysis in the EIR is based on the most up-to-date information available. All background information was updated to the extent feasible. For example, population data were taken from the 2000 U.S. Census; projects approved or completed since 1994 were addressed as such; new and modified ordinances and regulations were incorporated into the analysis; and new sources of information not available in 1994 were consulted. Each of the points raised was considered in the EIR. For instance, all approved projects ("existing commitments") were considered throughout the EIR; Project 184 and other water projects are discussed in Section 5.5; rare plant preserves are considered in Section 5.12; and reclaimed water use is discussed in Section 5.5. Global warming was considered beyond the scope of the EIR as it relates to global issues that are being scientifically debated and to which the General Plan would not meaningfully contribute. The energy "crisis" was not, per se, addressed as it is a temporal and social issue (arguably the crisis at the time, electricity, has since been resolved). However, demand for energy resources is addressed in Section 5.6 of the EIR, Volume 1. See also Section 15125 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Response to Comment 281-568 (EIR): The commenter acknowledges changes in the wording of Vision, Strategies, and Concepts in the General Plan. The purpose of the EIR is to evaluate environmental impacts of General Plan policies and Land Use Diagrams, rather than to critique the success of the General Plan in addressing its stated objectives.

Response to Comment 281-569 (EIR): Impacts of the various General Plan development scenarios and policies relating to power supply and distribution are addressed in Section 5.6, Utilities.

Response to Comment 281-570 (EIR): Impacts of the various General Plan development scenarios and policies relating to power supply and distribution are addressed in Section 5.6, Utilities. In addition, the EIR evaluates impacts of General Plan policies related to development in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing; traffic and resulting air emissions in Sections 5.4, Traffic and Circulation, and 5.11, Air Quality; and water supply in Section 5.5, Water Resources. The issue of global warming is undergoing extensive worldwide study and is not at all well understood. While potentially important or even critical to future environmental health of the world, this issue is beyond the scope of a General Plan EIR for El Dorado County. Further, how the General Plan

may contribute to global warming is speculative. Nevertheless, attendant issues are considered, as specified above, and alternatives (in addition to the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives; for instance, see Alternative #1, Transit Emphasis, and Alternative #12, Compact Development, in Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the EIR) are also considered to address these issues.

Response to Comment 281-571 (EIR): Policies relating to design standards for subdivisions are proposed in the Land Use Element of the General Plan and evaluated in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing, of the EIR. Air quality impacts of the Land Use Diagrams and policies proposed under each alternative are addressed in Section 5.11, Air Quality.

Response to Comment 281-572 (EIR): The Land Use Element and Public Services and Utilities Element of the General Plan contain policies relating to energy-efficient design of development projects. The comment relates to the County's design standards rather than to the EIR. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's desire for a "point" system for greening features on development projects, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-573 (EIR): The Land Use Element and Public Services and Utilities Element of the General Plan contain policies relating to energy-efficient design of development projects. The comment relates to the County's design standards rather than to the EIR. The impacts of General Plan policies are evaluated in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-574 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-573.

Response to Comment 281-575 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-573. With respect, to trees, please see Section 5.12, Biological Resources, and particularly Mitigation Measures 5.12-1(f) and 5.12-1(g).

Response to Comment 281-576 (EIR): The general concerns and opinions regarding development patterns expressed in the comment are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 281-577 (EIR): The Land Use Diagram and General Plan policies for each alternative were established concurrently to ensure that proposed policies and land use designations are appropriately intertwined. The EIR analyzes potential conflicts between the policies and designations.

Response to Comment 281-578 (EIR): The EIR addresses the concerns of the commenter regarding various land use and sphere of influence issues (e.g., EID – Section 5.5; setbacks, habitat conservation –Section 5.12; Parks –Section 5.7). Please refer to the appropriate section of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 281-579 (EIR): The EIR contains detailed descriptions of the land use terminology (e.g., Community Region), land use designations (e.g., Multi-Family Residential), and the objectives of the County, assumptions and distinguishing characteristics of each alternative in Chapter 3, Description of Equal-Weight Project Alternatives. In addition, land use designations, overlays, and terminology are described in Chapter 3 and discussed in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing. The degree to which each of the alternatives meets the “Visions, Strategies, and Concepts” is relevant in the EIR only insofar as they relate to environmental impacts of each alternative, and this is considered in detail in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-580 (EIR): The commenter expresses concerns about a “one size fits all” approach to designing for growth. The General Plan addresses differences in communities by designating various locations as Community Regions, Rural Centers, and Rural Regions, as described in Chapter 3 of Volume 1 of the EIR. The concept of “community character” is addressed in the Land Use Element of the General Plan and Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing, of Volume 1 of the EIR. Various geographically pertinent issues (e.g., wildland fire, species of concern, cultural resources) are discussed in relevant context throughout Chapter 5 of Volume 1 and 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-581 (EIR): Impacts of the policies identified in the Economic Development Element of the General Plan are evaluated where they could result in physical impacts on the environment, such as growth. CEQA does not require an EIR to evaluate impacts that are solely social or economic in nature. Examples of policies considered include General Plan Policies 10.1.5.6 and 10.2.7.1, which are evaluated in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing, as they relate to limiting development densities and planning for large commercial or industrial projects.

Response to Comment 281-582 (EIR): As described in Chapter 3, Description of Equal-Weight Project Alternatives, and Chapter 4, Land Use Forecasts and Development Estimates, the EIR evaluates the environmental impacts of each of the four equal-weight alternatives relative to the development scenarios projected by EPS, including the provision of infrastructure (roads, see Section 5.4; Water, see Section 5.5; Utilities, see Section 5.6; Public Services, see Section 5.7). Fiscal effects are not physical environmental effects under CEQA and are therefore not addressed in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-583 (EIR): Forecasts of additional housing units and jobs for each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, in 2025 and at buildout, are provided in Chapter 4, Land Use Forecasts and Development Estimates. Assumptions used in developing the forecasts are also described in that chapter. The assumptions include several categories of “undevelopable” or constrained parcels, such as parcels too small to accommodate modern building standards and fire setbacks; parcels that are precluded from development by their assessor’s parcel code (e.g., public easement); and parcels with slope constraints that would restrict development to minimum, rather than maximum, densities. Relative to the total number of mapped parcels, very few were deemed to constrain development, and all developable parcels were assumed in the EIR

to build out to their maximum density pursuant to the Land Use Diagram, as modified by the started assumptions, such as prohibition of subdivisions for the No Project Alternative. In isolated circumstances, topography is assumed to constrain the density of development. Please see Chapter 4 in Volume 1 of the EIR, particularly pages 4.4-12 and 4.4-13.

Response to Comment 281-584 (EIR): Chapter 4, Land Use Forecasts and Development Estimates, discusses recent housing and development trends in the County. The impact analyses in both the land use and housing portions of Section 5.1 address how the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives would affect development patterns and densities. These analyses also evaluate the extent to which the alternatives would concentrate growth. All of the environmental impact analyses in Chapter 5 address the effectiveness of the alternatives in minimizing environmental impacts of development. Effects of the General Plan policies on traffic congestion and air quality are addressed in Sections 5.4 and 5.11.

Response to Comment 281-585 (EIR): Information about service districts and sewer service and their relationship to land uses is provided in Section 5.6, Utilities. Information about water purveyors and detailed information about EID is included in Section 5.5, Water Resources. The economic constraints of EID, a jurisdiction separate from the County, are not an environmental issue.

Response to Comment 281-586 (EIR): Impacts of development on traffic are addressed in Section 5.4, Traffic and Circulation. This includes a discussion of Measure Y and the interaction between traffic congestion and development.

Response to Comment 281-587 (EIR): Concurrency is addressed in the context of compliance with proposed General Plan policies. This discussion takes place primarily in Section 5.4, Traffic and Circulation, and Section 5.5, Water Resources. Policies addressing availability of utilities and public services to serve new development are addressed in Section 5.6, Utilities, and Section 5.7, Public Services. Also, please refer to Master Responses 6 and 13.

Response to Comment 281-588 (EIR): Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing, addresses land use designations and the impacts of the Land Use Diagrams for the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives on separation of communities, including discussion of areas of specific concern. In particular, see the discussion under Impact 5.1.2 regarding community separators. The Land Use Diagrams are provided in Chapter 3. Section 5.6 addresses impacts of the alternatives on utilities. Although infrastructure providers, as jurisdictions separate from the County, may choose where and when to expand their boundaries, the County Board of Supervisors has ultimate decision-making authority over which areas of the County will be developed.

Response to Comment 281-589 (EIR): General Plan policies have been proposed that address subdivision design (Land Use Element), mixed-use development (Land Use

Element), pedestrian access (Land Use, Circulation Elements), and existing-use zoning (Land Use Element). The Zoning Ordinance allows flexibility in land use determinations based on site-specific criteria. The EIR evaluates impacts of these proposed policies in the appropriate sections of Chapter 5.

Response to Comment 281-590 (EIR): Section 5.3, Visual Resources, discusses the impacts of General Plan policies relating to ridgeline development. Please see Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(c).

Response to Comment 281-591 (EIR): Development of golf courses (as a land use unique from other uses) is not specifically addressed in the General Plan and thus is not evaluated in the EIR. Impacts of golf courses are entirely site specific and would need to be considered, if they are proposed, in CEQA evaluations of any such applications. Please refer also to Master Response 2. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, representing the commenter's desire for a "point" system for incorporating "green" attributes into golf course design, are noted for the record and will be considered by the County Planning Department in the future if golf courses are proposed.

Response to Comment 281-592 (EIR): The commenter's concerns regarding water quality and stormwater runoff are addressed in Subsection 5.5.3, Water Quality; the soils portion of Section 5.9, Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources, also discusses erosion control. Subsection 5.8.2, Flood Hazards, addresses protection against flooding.

Response to Comment 281-593 (EIR): Policies relating to street design are evaluated in Section 5.3, Visual Resources (see Impact 5.3-2 regarding street design) and Section 5.4, Traffic and Circulation. Consideration of the interaction between street width and emergency access is provided in these discussions.

Response to Comment 281-594 (EIR): Impact 5.1-2, Land Use, addresses impacts of the proposed General Plan policies and Land Use Diagrams on community character throughout the County. A "sense of community" and isolation among residents, however, are not considered environmental impacts under CEQA. The concerns and opinions expressed by the commenter regarding this issue are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-595 (EIR): The County's housing stock and fair-share housing requirement are discussed in Section 5.1.2, Housing, and in the proposed Housing Element. Section 5.1.1, Land Use, describes impacts of the General Plan scenarios relating to varying densities of development. The Land Use Element of the General Plan contains policies relating to clustering of development and density bonuses.

Response to Comment 281-596 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed by the commenter regarding senior housing options are not environmental in nature; they are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-597 (EIR): The General Plan contains policies relating to open space in the Conservation and Open Space Element and the Health and Safety Element, and the impacts of these policies are evaluated primarily in Section 5.12, Biological Resources, of the EIR. Policies relating to scenic corridors are provided in the Conservation and Open Space Element and the Land Use Element of the General Plan, and the impacts of these policies are evaluated in Section 5.3, Visual Resources. Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing, addresses the degree to which development may occur in open space.

Response to Comment 281-598 (EIR): Policies addressing gated communities are contained in the Land Use Element and Health and Safety Element of the General Plan. Section 5.8, Human Health and Safety, of the EIR evaluates impacts of gated communities, particularly in relation to fire prevention and access. The County's design standards (administered by the Planning Department) also address gated communities, and the County Board of Supervisors has ultimate decision-making authority to allow or prohibit gated communities countywide or in specific instances. The EIR does not provide a list of all gated communities in the County and such a list would not be relevant to consideration of the impacts of future development of the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-599 (EIR): Requirements that subdivision design include elements of passive heating and cooling are appropriately located in the County's design standards rather than the General Plan. The concerns and opinions expressed by the commenter regarding this issue are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan and conveyed to the Planning Department to consider for inclusion in the design standards.

Response to Comment 281-600 (EIR): Impacts of policies relating to locations of electrical generating facilities are evaluated in Section 5.6, Utilities. No General Plan designations identify suitable locations for single-home-based facilities, and the relationship between such facilities and environmental impacts is not identified in the comment. The County does not restrict photovoltaic cells, and such technology as microturbines and fuel cells would be permitted to the degree they are consistent with the Zoning Ordinance. These technologies are in development and their ultimate use and impacts is unknown and speculative.

Response to Comment 281-601 (EIR): Requirements that model homes include drought-resistant landscaping are more appropriately included in the County's design standards rather than the General Plan. The concerns and opinions expressed by the commenter regarding this issue are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan and conveyed to the Planning Department to consider for inclusion in the design standards.

Response to Comment 281-602 (EIR): For projects such as subdivisions and use permits, compliance with conditions is verified prior to final map or occupancy. Noncompliance after occupancy would be handled as a code enforcement item. Certificates of Compliance are processed according to the County's adopted standards and may include application of certain performance conditions such as roadway improvements.

Response to Comment 281-603 (EIR): The EIR describes the present roadway system including its operation through LOS analysis and safety through accident evaluation. Refer to Volume 1 of the EIR, pages 5.4-1 through 5.4-8, as well as Exhibits 5.4-1 through 5.4-6.

Response to Comment 281-604 (EIR): Refer to Master Response 13.

Response to Comment 281-605 (EIR): The effect of traffic congestion on recreation use and business is not an environmental impact, and would nevertheless be speculative. It is not addressed in the EIR. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-71.

Response to Comment 281-606 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-72 and 281-108.

Response to Comment 281-607 (EIR): The issue of maintenance and maintenance funding is not considered an environmental impact under CEQA. However, it is noted that the Department of Transportation has a Pavement Management System that tracks pavement conditions and forecasts future maintenance needs on a regular basis.

Response to Comment 281-608 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-73.

Response to Comment 281-609 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 281-610 (EIR): The U.S. Highway 50/Missouri Flat Road interchange project is proposed in two phases, and has undergone separate, project-specific environmental review pursuant to CEQA. The first phase will alleviate the existing traffic operational problems and provide sufficient capacity to accommodate projected growth for at least 10 years after construction regardless of the General Plan alternative adopted by the County. Depending on the General Plan alternative that is ultimately adopted and the level of development that occurs in the vicinity of the Missouri Flat Road interchange, the second phase of the interchange improvement project may be necessary. This decision will be determined by future operating conditions at the interchange.

The Missouri Flat Road-Pleasant Valley Road connector is included as a four-lane divided roadway in the circulation diagrams of all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. Depending on the General Plan alternative that is ultimately adopted and the level of development that occurs in the vicinity of this new roadway, the County could construct this new connection in two phases. The first phase would be a two-lane roadway and the second phase would be to add the third and fourth lanes.

Response to Comment 281-611 (EIR): Traffic impact fee programs are described on page 5.4-15 of the EIR. This discussion addresses funding shortfalls in the programs and Impact 5.4-3 specifically address the overall funding problems associated with providing the roadway improvements necessary to support the projected land use development under each General Plan alternative.

Response to Comment 281-612 (EIR): Page 5.4-22 of Volume 1 of the EIR describes the commuting characteristics of El Dorado County residents and workers and how this information is applied in the El Dorado County General Plan travel demand forecasting model. Specific changes to the model related to these characteristics for the General Plan alternatives are also discussed.

Response to Comment 281-613 (EIR): The principal highway corridors for El Dorado County are described in pages 5.4-1 through 5.4-4 in Volume 1 of the EIR. The LOS impacts associated with each General Plan alternative are summarized in Table 5.4-7 and described in Impacts 5.4-1, 5.4-2, and 5.4-3. Each impact has associated mitigation options that include physical improvements, policy changes, new policies, and implementation measures. Accepting a lower LOS threshold for select roadway segments is one of the mitigation options. The acceptability or desirability of this option is a decision for the Board of Supervisors.

Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-69, 281-70, and 281-97 for additional information.

Response to Comment 281-614 (EIR): The travel demand forecasting and traffic operations model used for this General Plan update and EIR have all been updated since the original 1996 General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-615 (EIR): The impact analysis included in Section 5.11, Air Quality, evaluates the effects that increased traffic under all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives would have on air quality. The computer modeling used to conduct the analysis includes emission factors that take into account the high percentage of vehicles in El Dorado County that are SUVs and the correspondingly higher rate of pollutant emissions that would result from operating these vehicles.

Response to Comment 281-616 (EIR): The EIR has evaluated the General Plan alternatives versus the variety of State, regional, and local plans and programs listed in the regulatory environment on pages 5.4-12 through 5.4-16 of Volume 1. This evaluation

included the transportation concept reports for State Route 49, State Route 193, and U.S. Highway 50 as well as the applicable regional plans such as the County's Regional Transportation Plan and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Section 5.11 of the EIR, Volume 2, considers air quality attainment plans.

Response to Comment 281-617 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-276.

Response to Comment 281-618 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comments 198-9, 229-27, 281-76, and 281-277. Private roads not associated with land development projects must comply with the County Grading Ordinance, and/or the State Fire Safe Standards as applicable.

Response to Comment 281-619 (EIR): The EIR discussion of schools can be found in Section 5.7.3 of Volume 2. The specific analysis of safety of particular schools would need to be addressed by the lead agency which would be the School District. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-82.

Response to Comment 281-620 (EIR): The Caltrans Deputy Directive 64 (DD-64) concerns accommodating nonmotorized travel in Caltrans infrastructure projects on the State highway system. El Dorado County coordinates directly with Caltrans on State highway infrastructure projects such as interchanges to ensure that bicycle and pedestrian mobility is improved as a result of the infrastructure project. Further, the nonmotorized policies contained in the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are also consistent with DD-64.

Response to Comment 281-621 (EIR): Transit service and facilities were evaluated in the EIR and one significant impact (Impact 5.4-4) related to the insufficient capacity of park-and-ride lots was identified. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-82 for additional information.

Response to Comment 281-622 (EIR): The EIR identifies for each of the four Alternatives mitigation to encourage the use of alternative fuel vehicles and to investigate replacement of fleet vehicles with more fuel-efficient or alternative fuel vehicles (Impact 5.11-2(b) and (C)). As identified by the Air Resources Control Board, electric vehicles are considered zero emission vehicles, are over 90 percent cleaner than the least-polluting conventional gasoline powered vehicle, and qualify as an alternative fuel vehicle.

Response to Comment 281-623 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-82 and 281-83.

Response to Comment 281-624 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 17.

Response to Comment 281-625 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 17.

Response to Comment 281-626 (EIR): The EIR considers the ability of each General Plan to affect out-of-county commuting. Refer to page 5.4-22.

Response to Comment 281-627 (EIR): The comment addresses an objective of the prior General Plan. This objective is not in the current General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-628 (EIR): The commenter's opinion that population forecasts based on trends of the recent past can be inaccurate is noted. The County recognizes that forecasts are estimations and that actual outcomes may be different from what was predicted. Regular review of and updating to the General Plan should identify any issues that may need to be reconsidered because the "results" may be dramatically different from forecasts.

Response to Comment 281-629 (EIR): With the four equal-weight and the eight comparative alternatives, the EIR analysis of alternatives satisfied the concerns of the Writ of Mandate in this regard. Table 3-2 of Volume 1 of the EIR shows the population differences between the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. See also the EPS reports that forecast land use for each alternative (Volume 3 of the EIR). The commenter's concerns and opinions regarding the population accommodation goals of the previous General Plan process are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 281-630 (EIR): Demographic information is provided in Chapter 4 of Volume 1 of the EIR. The draft General Plan documents provide more detailed information in the Housing Element of each document.

Response to Comment 281-631 (EIR): EPS's land use forecasts considered undeveloped parcels and "unoccupied" parcels in areas having approved tentative subdivision maps. The reports also considered underutilized parcels.

EPS did not break out its estimates based on water supplier service areas. EPS used a "market area" concept to evaluate different regions of the County (see page 4-8 of Volume 1 of the EIR). Water service is limited to specific areas; the market area evaluation gives good land use projections for those areas having water service by its nature of geographical forecasts.

The EPS reports consider the effects of market demand on development patterns, as suggested by the commenter. Please refer to the "Residential Allocation/Absorption" discussion beginning on page 44 of the March 2002 EPS report (contained in Appendix B of Volume 3 of the EIR).

Response to Comment 281-632 (EIR): EPS evaluated recent market trends (since the mid-1990s) and historical population trends as it prepared the General Plan land use forecasts (please refer to Section IV, "Land Use Demand", of the March 2002 EPS report). EPS did not perform further research on the type of water supply for residences

built over the past ten years; this type of analysis would not have contributed to the projections in a meaningful way since El Dorado County is not a water supplier and because water providers can and may establish additional (new) sources of water throughout the planning period. Future development in areas served by groundwater is considered in the draft General Plan documents and in the EIR, thus taking into consideration the potential limitations of groundwater dependence on future development (see pages 205 through 207 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives Draft General Plan; pages 207 through 211 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative Draft General Plan; pages 209 through 213 of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative Draft General Plan; and pages 5.5-61 through 5.5-71 of Volume 1 of the EIR).

Response to Comment 281-633 (EIR): The EIR does not contain extensive information about the existing distribution of housing types as this type of information was not necessary to complete an environmental analysis of the proposed General Plan alternatives. The "Housing Stock Characteristics" section of the Housing Element contained in each Draft General Plan document contains information about the types of housing units and vacancy rates in the County to the extent that information was available from the U.S. Census Bureau. These data were not broken out by "region". The County recognizes that the distribution of housing types is of concern to a number of residents. Accordingly, the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives contain a policy stating that "housing to serve all income groups shall be fairly distributed throughout the County" (See Goal LU-8 of those two alternatives).

Response to Comment 281-634 (EIR): The EIR does not contain extensive information about tenure as this type of information was not necessary to complete an environmental analysis of the proposed General Plan alternatives. Please see "Housing Stock Characteristics" section of the draft Housing Element in each General Plan alternative for information about tenure. The revised Housing Element contains additional information about Seniors. Please see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for that information.

Response to Comment 281-635 (EIR): The EIR does not contain extensive information about housing vacancy rates as this type of information was not necessary to complete an environmental analysis of the proposed General Plan alternatives. The "Housing Stock Characteristics" section of the draft Housing Element contained in each General Plan alternative contains information about vacant units for "seasonal, recreational, or occasional use only".

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, there were 358 vacant for-rent units in unincorporated El Dorado County on April 1, 2000. This represents 4.8 of the total vacant units at that time. The draft Housing Element contained in each General Plan alternative summarizes vacancy based on total number of housing units. This is consistent with guidance provided by the State Department of Housing and Community Development.

Response to Comment 281-636 (EIR): Neither the draft Housing Element contained in each General Plan alternative nor the EIR contain extensive information about the sizes of existing homes in El Dorado County. This level of detailed information was not necessary to complete an environmental analysis of the proposed General Plan alternatives. The income status of residents of El Dorado County is not an environmental issue pursuant to CEQA.

Response to Comment 281-637 (EIR): The EIR does not contain extensive information about the types of affordable housing (e.g., apartments versus granny flats, etc., either current or future) as this type of information was not necessary to complete an environmental analysis of the proposed General Plan alternatives. Revisions to the draft Housing Element contained in this Response to Comments document include a table of “quantified objectives” for very low, lower, and moderate income housing over the next five years. Please see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for that information. The objectives were not further specified by housing type; doing so could potentially limit flexibility in the provision of affordable housing. The draft Housing Element includes policies and/or implementation measures addressing hardship mobile homes, second units, and mobile homes. The Land Use Element of each draft also includes policies regarding mixed commercial and residential uses.

Response to Comment 281-638 (EIR): The EIR does not quantify the amount of housing within or the advantages and disadvantages of gated subdivisions, as this type of information was not necessary to complete an environmental analysis of the proposed General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-639 (EIR): According to EPS, new second units as a percent of total new single family units, have averaged 3.6 percent since 1995 (page 27 of the March 2002 EPS report). EPS included construction of second units at this rate in its land use forecasts for the General Plan, which were used extensively in the EIR analysis.

Response to Comment 281-640 (EIR): As noted in the “Seniors” discussion in the draft Housing Element of each General Plan alternative, 7.3 percent of the total households in El Dorado County are made up of Seniors living alone. The EIR does not analyze the housing status of Seniors as this type of information was not necessary to complete an environmental analysis of the proposed General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-641 (EIR): The EIR does not assess the condition of the County’s housing stock as this type of information was not necessary to complete an environmental analysis of the proposed General Plan alternatives. The “Physical Housing Conditions” section of the draft Housing Element contained in each of the General Plan alternatives includes information about the housing conditions in a number of survey areas throughout the County.

Response to Comment 281-642 (EIR): The EIR does not analyze the number and distribution of existing housing units by type; the tenure of existing housing units, the vacancy of existing housing units; the size of existing housing units the types of affordable housing units (either current or proposed); the nature and extent of gated subdivisions; or the condition of the existing housing stock, as such analysis was not necessary to complete an environmental analysis of the proposed General Plan alternatives. Most of these items were addressed in the draft and revised draft Housing Element contained in each General Plan alternative, as noted in Responses to Comments 281-633 through 281-638, 281-640, and 281-641. Population projections, an inventory of vacant and underdeveloped land, historic development patterns, and the construction of second units were used in the EIR analysis, as noted in Responses to Comments 281-629, 281-631, 281-632, and 281-639.

Response to Comment 281-643 (EIR): The draft Housing Element contained in each of the alternative General Plan documents includes an Implementation Measure that directs the County to adopt an inclusionary housing ordinance. Such an ordinance may include specific direction on the “percentage” of affordable housing that must be included in Planned Developments of a certain size. Such detail would be determined and proposed during the ordinance development process subsequent to General Plan adoption.

Response to Comment 281-644 (EIR): The commenter does not specify which “State Housing Plan” the Housing Element should be evaluated against. The State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has completed an initial evaluation of the draft Housing Element’s compliance with State law (as presented in each of the draft General Plan alternatives). This Response to Comments document proposes revisions to the original draft in response to HCD’s comments. Please see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document for those revisions.

Response to Comment 281-645 (EIR): Information on the jobs-housing balance in El Dorado County is provided in Chapter 4, Land Use Forecasts and Development Estimates, under Section 4.3.3, Employment. The requested analysis (types of businesses that should be targeted to improve the jobs-housing balance) is not provided in the EIR because the type of business would not affect the environmental impacts of the various alternatives. As described in Chapter 4, residential and nonresidential development was projected based on the availability of land, development potential, and market demand.

Response to Comment 281-646 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-645.

Response to Comment 281-647 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-645 and 281-646. Questions of funding and economic analysis are not considered environmental impacts under CEQA. The concerns and opinions expressed by the commenter regarding funding are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-648 (EIR): Unemployment is not considered to be a physical effect on the environment under CEQA and is not discussed in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-649 (EIR): Economic and employment trends are not considered to be physical effects on the environment and are not discussed in the EIR. See Chapter 4, Volume 1 of the EIR for forecasts of jobs and housing growth.

Response to Comment 281-650 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-649.

Response to Comment 281-651: The commenter presents observations regarding influences on and causes of wildland fires. Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-652 through 281-668 regarding specific fire-related issues.

Response to Comment 281-652 (EIR): The requested history of forest preservation techniques from Native American times to the present day does not determine the extent to which wildland fire may occur as a result of the General Plan and is not addressed.

Response to Comment 281-653 (EIR): Section 5.7, Public Services, contains information on fire protection services and districts throughout the County (adequacy of facilities, response times, etc.) that is applicable to the analysis of environmental impacts (see Impact 5.7.2). A comparative analysis of funding is not relevant to the impacts of developing the General Plan and is not considered in the EIR. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-657.

Response to Comment 281-654 (EIR): Exhibit 5.8-1 in Section 5.8, Human Health and Safety, shows the fire hazard classifications of areas over which the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) has jurisdiction. The information for the exhibit has been provided by CDF, which determines the classification based on cover, beneficial water uses, probable erosion damage and fire risks, and hazards. Figure HS-1 in the Health and Safety Element for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives shows fuel loading in the County.

Response to Comment 281-655 (EIR): Section 5.8.5, Wildland Fire Hazards, discusses General Plan policies relating to wildland fire hazard and environmental impacts of the General Plan scenarios with regard to fire hazard. Impact 5.8-10 addresses the level of development intensity in relation to fire hazard risk.

Response to Comment 281-656 (EIR): Although information on the ratio of volunteer to professional firefighters in districts with high fire hazard zones may be of general interest, it does not relate to the environmental analysis. Volunteers receive sufficient training and equipment to effectively fight fires.

Response to Comment 281-657 (EIR): Section 5.8, Human Health and Safety, contains a discussion of current funding sources for fire protection services and describes fuel

loading and fire hazard classifications throughout the County. Policies within each of the alternatives provide for adequate funding for facilities (e.g., Policy 5.7.2.1 under the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and PS-7c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives).

Response to Comment 281-658 (EIR): Project-level environmental analysis for a development project is required under CEQA to address impacts of the project on levels of fire protection. This protection is reinforced by General Plan policies in the Health and Safety Element and by Mitigation Measure 5.8-10(b), Preclude Development in Areas of High Wildland Fire Hazard.

Response to Comment 281-659 (EIR): Please see Implementation Measure HS-B of the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives as modified in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 281-660 (EIR): Background information about fire hazard origins, trends, and vegetation management strategies is provided in Section 5.8, Human Health and Safety.

Response to Comment 281-661 (EIR): General Plan policies relating to fire protection standards are provided in the Health and Safety Element. Impacts of these policies are evaluated in Section 5.8, Human Health and Safety, of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-662 (EIR): General Plan policies relating to fire protection standards are provided in the Health and Safety Element. Impacts of these policies are evaluated in Section 5.8, Human Health and Safety, of the EIR. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, regarding suggested additional standards for fire protection, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-663 (EIR): The General Plan provides countywide policies for fire protection, and the EIR addresses countywide impacts of implementing those and other policies on the provision of fire protection services in Section 5.8, Human Health and Safety. Individual fire protection districts establish their own policies, which are applied on a project-by-project basis during the environmental review process. Both the General Plan and the individual districts have policies and plans that apply to high-risk areas. The effectiveness of district policies for individual projects must be evaluated during project-level review, as required in General Plan Policy PS-7c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives and Policies 5.7.1.1 and 5.7.2.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-664 (EIR): Section 5.8.5, Wildland Fire Hazard, contains a discussion of regulatory requirements that identifies the responsibilities of local, State, and federal firefighting agencies.

Response to Comment 281-665 (EIR): The County's Fire Hazard Ordinance (Chapter 8.08 of the El Dorado County Code) contains requirements for defensible space, emergency access, signing and numbering, and emergency water supply. These requirements are consistent with and, in some cases, more stringent than those required by State law. The California Fire Plan, developed by CDF and the California Board of Forestry, is described on page 5.8-116 of Volume 2 of the EIR. For any development project receiving environmental analysis, CEQA requires that the lead agency assess the project's impact on the fire protection district's ability to provide adequate fire protection services.

Response to Comment 281-666 (EIR): Strategic fire planning, coordination of fire protection districts, and evacuation routes are addressed by the individual districts, the El Dorado County Fire Safe Council, and the El Dorado County Multi-Hazard Functional Emergency Operations Plans. These are described in Section 5.8.5, Wildland Fire Hazards.

Response to Comment 281-667 (EIR): Equipment owned by the individual fire protection districts is identified in Section 5.7.2, Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services. Equipment needs for the districts is discussed where such information was provided by the district in response to requests by the EIR team. Not all districts responded.

Response to Comment 281-668 (EIR): General Plan Policy 6.2.5.1 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policy HS-3a of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives identify public education programs relating to fire prevention that would be conducted cooperatively by the County, local Fire Safe Councils, USFS, CDF, and local fire protection districts.

Response to Comment 281-669 (EIR): Statistics about crime trends in the County are provided in Table 5.7-1 and discussed in Section 5.7.1, Law Enforcement.

Response to Comment 281-670 (EIR): The El Dorado County Sheriff's Office operates a Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) program. Information about programs related to gang activity can be obtained from the El Dorado County Sheriff's Office. Providing this information in the EIR would not contribute to the environmental analysis.

Response to Comment 281-671 (EIR): The staff is not aware of other teen delinquency problems that result in General Plan-level environmental impacts.

Response to Comment 281-672 (EIR): Information about after-school activities can be obtained from the individual school districts. Providing this information in the EIR would not contribute substantively to the environmental analysis.

Response to Comment 281-673 (EIR): Section 5.7.1, Law Enforcement, contains information on each of the law enforcement jurisdictions in the County.

Response to Comment 281-674 (EIR): Information on response times is provided in Section 5.7.1, Law Enforcement.

Response to Comment 281-675 (EIR): Funding is not considered an environmental issue under CEQA and is not addressed in the EIR. The concerns expressed in the comment, regarding availability of adequate funding for law enforcement, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-676 (EIR): Project-level environmental analysis for a development project is required under CEQA to address impacts of a project on levels of law enforcement services to the extent this could result in an environmental impact.

Response to Comment 281-677 (EIR): The Shingle Springs Rancheria is a sovereign nation and is not under the jurisdiction of the County. Information on environmental impacts of the Shingle Springs Rancheria project is available in the *Environmental Assessment: Shingle Springs Rancheria 5-Acre Fee-to-Trust Transfer Project and Hotel and Casino, El Dorado County, California*, published in 2001 by the U.S. Department of Interior.

Response to Comment 281-678 (EIR): Information on programs operated by the El Dorado County Sheriff's Office is provided in Section 5.7.1, Law Enforcement.

Response to Comment 281-679 (EIR): The commenter's suggestions apply to the County's design review process. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, regarding law enforcement input to design standards, are noted for the record and will be conveyed to the County Planning Department for consideration.

Response to Comment 281-680 (EIR): Funding is not considered an environmental issue under CEQA and is not addressed in the EIR. The County is currently expanding juvenile justice housing in South Lake Tahoe and is considering the same in Placerville. The concerns expressed in the comment, regarding availability of adequate funding for law enforcement and associated services, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-681 (EIR): Provision of emergency medical services is discussed in Section 5.7.2, Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services.

Response to Comment 281-682 (EIR): Provision of emergency medical services and sources of funding are discussed in Section 5.7.2, Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services.

Response to Comment 281-683 (EIR): Project-level environmental analysis for a development project is required under CEQA to address impacts of the project on levels of emergency medical service to the degree environmental impacts could occur.

Response to Comment 281-684 (EIR): Levels of service and standards for response times, established by the County's Emergency Medical Services Agency, are discussed in Subsection 5.7.2, Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services. Impacts of the General Plan development scenarios on provision of these services are also evaluated in that subsection.

Response to Comment 281-685 (EIR): The General Plan provides countywide policies for emergency medical services, and the EIR addresses countywide impacts of implementing those and other policies on the provision of fire protection services in Subsection 5.7.2, Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services. Individual fire protection districts establish their own policies for emergency medical services, which are applied on a project-by-project basis during the environmental review process. Cumulative impacts of the General Plan development scenarios on emergency medical services are addressed in Chapter 7, Other CEQA Considerations, of the General Plan EIR.

Response to Comment 281-686 (EIR): The information on schools that is provided in Subsection 5.7.3, Schools and Childcare Facilities, has been updated from that provided in the previous General Plan EIR.

Response to Comment 281-687 (EIR): Information on school districts, including a map showing district boundaries, is provided in Subsection 5.7.3, Schools and Childcare Facilities.

Response to Comment 281-688 (EIR): Impacts of the General Plan development scenarios on school facilities are evaluated in Subsection 5.7.3, Schools and Childcare Facilities.

Response to Comment 281-689 (EIR): Under CEQA, noise and glare impacts on surrounding properties must be considered during the environmental analysis of a proposed school project. In addition, Mitigation Measure 5.7-3 in Subsection 5.7.3, Schools and Childcare Facilities, would require that projects be located and designed to avoid adjacent incompatible land uses.

Response to Comment 281-690 (EIR): Funding sources mandated by law for school programs are described in Subsection 5.7.3, Schools and Childcare Facilities.

Response to Comment 281-691 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-690.

Response to Comment 281-692 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-690. Information on management of fees paid is available from the individual school districts and would not contribute to the environmental analysis.

Response to Comment 281-693 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-690. The finding requested by the commenter, that school impact fees are sufficient to pay for needed expansion or construction of schools, is not permitted under the State-mandated fee system established by Senate Bill 50 (1998) or Proposition 1A (1998), as codified in California Government Code Sections 65995 et seq. Please see page 5.7-37 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-694 (EIR): This level of analysis is beyond the scope of this EIR. A General Plan EIR is necessarily programmatic by nature. Please refer to master Response 2.

Response to Comment 281-695 (EIR): Impacts of the General Plan development scenarios on library services are evaluated in Subsection 5.7.4, Public Libraries.

Response to Comment 281-696: The commenter presents observations regarding distributed energy.

Response to Comment 281-697 (EIR): Impacts of the General Plan development scenarios on power supply, including the need for new facilities, are evaluated in Subsection 5.6.3, Power Supply Systems.

Response to Comment 281-698 (EIR): General Plan Policy LU-6-G for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives addresses undergrounding of utility lines. In general, considerations involved in undergrounding of utility lines are determined primarily by the service providers. Section 5.3, Visual Resources, of the EIR also addresses the aesthetic effects of undergrounding utility lines.

Response to Comment 281-699 (EIR): Goal HO-5 of all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives addresses energy conservation. See also Implementation Measure HO-HH. The 1996 General Plan Alternative contains Policies 5.6.2.1 and 5.6.2.2, which also address this issue.

Response to Comment 281-700 (EIR): Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-600.

Response to Comment 281-701 (EIR): Although no map is provided, the availability of natural gas and the potential for impacts related to new demand are discussed in Subsection 5.6.3, Power Supply Systems.

Response to Comment 281-702 (EIR): The availability of propane and the potential for impacts related to new demand are discussed in Subsection 5.6.3, Power Supply Systems.

Response to Comment 281-703 (EIR): The commenter presents observations regarding wireless communication towers.

Response to Comment 281-704 (EIR): Wireless communication systems are discussed in Subsection 5.6.4, Communication Systems.

Response to Comment 281-705 (EIR): The potential need for additional communication services, including towers, is discussed in Subsection 5.6.4, Communication Systems. Aesthetic impacts of wireless communication towers are addressed in Section 5.3, Visual Resources.

Response to Comment 281-706 (EIR): Aesthetic impacts of wireless communication towers are addressed in Section 5.3, Visual Resources.

Response to Comment 281-707 (EIR): Aesthetic impacts of wireless communication towers are addressed in Section 5.3, Visual Resources. The concerns and opinions expressed by the commenter regarding aesthetic impacts of wireless communication towers on existing uses are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan and conveyed to the Planning Department to consider for inclusion in the Zoning Ordinance.

Response to Comment 281-708 (EIR): The information on surface water resources that is provided in Subsection 5.5.1, Surface Water and Groundwater Resources, has been updated from that provided in the previous General Plan EIR.

Response to Comment 281-709 (EIR): Existing hydropower systems in the County are described in Subsection 5.5.1, Surface Water and Groundwater Resources. Failed systems are not addressed because the discussion is not relevant to the environmental analysis.

Response to Comment 281-710 (EIR): Beneficial uses are described in Section 5.5.1, Surface Water and Groundwater Resources. Beneficial uses outside the County are also addressed in Section 5.5.1.

Response to Comment 281-711 (EIR): The water supply information provided in Section 5.5 represents the most up-to-date data available from the water purveyors at the time the EIR was released. The El Dorado County Water Agency's (EDCWA's) water master plan (in process) may include more information on the hydrologic history used to obtain the data. Regarding global warming, please refer to Response to Comment 281-570.

Response to Comment 281-712 (EIR): The regulatory environment surrounding surface water supply is described in Subsection 5.5.1, Surface Water and Groundwater Supply.

Response to Comment 281-713 (EIR): To the degree relicensing activities could affect water supplies, they are addressed in Section 5.5.1.

Response to Comment 281-714 (EIR): The commenter presents observations regarding public information on water suppliers, as required by El Dorado County Ordinance 4325. The most recent report, "El Dorado County 2000 Public Water Availability Evaluation", was submitted to the Board of Supervisors in February 2002; however, the Board did not take any action to approve the report. The analysis of water supply in the General Plan EIR is based on the most up to date information developed by the County Water Agency and does not rely on prior County annual assessments.

Response to Comment 281-715 (EIR): The systems and service areas of water purveyors and the impacts of the General Plan development scenarios on these areas are described in Section 5.5.1.

Response to Comment 281-716 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-715.

Response to Comment 281-717 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-715.

Response to Comment 281-718 (EIR): Although, the requested information regarding developer funding for seismic retrofit of Weber Dam maybe of general interest, it is not necessary for a program-level analysis of countywide environmental impacts of the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-719 (EIR): Lining of ditches is considered in Section 5.5.1 of the EIR, Volume 1.

Response to Comment 281-720 (EIR): Lake Tahoe growth trends are addressed in Section 5.14 of the EIR, Volume 2.

Response to Comment 281-721 (EIR): Flow criteria from water sources for EID and the Georgetown Divide Public Utility District (GDPUD) are evaluated in Subsection 5.5.1.

Response to Comment 281-722 (EIR): The development of a multispecies countywide habitat conservation plan (HCP) is discussed in Section 5.12, Biological Resources, of the EIR (Volume 2). Also, please refer to Section 5.5.1 of the EIR, Volume 1.

Response to Comment 281-723 (EIR): The commenter presents observations regarding growth in EID service areas.

Response to Comment 281-724 (EIR): Subsection 5.5.1 includes information on EID service areas. An analysis of the subareas of EID, an independent agency, is not

necessary for a program-level analysis of countywide environmental impacts of the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-725 (EIR): The requested history of equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) values in EID service areas would not change the independent forecasts used in the EIR (Section 5.5.1, Volume 2) and are not necessary for a program-level analysis of countywide environmental impacts of the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-726 (EIR): Although, the requested information on EID's financial situation may be of general interest, it is not an environmental issue. Please refer also to Response to Comment Letter 211.

Response to Comment 281-727 (EIR): Information on water availability under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) is provided in Subsection 5.5.1 of Volume 1 of the EIR and in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 281-728 (EIR): The need for additional water sources for GDPUD to serve new development under the General Plan scenarios is addressed in Subsection 5.5.1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-729 (EIR): Information on the water supply available from Folsom Reservoir is provided in Subsection 5.5.1. The level of detail requested by the commenter is not necessary for a program-level analysis of countywide environmental impacts of the General Plan. Please refer also to Master Response 2.

Response to Comment 281-730 (EIR): Information on the use of recycled water by EID is provided in Subsection 5.5.1, Surface Water and Groundwater Resources, and in Subsection 5.5.2, Wastewater Systems.

Response to Comment 281-731 (EIR): Anticipated water demand at buildout of the General Plan scenarios is shown in Table 5.5.1 and described in Subsection 5.5.1 of Volume 1 of the EIR. It is considered by service purveyors (and their service areas) but not by subarea as requested in this comment. A subarea analysis is not needed to determine the impacts of the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-732 (EIR): Information regarding Jenkinson Lake is provided in Subsection 5.5.1 of Volume 1 of the EIR. Although a detailed discussion of EID's purchase from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) may be of general interest, it is not necessary for a program-level analysis of countywide environmental impacts of the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-733 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-732.

Response to Comment 281-734 (EIR): Information on Project 184 is provided in Subsection 5.5.1 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-735 (EIR): Information on Project 184 is provided in Subsection 5.5.1 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-736 (EIR): Decision 1635 is addressed in Subsection 5.5.1 of Volume 1 of the EIR, in the discussion of Project 184.

Response to Comment 281-737 (EIR): Water supply impacts of the General Plan scenarios are evaluated in Subsection 5.5.1. Growth enabled by water supplies is addressed throughout Chapter 5 of Volumes 1 and 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-738 (EIR): Information on GDPUD systems and impacts of the General Plan scenarios on those systems are addressed in Subsection 5.5.1. Conversion of ditches is addressed in Subsection 5.2.1 of Volume 1 of the EIR, Agricultural Resources. Impacts of conversion are discussed in Subsection 5.5.1 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-739 (EIR): The requested history of hydropower systems in the GDPUD service area is not an environmental issue related to the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-740 (EIR): Impacts of the four General Plan scenarios on water supply at 2025 and buildout are evaluated in Subsection 5.5.1. The assumptions used in this evaluation are identified in the text and in notes to Table 5.5-1.

Response to Comment 281-741 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-740. Impacts related to agricultural water demand are addressed in Subsection 5.5.1, Surface Water and Groundwater Supply, and Subsection 5.2.1, Agricultural Resources.

Response to Comment 281-742 (EIR): The comment is an introduction to the following comments.

Response to Comment 281-743 (EIR): The commenter's suggested policy is substantially similar to Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b), as modified in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 281-744 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-743.

Response to Comment 281-745 (EIR): The commenter's suggested policy is similar to Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(c). The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, providing detailed elements of a recycled water plan, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-746 (EIR): The commenter presents observations regarding groundwater in El Dorado County.

Response to Comment 281-747 (EIR): The commenter presents observations regarding groundwater in El Dorado County.

Response to Comment 281-748 (EIR): The regulatory framework for groundwater supply is provided in Subsection 5.5.1, Surface Water and Groundwater Supply.

Response to Comment 281-749 (EIR): Impacts on infiltration from increased amounts of impervious surfaces are evaluated in Subsection 5.5.1 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-750 (EIR): Detailed information on groundwater resources is not available for most areas of El Dorado County. Generalizations regarding groundwater supplies are identified in Impact 5.5-3. The water districts have been unable to provide detailed information for use in the environmental analysis, but sufficient information is available to understand the impacts of the General Plan and to develop mitigation.

Response to Comment 281-751 (EIR): The County's Well Standards Ordinance requires that a County permit be obtained before new wells are drilled, and affect on surrounding wells is one of the permit criteria. Policies 5.2.3.4 and 5.2.3.5 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policy PS-2d of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives require that new wells may not adversely affect the production of existing wells. Impact 5.5-3 addresses this issue. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, requesting General Plan policies to protect existing wells from being affected by new wells, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-752 (EIR): Section 5.5 of Volume 1 of the EIR addresses water supply. The individual policies of water districts related to infrastructure are not specifically analyzed as they are beyond the scope of the EIR. Section 5.5 addresses supply and demand and overall impacts related to groundwater availability and projected growth. Pages 5.5-61 through 5.5-71 contain a discussion of the potential for groundwater well problems that could result in requests for delivered water. Please refer to that discussion.

Response to Comment 281-753 (EIR): As stated in Impact 5.5-3, the required data on precipitation infiltration to groundwater is not available and the process is believed to be site specific. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-750.

Response to Comment 281-754 (EIR): The EIR evaluates impacts of the General Plan scenarios on groundwater resources. The requested information on the parcel size needed to ensure recharge of groundwater wells is site specific. This level of analysis is not appropriate for a General Plan EIR. In addition, generalizations in Impact 5.5-3 state that no correlation has been found between recharge and supply that can be used for long-range planning. The County Environmental Management Department recently released

Policy 800-02 (October 8, 2003), which adds flow testing requirements for new wells. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-750.

Response to Comment 281-755 (EIR): Groundwater recharge in El Dorado County is limited by the rocky nature of the bedrock and is primarily dependent on site-specific conditions. This level of detail is not appropriate for a General Plan EIR. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-750.

Response to Comment 281-756 (EIR): The requirements needed to protect wells from septic systems are discussed on pages 5.5-129 through 5.5-135 of Volume 1 of the EIR. Also refer to Response to Comment 81-182 and 281-754.

Response to Comment 281-757 (EIR): The County's Well Standards Ordinance and the required County permit protect existing wells from adverse effects of new wells. As stated in Impact 5.5-3, no residential project has been abandoned because of declining well yield.

Response to Comment 281-758 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-754.

Response to Comment 281-759 (EIR): Groundwater supply and recharge are discussed in Impact 5.5-3. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-754.

Response to Comment 281-760 (EIR): The County already relies on a Well Standards Ordinance and permit system to regulate drilling of new wells. In addition, several studies have indicated that additional study of groundwater conditions is required, and the County has a groundwater database in place to monitor supply and production. See also Response to Comment 281-754 and Section 5.5.1 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-761 (EIR): Sections 5.5 of Volume 1 (Water Resources) and 5.12 of Volume 2 (Biological Resources) of the EIR evaluate impacts on native vegetation as a result of the General Plan scenarios.

Response to Comment 281-762 (EIR): The water purveyors' use of groundwater resources is described in Subsection 5.5.1. For the most part, groundwater supply (primarily from private wells) is used outside the service areas of the public water providers. Thus, no agency is responsible for compiling the requested information for these areas.

Response to Comment 281-763 (EIR): State requirements for water systems are described in Subsection 5.5.1.

Response to Comment 281-764 (EIR): The estimated increase in groundwater demand under the General Plan scenarios in areas not served by public water purveyors is provided in Table 5.5-13.

Response to Comment 281-765 (EIR): The information on wastewater treatment that is provided in Subsection 5.5.2, Wastewater Systems, has been updated from that provided in the previous General Plan EIR. This includes updated information about the Deer Creek and El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plants (page 5.5-75), information about EMD's oversight of septic systems, information about SWRCB's soon-to-be-released regulations for OWTS, and information about EPA's recently revised guidelines.

Response to Comment 281-766 (EIR): The commenter presents general information regarding sewage treatment plants.

Response to Comment 281-767 (EIR): The commenter presents general information regarding EID's treatment plants.

Response to Comment 281-768 (EIR): Subsection 5.5.2 (pages 5.5-72 through 5.5-78) provides updated information about treatment plants in the County, including design capacities and types of treatment. Also, please refer to Responses to Comments 104-4 and 281-161.

Response to Comment 281-769 (EIR): Subsection 5.5.2 describes EID's Wastewater Master Plan Update, which contains information about the district's expansion plans. Impacts of the General Plan alternatives relating to wastewater treatment capacity are addressed on pages 5.5-79 through 5.5-88. Please refer also to Response to Comment 104-4 and 281-161.

Response to Comment 281-770 (EIR): EID's plans to address future capacity issues are addressed under "Regulatory/Planning Environment" on page 5.5-78. Impacts of the General Plan alternatives relating to wastewater treatment capacity are addressed on pages 5.5-79 through 5.5-88.

Response to Comment 281-771 (EIR): The General Plan EIR is a program-level planning document that addresses impacts of development under the General Plan alternatives on various environmental topics, such as wastewater treatment and biological resources. The potential impacts of the Deer Creek treatment plant are discussed in Chapter 5.5 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-772 (EIR): EID's recycled water system is described on page 5.5-18 (specifically, the district's Recycled Water Master Plan) and pages 5.5-22 through 5.5-25 (relating to the use of, sources of, and demand for recycled water).

Response to Comment 281-773 (EIR): The EIR evaluates at a programmatic level the impacts of the General Plan alternatives on the environment, including the impacts from

operating wastewater treatment plants (wet weather flow is part of plant design and is therefore included in the analysis). Refer to Subsection 5.5.2 of Volume 2 of the EIR. For a detailed discussion of EID expansion and replacement plans, see EID's Wastewater Master Plan Update.

Response to Comment 281-774 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-773.

Response to Comment 281-775 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-773.

Response to Comment 281-776 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-773. Financial analysis is not required by CEQA to be included in an EIR, which is intended to disclose impacts of a project on the physical environment. The EIR evaluates the impacts of the General Plan alternatives relating to wastewater treatment; this does not include an analysis of the effects of EID's water policy decisions on land use planning.

Response to Comment 281-777 (EIR): As stated on page 5.5-75 of Volume 1 of the EIR, sewage sludge from EID's two wastewater treatment plants are taken to Silva Farms, a permitted land disposal site. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-163.

Response to Comment 281-778 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-163 and 281-777.

Response to Comment 281-779 (EIR): An analysis of odors is appropriate if relevant in the environmental analysis for a project. The EIR evaluates the impacts of odors with regard to the General Plan alternatives. Policy 6.7.6.1 for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policies HS-10a and 10b of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives restrict the location of development near odor-producing sources. As described in Impact 5.11-5, implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b) requiring review of land uses for compatibility would ensure that conflicts between new development and the El Dorado Hills wastewater treatment plant would be addressed.

Response to Comment 281-780 (EIR): The commenter describes EPA's regulations for siting of septic systems.

Response to Comment 281-781 (EIR): The commenter describes EPA's regulations for siting of septic systems.

Response to Comment 281-782 (EIR): Background and regulations relating to septic systems (also referred to as onsite wastewater treatment systems [OWTS]) are described in the EIR on pages 5.5-94 and 5.5-95 (existing conditions); page 5.5-102 (Statewide regulations); and pages 5.5-105 through 5.5-107 (County regulations) of Volume 1.

Response to Comment 281-783 (EIR): Chapter 15.32 of the County Code requires a minimum of five feet of separation between groundwater and the bottom of the leach field trench (refer to page 5.5-107 of Volume 1 of the EIR).

Response to Comment 281-784 (EIR): The EIR provides information about regulatory requirements for OWTS. It also addresses the potential for water quality degradation from operation of OWTS. Please refer to Subsection 5.5.3 of Volume 1 of the EIR and to Response to Comment 291-182.

Response to Comment 281-785 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-784. Note that County regulations, as described and analyzed in Subsection 5.5.3 of Volume 1 of the EIR require consideration of soils via testing requirements when OWTS are proposed for installation.

Response to Comment 281-786 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-783 through 281-785.

Response to Comment 281-787 (EIR): Impact 5.5-8 evaluates impacts of the General Plan alternatives relating to septic systems. Detailed analysis of the appropriate locations for septic systems is conducted as a part of the approval process for these systems, using the standards and ordinances summarized in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-788 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-787.

Response to Comment 281-789 (EIR): Chapter 15.32 of the County Code states that when an older, “grandfathered” septic system fails, its replacement must conform to the requirements of Ordinance 4542. Mitigation Measure 5.5-8, applied under all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, requires that Environmental Management Department conduct annual monitoring (and remediation if needed) of all septic systems installed since Ordinance 4542 was implemented.

Response to Comment 281-790 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-789.

Response to Comment 281-791 (EIR): Mitigation Measure 5.5-8, applied under all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, requires that Environmental Management Department conduct annual monitoring of all septic systems installed since Ordinance 4542 was implemented.

Response to Comment 281-792 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-789.

Response to Comment 281-793 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-789.

Response to Comment 281-794 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-189 and 281-792. Use of garbage disposals has not been identified as a significant cause of OWTS failure in the County.

Response to Comment 281-795 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-787.

Response to Comment 281-796 (EIR): Please refer to the discussion of the Union Mine septage facility in Section 5.6 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-797: Intentionally left blank due to error in bracketing and numbering the comment letter.

Response to Comment 281-798 (EIR): Solid waste is addressed in Subsection 5.6.2, beginning on page 5.6-14 of Volume 1 of the EIR. Solid waste disposed of in Nevada is not considered “diverted.”

Response to Comment 281-799 (EIR): The regulatory framework of the County and the State of California is described beginning on page 5.6-15. This discussion includes information about Material Recovery Facilities, Source Reduction and Recycling Element programs, and landfills.

Response to Comment 281-800 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-799. Solid waste facilities are identified in Exhibit 5.6-2.

Response to Comment 281-801 (EIR): Information about existing conditions at Union Mine Landfill is provided on page 5.6-20 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-802 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-777. El Dorado County does not currently ban land disposal of sewage sludge.

Response to Comment 281-803 (EIR): Information about the Lockwood Landfill in Reno, Nevada, is provided on page 5.6-20 of Volume 1 of the EIR. The County has no jurisdiction over the Lockwood Landfill in Reno, Nevada, and El Dorado County contributes only an estimated 5.8 percent of the solid waste received by the facility.

Response to Comment 281-804 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-803.

Response to Comment 281-805 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-803.

Response to Comment 281-806 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-801 regarding the Union Mine facility or 281-803 regarding the Nevada facility.

Response to Comment 281-807 (EIR): Impact 5.6-3, beginning on page 5.6-26 of Volume 1 of the EIR, discusses the potential failure of the County to achieve State-mandated goals for diversion of garbage that could result from the General Plan alternatives. Some of the commenter’s recommended measures are already being implemented by the County, such as street-side pickup programs, composting programs, and door-to-door chipper service. Mitigation Measure 5.6-3 requires adoption of a

construction and demolition debris diversion ordinance to address one of the most likely areas where greater success in diversion is possible. The other suggestions made by the commenter will be forwarded to the County Waste Management Task Force for consideration.

Response to Comment 281-808 (EIR): The County's Source Reduction and Recycling Element programs include a program to promote composting and recycling by government agencies, as described on page 5.6-19 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-809 (EIR): The County's success to date in reducing the waste stream is described under "County Waste Collection, Recycling, and Disposal Programs" on pages 5.6-16 and 5.6-19 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-810 (EIR): The County's policies and programs for collection of household hazardous waste are described on page 5.6-19 of Volume 1 of the EIR. Impact 5.6-4 addresses the potential for implementation of General Plan alternatives to result in insufficient facilities or mechanisms to dispose of hazardous waste.

Response to Comment 281-811 (EIR): Illegal dumping of hazardous materials is described on pages 5.8-6 and 5.8-7 in Subsection 5.8.1 of Section 5.8, Human Health and Safety. Impact 5.8-2 addresses impacts of the General Plan alternatives relating to illegal dumping. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-245.

Response to Comment 281-812 (EIR): The information on air quality provided in the DEIR has been updated as appropriate.

Response to Comment 281-813 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-812.

Response to Comment 281-814 (EIR): Information about methodology, modeling data, and assumptions are included in Section 5.11, Air Quality, of Volume 2 of the EIR, with modeling methods described on page 5.11-28. Summaries of output from modeling runs are provided in Table 5.11-7 (long-term daily operational emissions), Table 5.11-9 (local mobile-source CO emissions), and Exhibits 5.11-2 through 5.11-7 (CO concentrations near specific intersections). Information about meteorology in El Dorado County is provided on pages 5.11-2 and 5.11-3 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-815 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-465 and 281-475.

Response to Comment 281-816 (EIR): Tables 5.11-2 through 5.11-6 provide various inventories of air pollutant levels in El Dorado County. This includes pollution from stationary and mobile sources, including point sources. Data on current sources is provided for the time period between 1975 and 2001. Whether mills or quarries have closed since 1994 has not been catalogued for the EIR however this information has not

been determined to be necessary for the impact analysis. The necessary information, that is, pollution levels in the County, is reported in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-817 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-816.

Response to Comment 281-818 (EIR): The commenter provides information about the constituents of mobile-source emissions.

Response to Comment 281-819 (EIR): The commenter provides information about area sources of emissions.

Response to Comment 281-820 (EIR): The commenter provides information about ozone.

Response to Comment 281-821 (EIR): Information about ozone is described on page 5.11-4 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Federal, State, and local regulations addressing air quality are summarized on pages 5.11-10 through 5.11-16. The County's attainment status is addressed on pages 5.11-17 and 5.11-18. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-465.

Response to Comment 281-822 (EIR): The County's attainment status is addressed on pages 5.11-17 and 5.11-18.

Response to Comment 281-823 (EIR): SACOG's regional air quality planning efforts are described on pages 5.11-13 and 5.11-14. Please refer to Responses to Comments 157-6 and 281-465.

Response to Comment 281-824 (EIR): Impacts 5.11-1 and 5.11-2 address the impacts of the General Plan alternatives relating to ozone precursors (ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀). Please refer to Response to Comment 281-465.

Response to Comment 281-825 (EIR): Regulatory responsibilities of the County with regard to air quality are addressed on pages 5.11-13 through 5.11-16. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-465.

Response to Comment 281-826 (EIR): Ozone formation is discussed on page 5.11-4 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document contains revisions to Mitigation Measure 5.11-1 to address heat island effects.

Respond to Comment 281-827 (EIR): The commenter provides information about particulate matter (PM₁₀).

Response to Comment 281-828 (EIR): EPA's air quality standards are described on pages 5.11-10 and 5.11-11 of Volume 2 of the EIR, as they relate to El Dorado County.

New standards for PM_{2.5} are still being developed, so compliance determinations cannot be made.

Response to Comment 281-829 (EIR): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, regarding the elimination of trash burning and encouragement of composting organic materials, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-830 (EIR): The commenter provides information about the air quality effects of wood-burning fireplaces.

Response to Comment 281-831 (EIR): Mitigation Measures 5.11-2(d) and 5.11-2(e) identify new General Plan policies to control and reduce emissions from wood-burning stoves.

Response to Comment 281-832 (EIR): The four equal-weight General Plan alternatives identify an intent to permit continued agricultural burning while minimizing the effects of those activities. Impact 5.11-2 of the EIR evaluates air quality impacts of development under the General Plan alternatives, including impacts from burning.

Response to Comment 281-833 (EIR): Updated information about naturally occurring asbestos is provided in Section 5.9, Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources, and Section 5.8, Human Health and Safety. This includes discussion of the impacts of construction on serpentine soils. Updated information about air quality effects of diesel engines is provided in Section 5.11, Air Quality, including the County AQMD's diesel rules (page 5.11-15) and construction-related effects that include diesel emissions (page 5.11-20). Please also refer to Response to Comment 281-350 through 281-355.

Response to Comment 281-834 (EIR): The commenter provides information about effects of carbon monoxide.

Response to Comment 281-835 (EIR): The commenter provides information about carbon monoxide regulations in the County.

Response to Comment 281-836 (EIR): Table 5.11-2 identifies three monitoring stations that collect data on carbon monoxide. Table 5.11-3 provides data from these stations for 1992-2001.

Response to Comment 281-837 (EIR): The impact analysis in Section 5.11 addresses projected exceedances throughout the County and identifies mitigation to reduce those impacts, where possible, to less-than-significant levels.

Response to Comment 281-838 (EIR): Regulations and laws addressing air quality attainment are discussed in "Regulatory Setting" beginning on page 5.11-9 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-839 (EIR): The commenter provides information about toxic air contaminants.

Response to Comment 281-840 (EIR): Impact 5.11-2 addresses impacts relating to long-term operational emissions, including toxic air emissions that would result from development of the General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-841 (EIR): Air quality impacts of development under the General Plan alternatives, including impacts of emissions from additional vehicles, are evaluated in Impact 5.11-2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-842 (EIR): The commenter discusses vehicular emissions.

Response to Comment 281-843 (EIR): The existing air quality conditions in El Dorado County are described in Section 5.11 and quantified in Tables 5.11-3 through 5.11-6. The trends identified in these tables include emissions from SUVs. Please also refer to Response to Comment 281-465.

Response to Comment 281-844 (EIR): Policies encouraging alternative transportation are included in the General Plan alternatives. These include 1996 General Plan Policy 3.2.1.3, requiring development projects to provide mitigation for alternative transportation, and Policy 3.9.1.7, requiring planned communities to accommodate alternative transportation into their design. Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Policy TC-3c, encouraging additional facilities in Community Regions and Rural Centers that accommodate alternative transportation. The impacts of these policies are identified in Section 3.3, Traffic and Circulation.

Response to Comment 281-845 (EIR): Impacts 5.11-1 and 5.11-2 address both construction-related and long-term operational emissions of the General Plan alternatives relating to ozone precursor emissions.

Response to Comment 281-846 (EIR): The commenter provides information about noise pollution in a rural environment.

Response to Comment 281-847 (EIR): The commenter provides information about noise limits recommended by WHO and EPA.

Response to Comment 281-848 (EIR): The General Plan identifies noise standards determined by the County to protect the health of its residents. The purpose of the EIR is to evaluate the impact of these standards on the physical and human environment. The concerns and opinions of the commenter, regarding justification for the County's noise standards, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Response to Comment 281-429.

Response to Comment 281-849 (EIR): Tables 5.10-1 through 5.10-3 provide monitoring data for ambient noise and traffic noise in the County taken from 2001.

Response to Comment 281-850 (EIR): Although residents were not polled for their opinions of noise levels, the ambient noise level measurements referred to in Response to Comment 281-849, as well as the noise compatibility guidelines provided in Table 5.10-4, include “weighting” to account for the greater annoyance attributed to noise levels during evening and nighttime hours. These weighting standards are described on pages 5.10-3 and 5.10-4.

Response to Comment 281-851 (EIR): Various types of noise mitigation are identified in Section 5.10. The concerns and opinions of the commenter regarding the comparative merits of various types of noise mitigation are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-852 (EIR): The regulatory framework for noise standards in El Dorado County is described on pages 5.10-12 and 5.10-13.

Response to Comment 281-853 (EIR): The EIR evaluates the impacts of General Plan policies that restrict building in the County on slopes greater than 25 percent. Exhibit 5.9-5 shows these areas. Avalanche hazards are described in Section 5.9 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-854 (EIR): Please see Response to Comment 162-31 and 281-331.

Response to Comment 281-855 (EIR): The regulatory environment related to dam safety, including federal, State, and county laws and programs, is described beginning on page 5.8-54 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 280-95 and 281-333.

Response to Comment 281-856 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-333 and 281-855.

Response to Comment 281-857 (EIR): The requested data regarding retrofits of dams was not collected for the EIR as it was not determined to be necessary for the environmental analysis of the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-858 (EIR): Dam-failure inundation areas are identified in Appendix A of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. Impacts of dam inundation risk are evaluated in Impact 5.8-6 of the EIR. Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b) requires that discretionary and ministerial projects, including single-family residential projects, must undergo a General Plan conformity

review that would ensure these projects conform with all General Plan policies, including those relating to dam safety.

Response to Comment 281-859 (EIR): The commenter provides information about the County's adoption of the latest version of the California Building Code (CBC).

Response to Comment 281-860 (EIR): Information about the CBC is provided on page 5.9-30 of Volume 2 of the EIR. The 2001 CBC regulations are reflected in the County's Building Code requirements.

Response to Comment 281-861 (EIR): The commenter provides information about past flooding in El Dorado County.

Response to Comment 281-862 (EIR): The commenter provides a summary of a 1985 report by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service relating to causes of flooding on upper Deer Creek.

Response to Comment 281-863 (EIR): The regulatory framework relating to flooding in the County is addressed beginning on page 5.8-54 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-864 (EIR): The most recent Flood Insurance Rate Maps provided by FEMA are dated 1996 (refer to Exhibits 5.8-1A and 5.8-1B). These maps identify floodplains throughout the area depicted, not just in developed areas.

Response to Comment 281-865 (EIR): FEMA's floodplain maps are updated periodically based on recent information, but not in response to each flooding incident. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-334.

Response to Comment 281-866 (EIR): As described in Subsection 5.8.2, increased development is known to lead to increased amounts of impervious surfaces, which may increase flooding. Impact 5.8-5 addresses the impacts of development under the General Plan alternatives on flooding risk.

Response to Comment 281-867 (EIR): Page 5.8-61 of Volume 2 of the EIR describes the County Department of Transportation's ongoing program to develop a Capital Improvement Program for drainage infrastructure, including updating FEMA mapping where appropriate. Flooding risk is depicted in Exhibits 5.8-1A and 5.8-1B, and this risk is used in the analysis in Impact 5.8-1.

Response to Comment 281-868 (EIR): Flooding mechanisms in the County are described beginning on page 5.8-51.

Response to Comment 281-869 (EIR): Trends relating to wetlands in the County, and the impact of General Plan alternatives on wetlands, are described and evaluated in Section 5.12, Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 281-870 (EIR): The term “100-year flood” and the concept of floodway and floodway fringe are discussed on pages 5.8-56 and 5.8-57 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-871 (EIR): The County’s Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance is described on page 5.8-55 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Other County responsibilities and policies are described on pages 5.8-61 and 5.8-62 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-872 (EIR): The responsibilities and actions of Department of Water Resources are identified on page 5.8-60 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-873 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-871. As with all development regulations, the County allows flexibility for the protection of public safety.

Response to Comment 281-874 (EIR): FEMA allows local jurisdictions to implement more restrictive regulations.

Response to Comment 281-875 (EIR): The commenter provides recommendations for revisions to the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance and other County regulations relating to flood control. These issues are addressed in Section 5.5, Water Resources, Section 5.8, Human Health and Safety, and Section 5.12, Biological Resources. The concerns and opinions of the commenter regarding these recommendations are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-876 (EIR): The U.S. Soil Conservation Service’s 1985 study of Deer Creek is part of the existing conditions discussion beginning on page 5.8-52 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-877 (EIR): Impact 5.8-5 identifies risk of exposure to a 100-year flood as less than significant, thus mitigation was not required.

Response to Comment 281-878 (EIR): Impact 5.5-6 in Subsection 5.5.3, Water Quality, addresses impacts of increased area of impervious surfaces under the General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-879 (EIR): The County Drainage Manual is described on page 5.5-108 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-880 (EIR): The commenter states that the EIR does not address what happens to flood waters after they pass from the boundaries of individual development proposals to “downstream”. Section 5.6.1 “Stormwater Systems” outlines

the various local, State and federal requirements and studies that outline the requirements necessary to regulate downstream stormwater impacts with the intent to prevent both localized and regional flooding and as well as stormwater pollution. Because adequate regulations are in place, the impacts have been determined to be less than significant in the EIR for each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The County Drainage Manual prohibits increases in downstream runoff. See also page 5.5-108 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-881 (EIR): County programs that focus on drainage and flood management are described on pages 5.8-61 and 5.8-62 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-882 (EIR): The State's stormwater quality BMPs, implemented as part of the NPDES program, are described beginning on page 5.5-97 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-883 (EIR): Federal, State, and local agencies maintain lists of businesses that use hazardous materials that might present a risk of upset or contamination. The applicable programs are described beginning on page 5.8-2 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Proximity to hazardous materials is a factor considered in the land use compatibility review conducted by the Planning Department (please see Mitigation measures in Section 5.1 of the EIR).

Response to Comment 281-884 (EIR): The County has a Multi-Hazard Functional Emergency Operational Plan, described on page 5.8-18 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Other policies and regulations described beginning on page 5.8-16 require emergency response plans.

Response to Comment 281-885 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-883.

Response to Comment 281-886 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-883.

Response to Comment 281-887 (EIR): The commenter provides information about the 1996 General Plan relating to asbestos.

Response to Comment 281-888 (EIR): The commenter provides information about naturally occurring asbestos.

Response to Comment 281-889 (EIR): The commenter provides information about crushed rock that includes serpentine.

Response to Comment 281-890 (EIR): Information about naturally occurring asbestos is provided in Section 5.8, Human Health and Safety" (beginning on page 5.8-88). Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10, 281-219, and 281-350 through 281-370 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-891 (EIR): Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document contains revised mitigation language related to this issue. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10, 281-219, and 281-350 through 281-370 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-892 (EIR): The presence and types of asbestos in El Dorado County are described beginning on page 5.8-88 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10, 281-219, and 281-350 through 281-370 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-893 (EIR): Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document contains revisions to page 5.11-9 of Volume 2 of the EIR to add information about the health hazards of various types of asbestos. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10, 281-219, and 281-354 through 281-357 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-894 (EIR): The County's policies, measures, and ordinances relating to construction on asbestos-containing soils are described beginning on page 5.8-91 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 281-10, 281-219, and 281-350 through 281-370 for additional discussion.

Response to Comment 281-895 (EIR): Subsection 5.5.3 of Volume 1 of the EIR addresses existing water quality conditions and the regulatory framework in the County for protecting water quality.

Response to Comment 281-896 (EIR): The regulatory framework of water quality in the County is described beginning on page 5.5-96 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-897 (EIR): The EIR evaluates impacts of implementing the General Plan alternatives as they relate to water quality. Although the history of EID water quality issues may be of general interest, it has not been determined to be relevant to the CEQA impact analysis.

Response to Comment 281-898 (EIR): Water quality ordinances and monitoring programs of the County are described beginning on page 5.5-104 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-899 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-898. In addition, the Central Valley RWQCB collects information on water quality within its jurisdiction and makes that information available to the appropriate agencies, including the County.

Response to Comment 281-900 (EIR): Response to Comment 281-176 provides information about Hazel Creek Mine, the only mine recently known to have been under a cleanup and abatement order from the RWQCB. No water bodies in the west slope of the County are on the State's list of "impaired water bodies" compiled under CWA Section 303(d). Thus, no abandoned mines are currently known to be causing water quality

problems in the County. Any such issues would be addressed by the RWQCB and the County EMD.

Response to Comment 281-901 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-900.

Response to Comment 281-902 (EIR): Salt and sand on snowy roads contribute to urban pollutants in runoff that are controlled by stormwater BMPs, as addressed in Impact 5.5-6.

Response to Comment 281-903 (EIR): The occurrence of MTBE in the County is discussed on page 5.5-95 in Subsection 5.5.3, Water Quality, and on page 5.14-20 in Section 5.14, Lake Tahoe Basin.

Response to Comment 281-904 (EIR): Known sites of hazardous materials, including LUSTs, are discussed beginning on page 5.8-7 of Volume 2 of the EIR. The responsibilities of the federal government, the State, and the County with regard to cleanup of LUSTs and other hazardous materials are described beginning on page 5.8-10.

Response to Comment 281-905 (EIR): Water quality of wells is monitored and evaluated by the RWQCB and the County EMD, as described under “Residential Wells and Quality of Groundwater Used for Drinking Water,” beginning on page 5.5-95 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-906 (EIR): The commenter provides information from the TAC Report regarding protection of water quality.

Response to Comment 281-907 (EIR): Impacts 5.5-5 and 5.5-6 evaluate impacts of the General Plan alternatives relating to protection of water quality. Impacts of General Plan development on wetlands are addressed in Section 5.12, Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 281-908 (EIR): Information about the County’s approach to controlling erosion and sedimentation, and the standards used to measure quality of runoff, are described beginning on page 5.5-104 of Volume 1 of the EIR. For the most part, the standards themselves are established by the RWQCB.

Response to Comment 281-909 (EIR): The amount of unpaved, gravel roads in the County is not quantified in the EIR. These constitute existing conditions and, as such, are included in the description of environmental setting for water quality and air quality. With regard to future projects, unpaved roads would be required to meet the same erosion/sedimentation control measures as would other facets of a project.

Response to Comment 281-910 (EIR): Impact 5.5-6 of Volume 1 of the EIR, beginning on page 5.5-115, identifies General Plan policies that address increases in impervious

surfaces as they relate to water quality and evaluates the impacts of implementing the General Plan alternatives with regard to this issue.

Response to Comment 281-911 (EIR): Use of drainage channels and wetlands to filter urban pollutants from runoff is a well-known technique and is incorporated into stormwater BMPs. This technique is available for use as appropriate in the County.

Response to Comment 281-912 (EIR): Setbacks have been identified by the County as a useful tool in protecting water quality. The General Plan alternatives contain policies requiring the establishment of setbacks to protect surface waters. Please refer to Response to Comment 198-13.

Response to Comment 281-913 (EIR): The impacts of grazing on riparian areas and wetlands are addressed generally in Section 5.2, Agriculture and Forestry, and in Section 5.12, Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 281-914 (EIR): As described in Subsection 5.5.1, Water Supply, county water purveyors have implemented BMPs identified by USBR for urban water use. These include lining or piping of irrigation ditches. The General Plan balances the water conservation benefits of culverts with the biological and agricultural benefits of natural channels.

Response to Comment 281-915 (EIR): Existing pollutant control measures for urban runoff are described under “Regulatory/Planning Environment,” beginning on page 5.5-96 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-916 (EIR): The EIR is a program-level document that evaluates countywide impacts of development under the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. Turf blocks and other means of increasing infiltration are certainly options for reducing runoff in areas with large amounts of impervious surfaces. These techniques can be evaluated and implemented on a project-specific basis.

Response to Comment 281-917 (EIR): The commenter provides information about protection of soils.

Response to Comment 281-918 (EIR): The commenter provides information about depth of soil to groundwater.

Response to Comment 281-919 (EIR): The commenter provides information about soil erodibility and slope stability.

Response to Comment 281-920 (EIR): The County’s Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance is described beginning on page 5.9-31 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-921 (EIR): Beginning on page 5.9-13, Section 5.9 of the Volume 2 of EIR provides information about types, slopes, and characteristics of soils in the County. Exhibit 5.9-5 identifies critical slopes (those greater than 25 percent) throughout the County, and Table 5.9-3 indicates the acreage and percentage of land in each Market Area with critical slopes.

Response to Comment 281-922 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-186 regarding the amount of land required for grading permits and Response to Comment 281-352 through 281-357 regarding precautionary measures for naturally occurring asbestos.

Response to Comment 281-923 (EIR): The NRCS is a federal agency and, thus, may review development proposals that include some form of federal involvement. NRCS/U.S. Soil Conservation Service soil survey data are used, however, to evaluate soils impacts on all projects that require environmental review.

Response to Comment 281-924 (EIR): Slopes greater than 25 percent are identified as critical slopes (see Exhibit 5.9-5 in Volume 2 of the EIR) and development in these areas is restricted. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-404.

Response to Comment 281-925 (EIR): The geologic setting of the County, including earthquake fault zones, is described beginning on page 5.9-1 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Asbestos is treated as a public safety issue and is described beginning on page 5.8-88. Dam failure is addressed beginning on page 5.8-53.

Response to Comment 281-926 (EIR): Mineral resources, mineral resource classifications, and mining sites and operations are described beginning on page 5.9-20. Exhibit 5.9-6 shows the locations of important mineral resources in the County, and Exhibit 5.9-7 identifies documented active, closed, idle, and reclaimed mining sites.

Response to Comment 281-927 (EIR): Documented abandoned mines are identified in Exhibit 5.9-7. The County EMD maintains information regarding the status of mining activities in the County. This information, although it may be of general interest, is not directly related to environmental impacts of implementing the General Plan alternatives, and was not determined to be necessary for an adequate EIR.

Response to Comment 281-928 (EIR): The regulatory framework of mining activities in El Dorado County is described beginning on page 5.9-33. Measure A is discussed on page 5.9-35.

Response to Comment 281-929 (EIR): Documented reclaimed mines are identified in Exhibit 5.9-7. The County EMD maintains information regarding the status of mining activities in the County. Additional information about the reclamation status of these operations has not been determined to be relevant to the CEQA impact analysis of the General Plan and thus has not been included in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-930 (EIR): Exhibit 5.9-6 and Exhibit 5.9-7 identify sites of important mineral resources and the locations of mining activities, including quarries. Impact 5.9-5 addresses the potential for development under the General Plan alternatives to reduce the accessibility of mineral resources and identifies mitigation to reduce that impact to a less-than-significant level.

Response to Comment 281-931 (EIR): Exhibits in Section 5.9 identify fault systems, snow load, and critical slopes in the County and uses them to evaluate impacts of the General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-932 (EIR): Section 5.12, Biological Resources, describes plant and wildlife species in the County, including habitat types, special-status species, and listing status.

Response to Comment 281-933 (EIR): Fragmentation of habitat that could occur under the General Plan alternatives is analyzed in Impact 5.12-1.

Response to Comment 281-934 (EIR): The presence and importance of deer migration corridors in the County is discussed on pages 5.12-22 and 5.12-23. Exhibit 5.12-7 identifies important migratory deer herd habitats.

Response to Comment 281-935 (EIR): Impact 5.12-1, Loss and Fragmentation of Wildlife Habitat, includes impacts of development on deer and their habitat. Identified mitigation measures would protect these resources.

Response to Comment 281-936 (EIR): The commenter provides information about the benefits of wetlands.

Response to Comment 281-937 (EIR): The commenter provides information about the benefits of rivers.

Response to Comment 281-938 (EIR): The commenter provides information about degradation of wetlands and rivers.

Response to Comment 281-939 (EIR): The hydrologic setting of the County is described beginning on page 5.5-1 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-940 (EIR): Fisheries and their habitat are described beginning on page 5.12-10 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-941 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-900. Water obstructions that affect fish habitat are described on page 5.12-11 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-942 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-939 and 281-941.

Response to Comment 281-943 (EIR): The regulatory and planning environment of the County are described beginning on page 5.12-25 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-944 (EIR): Exhibit 5.12-1 identifies the locations of montane riparian and wet meadow habitats. As described in the regulatory setting discussion, the County follows the USACE definition of wetlands.

Response to Comment 281-945 (EIR): Impact 5.12-4 addresses removal, degradation, and fragmentation of sensitive habitats. General Plan policies that specifically address wetlands are identified in the discussion for this impact. Specifically, Policy 7.3.3.2 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative requires compensation for wetland losses on a no-net-loss basis. Policy CO-3b for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives does the same.

Response to Comment 281-946 (EIR): County planning issues relating to protection of oaks and other hardwoods are discussed beginning on page 5.12-30 of Volume 2 of the EIR. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives identify Implementation Measure CO-F, which involves development of a natural resource management plan that would provide protections for wetlands and hardwoods.

Response to Comment 281-947 (EIR): Impact 5.12-4 of Volume 2 of the EIR discusses impacts on wetlands and other sensitive habitats. The hydrologic setting of the County is described beginning on page 5.5-1 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-948 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 198-13 regarding the reasons for allowing setbacks to be established on a site-specific basis.

Response to Comment 281-949 (EIR): Impacts of increased demand for groundwater under the General Plan alternatives are discussed in Impact 5.5-3.

Response to Comment 281-950 (EIR): Major habitat types (i.e., most common assemblages of plant species) are described beginning on page 5.12-1, and special-status plant species present in the County are described beginning on page 5.12-12 of Volume 2 of the EIR. The rare plants present in the Pine Hill formation are described beginning on page 5.12-15.

Response to Comment 281-951 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-950.

Response to Comment 281-952 (EIR): The locations of special-status plant and wildlife occurrences in the County are identified in Exhibits 5.12-4 and 5.12-6, respectively. The location of the Pine Hill Preserve is shown in Exhibit 5.12-5.

Response to Comment 281-953 (EIR): Impact 5.12-2 addresses impacts of the General Plan alternatives on special-status species, including those in the Pine Hill Ecological Preserve.

Response to Comment 281-954 (EIR): The purpose, establishment, and function of the Pine Hill Ecological Preserve are described beginning on page 5.12-15 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Please refer also to Master Response 20.

Response to Comment 281-955 (EIR): Exhibits 5.12-9, 5.12-12, and 5.12-15 depict the extent of the Pine Hill Ecological Preserve under each of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. Exhibits 5.12-8, 5.12-11, and 5.12-14 depict special-status plant occurrences and land use intensity under the General Plan alternatives. These impacts are described in Impact 5.12-2. Please also refer to Master Response 20.

Response to Comment 281-956 (EIR): As described beginning on page 5.12-25, plant species listed on the federal or State Endangered Species List are protected by law from impacts of development. Impact 5.12-2 addresses potential effects of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives on these resources.

Response to Comment 281-957 (EIR): Sensitive habitats are described beginning on page 5.12-23 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Protections are identified beginning on page 5.12-25.

Response to Comment 281-958 (EIR): The commenter provides information about the importance of oak woodlands.

Response to Comment 281-959 (EIR): Canopy cover of oaks and other hardwoods is discussed beginning on page 5.12-30. Impact 5.12-1 describes impacts of the loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat, including canopy. A discussion of the importance of oak canopy begins on page 5.12-40. General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 for the 1996 General Plan Alternative identifies oak canopy retention guidelines, and Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(f) revises and strengthens the retention requirements of the policy. General Plan Policy CO-J for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives requires establishment of an oak woodland management plan.

Response to Comment 281-960 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-959.

Response to Comment 281-961 (EIR): Policy 7.4.5.1 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative requires a tree survey, preservation, and replacement plan for oaks and landmark and heritage trees. Policy CO-70 for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives requires protection of heritage and landmark trees, and Implementation Measure CO-J establishes an oak woodland management plan. Although the County has no tree preservation ordinance, these policies serve a similar purpose.

Response to Comment 281-962 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-961, which discusses the requested inventory.

Response to Comment 281-963 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 20.

Response to Comment 281-964 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 253-29 for a discussion of noxious weeds.

Response to Comment 281-965 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 253-29 for a discussion of noxious weeds.

Response to Comment 281-966 (EIR): Many of the requested policies are included in the General Plan alternatives. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment, regarding policies to protect biological resources in the County, are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-967 (EIR): Exhibit 5.7-4 identifies developed park and recreation facilities in the County. Table 5.7-9 describes these facilities in more detail. The uses of parks and open space in the County are discussed beginning on page 5.7-63 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-968 (EIR): The EIR evaluates impacts on the physical environment of development under the General Plan alternatives. Quality of life, while it is an important factor in the living environment, is not considered an environmental issue; it is qualitatively addressed as “community character” in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing. Property values and related economic issues are likewise not required to be evaluated under CEQA.

Response to Comment 281-969 (EIR): The California Department of Conservation tracks conversion of undeveloped land in the context of agricultural conversion; Table 5.2-4 provides this information for the period 1998-2000.

Response to Comment 281-970 (EIR): Impact 5.1-2 discusses General Plan policies relating to open space and rural land uses and evaluates the impact of the General Plan alternatives on land use character. The visual character of the County is also described in the physical setting portion of Section 5.3, Visual Resources.

Response to Comment 281-971 (EIR): County community services districts and the Airports, Parks, and Grounds Division of the General Services Department are discussed and their responsibilities described beginning on page 5.7-64.

Response to Comment 281-972 (EIR): Policies to restrict ridgeline development and protect views in these areas are described in Impact 5.3-1.

Response to Comment 281-973 (EIR): The commenter's requested considerations are found throughout the EIR, in the appropriate topic areas. For example, biological resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of Volume 2 of the EIR. The commenter is referred to the Table of Contents in Volume 1.

Response to Comment 281-974 (EIR): The commenter provides information on the importance of agriculture in the County.

Response to Comment 281-975 (EIR): The commenter provides information on soil classifications.

Response to Comment 281-976 (EIR): The commenter provides information about the importance of protecting soils amenable to cultivation.

Response to Comment 281-977 (EIR): The commenter provides information about the Important Farmland Mapping Program.

Response to Comment 281-978 (EIR): Information about the County's participation in the Important Farmland Mapping Program is provided beginning on page 5.2-17 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-979 (EIR): The present state of agriculture in the County is described beginning on page 5.2-1 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-980 (EIR): The acreage in agricultural production and trends in agricultural production are described on pages 5.2-1 and 5.2-2. Conversion of agricultural land over the period 1998-2000 is identified in Table 5.2-4.

Response to Comment 281-981 (EIR): Development pressures presented by encroaching suburban land uses are described beginning on page 5.2-9 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-982 (EIR): No comparison is provided of the value of agricultural land versus residential land to County revenue. CEQA requires an evaluation of impacts on the physical environment; economic and fiscal considerations are not environmental impacts and therefore need not be evaluated.

Response to Comment 281-983 (EIR): Pages 5.2-2 through 5.2-9 of Volume 1 of the EIR describe the contribution of various agricultural activities to the economy of El Dorado County.

Response to Comment 281-984 (EIR): Land use character of the County and the rural environment are addressed in the discussions of Impact 5.1-2 and the setting portion of Section 5.3, Visual Resources.

Response to Comment 281-985 (EIR): The Williamson Act is described, and the extent of dedicated lands in the County is identified, beginning on page 5.2-14, including Exhibit 5.2-2.

Response to Comment 281-986 (EIR): The evaluation of Impact 5.2-1 primarily focuses on the effects of development under the General Plan alternatives relative to continued agricultural operations in the County.

Response to Comment 281-987 (EIR): Changes in the quantity of agricultural land in the County is tracked by the Agriculture Department and by the California Department of Conservation, as described on pages 5.2-11 and 5.2-14 through 5.2-19.

Response to Comment 281-988 (EIR): No data are provided regarding conversion of other land types to vineyards. This is primarily a conversion from one type of agricultural land to another. Table 5.2-4 identifies acreages of conversion to and from agricultural land but does not distinguish the various types of agricultural uses.

Response to Comment 281-989 (EIR): Small-farm activity in the County is primarily located on smaller agricultural parcels (5-acre Low-Density Residential and 10-acre Rural Residential parcels). These are widespread uses, but the EIR does not contain information regarding their economic contribution to the County. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-982.

Response to Comment 281-990 (EIR): The County Department of Agriculture provides public information about issues of interest or concern to agricultural operations, as does the State Department of Food and Agriculture.

Response to Comment 281-991 (EIR): Table 5.2-3 provides information about acreage in agricultural production by crop type for each Market Area. Agricultural water demand is described in Subsection 5.5.1, Water Supply. Table 5.5-5 provides information on acreage of agricultural land and water use in 2000; Tables 5.5-6 through 5.5-8 provide estimates of increases in irrigable agricultural land and agricultural water demand through 2050.

Response to Comment 281-992 (EIR): Information about existing water demand is provided beginning on page 5.5-29. Impacts of development under the General Plan alternatives on the availability of water for agriculture are addressed along with impacts on water demand in general in Impact 5.5-1.

Response to Comment 281-993 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-992.

Response to Comment 281-994 (EIR): The EIR does not evaluate the impacts of water rates set by individual purveyors.

Response to Comment 281-995 (EIR): The commenter provides information about historic logging and its effects on forests.

Response to Comment 281-996 (EIR): The regulatory and planning environment relating to forestry in the County is described beginning on page 5.2-81 of Volume 1 of the EIR. The discussion includes information about the California Forest Practice Act and County ordinances and responsibilities. Information about water quality (erosion and sedimentation, urban pollutants in runoff) is found in Subsection 5.5.3.

Response to Comment 281-997 (EIR): BMPs relating to water quality are described beginning on page 5.5-104. Implementation of these BMPs is part of the existing condition relating to forestry practices in the County and is included in the baseline against which the impacts of the General Plan alternatives are measured.

Response to Comment 281-998 (EIR): The “Existing Conditions” portion of Subsection 5.2.2 describes acreages and types of forest and timberland in the County and the impact of the timber industry on the County’s economy.

Response to Comment 281-999 (EIR): Pages 5.2-80 and 5.2-81 of Volume 1 of the EIR provide information on the forest products and logging industry, including a discussion of the types of trees used. As noted there, more information is available from the U.S. Forest Service’s Resources Planning Act Assessment.

Response to Comment 281-1000 (EIR): The General Plan, under all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, identifies policies to protect and encourage timber harvesting activities in the County while balancing these activities with environmental protection. The EIR evaluates the impacts of these and other General Plan policies on the environment. Research into the soil-depleting effects of timber harvesting, although it may be of general interest, would not alter the analysis or conclusions of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-1001 (EIR): Deforestation was not identified as an impact of implementing the General Plan alternatives. Timber harvesting is regulated by the state and is generally subject to restocking requirements under state regulations.

Response to Comment 281-1002 (EIR): The commenter requests information about the County’s programs to prevent accidental introduction of fungus into forests. The County Department of Agriculture has several programs focused on pest management. For more information, contact the Department of Agriculture.

Response to Comment 281-1003 (EIR): The amount of privately held land interspersed in the Eldorado National Forest can be seen most clearly by referring to Exhibit 5.1-1, which depicts nonjurisdictional lands in the County. In addition, page 5.2-78 provides information about the amount of land in the Eldorado National Forest that is under USFS and County jurisdiction. Table 5.1-5 in Subsection 5.1.1, Land Use, contains a discussion

of cooperation between the County and other jurisdictions, including USFS; refer to pages 5.1-26 and 5.1-27.

Response to Comment 281-1004 (EIR): Information is provided on page 5.2-80 about the number of employees at the three major lumber mills in the County.

Response to Comment 281-1005 (EIR): Information about the three major lumber mills in the County is provided on page 5.2-80

Response to Comment 281-1006 (EIR): The EIR evaluates the impacts of the General Plan alternatives on forestry and timber harvesting activities in Section 5.2.

Response to Comment 281-1007 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-1006.

Response to Comment 281-1008 (EIR): The County has implemented several special rules relating to forestry, including the Timber Preserve Zone (TPZ) program and definition of choice soils. These are discussed beginning on page 5.2-84. Canopy protection is discussed in several General Plan policies and in Section 5.12, Biological Resources (please refer to Response to Comment 281-959).

Response to Comment 281-1009 (EIR): The EIR identifies acreage of land designated Natural Resource (the primary land use designation under which timber harvesting is permitted) in Table 3-4 of Volume 1.

Response to Comment 281-1010 (EIR): Impact 5.2-4 addresses the impacts of development under the General Plan alternatives on timberland, including encroachment and potential for conversion to nontimberland uses. The County has established TPZs to protect timber harvesting areas from encroachment.

Response to Comment 281-1011 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-1010 and Impact 5.2-4 in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-1012 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-1010 and Impact 5.2-4.

Response to Comment 281-1013 (EIR): The commenter provides information about the value of trees to the environment.

Response to Comment 281-1014 (EIR): Tree cutting on private lots is addressed in Section 5.12 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-1015 (EIR): Impact 5.2-4 addresses the potential for conversion of timberland to other uses and determines that this is a less-than-significant impact under the General Plan alternatives because of the protections afforded by

existing County ordinances and programs, as well as the protections provided by General Plan policies. These policies include establishment of setbacks and buffers to avoid land use conflicts (1996 General Plan Policies 8.4.1.1 and 8.4.1.2, Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Implementation Measure AF-A) and a review process to ensure that land use conflicts would not occur (1996 General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1, Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Policy AF-4a and Implementation Measure AF-E).

Response to Comment 281-1016 (EIR): Information about the Airport, Parks and Grounds Division of the County General Services Department and about the County Parks and Recreation Commission is provided on page 5.7-64 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-1017 (EIR): Information about the various community service districts and other agencies with jurisdiction over parks in the County is provided beginning on page 5.7-64 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-1018 (EIR): The commenter provides an opinion about causes of overcrowding of recreational facilities.

Response to Comment 281-1019 (EIR): Recreation plans in the County are described beginning on page 5.7-69 of Volume 2 of the EIR. Information about responsibilities and funding sources is provided throughout the background discussion (pages 5.7-64 through 5.7-72).

Response to Comment 281-1020 (EIR): Table 5.7-9 identifies parks and recreational facilities in western El Dorado County, including location and approximate size. Information about persons-per-acre standards is provided in the discussion of community service districts. Exhibit 5.7-4 depicts the locations of developed parks and recreation facilities in the County.

Response to Comment 281-1021 (EIR): Page 5.7-72 of Volume 2 of the EIR includes descriptions of regional, community, and neighborhood parks and identifies the types of facilities available at each.

Response to Comment 281-1022 (EIR): The 1996 General Plan Alternative contains Policy 9.1.1.2, which identifies a preference for neighborhood parks to be located adjacent to schools, and Policy 9.1.1.7, which requires coordination between CSDs, recreation districts, school districts, cities, and the County to share recreational facilities. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives contain Policy PR-4d, which encourages establishment of parks near schools and encourages joint use of these facilities.

Response to Comment 281-1023 (EIR): Regional parks are defined on page 5.7-72 of Volume 2 of the EIR identified in Table 5.7-9. Establishment of a regional park at Texas

Hill Reservoir is not proposed as a part of the General Plan and therefore not within the scope of issues addressed in the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-1024 (EIR): Table 5.7-9 identifies Bass Lake Park as a planned three-acre joint use park. Design, construction, and operation of this park are currently undergoing a separate CEQA analysis to address project-level and site-level issues of concern.

Response to Comment 281-1025 (EIR): Information about persons-per-acre standards is provided in the discussion of community service districts, beginning on page 5.7-64. Information about responsibilities and funding sources is provided throughout the background discussion (pages 5.7-64 through 5.7-72). Some funding is available under the Quimby Act (refer to discussion beginning on page 5.7-72).

Response to Comment 281-1026 (EIR): The County has a Bikeway Master Plan and a Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan. The County also intends to adopt a Parks Master Plan following adoption of a General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-1027 (EIR): Interagency cooperation is identified as a goal in the General Plan policies, as described in Response to Comment 281-1022. Also refer to pages 5.7-64 through 5.7-69 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-1028 (EIR): The commenter's inquiry will be addressed specifically in the planned update of the County's Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan. The General Plan alternatives include policies encouraging trails. Please see Response to Comment 281-1029 and Master Response 17.

Response to Comment 281-1029 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 17. The Sacramento Placerville Transportation Corridor (SPTC) Master Plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on February 25, 2003. Included in this document is the statement that the SPTC-JPA was formed to purchase the corridor in 1996 in order to preserve the continuity of the corridor under the protection of the "rails-to-trails" provisions of the National Trails System Act.

Response to Comment 281-1030 (EIR): Information about responsibilities and funding sources is provided throughout the background discussion on parks (pages 5.7-64 through 5.7-72). Some funding is available under the Quimby Act (refer to discussion beginning on page 5.7-72).

Response to Comment 281-1031 (EIR): The requested information would best be located in the updated Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan. The comment is noted for the record and will be conveyed to the General Services Department for use in the ensuing update of the Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan.

Response to Comment 281-1032 (EIR): The EIR analyzes both a 2025 and buildout scenario which would include the effects of a successful economic development program.

Response to Comment 281-1033 (EIR): The commenter's concerns and opinions regarding the impossibility of sustaining growth are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 281-1034 (EIR): The information regarding environmental degradation as a result of historic mining in the County (which constituted early "economic development") is noted and may be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-1035 (EIR): The information regarding environmental degradation as a result of historic mining in the County (which constituted early "economic development") is noted and may be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-1036 (EIR): The information regarding environmental degradation as a result of historic mining in the County (which constituted early "economic development") is noted and may be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-1037 (EIR): The information regarding environmental degradation as a result of historic logging in the County (which also constituted early economic development) is noted and may be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-1038 (EIR): The information regarding environmental degradation as a result of historic logging in the County (which also constituted early economic development) is noted and may be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan.

Response to Comment 281-1039 (EIR): The commenter's opinions regarding the basis of the Economic Development Element; importance of the Economic Development Element relative to housing, population, and a jobs-housing balance; and need to evaluate the effects that economic development may ultimately lead to are noted for the record and will be considered by the decisionmakers as they deliberate the General Plan. Please see Response to Comment 281-1032.

Response to Comment 281-1040 (EIR): The commenter's opinions regarding the way in which the Economic Development Element should be developed are noted for the record. The Economic Development Elements of the draft General Plan alternatives include a focus on developing outreach and support programs so that the public and decisionmakers can better understand the importance of economic development. The No

Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives include a very detailed set of programs through which these goals may be accomplished. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives take a more general approach, largely delegating program development and implementation to an advisory body and an Economic Policy Framework, which would be developed subsequent to General Plan adoption.

Response to Comment 281-1041 (EIR): The EIR includes a brief summary of employment and the labor force (see Chapter 4 of Volume 1 of the EIR). A more detailed version of this summarized information was utilized in preparation of the land use forecasts completed by EPS. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-639 for more information on EPS's reports. Please refer also to Master Response 2.

Response to Comment 281-1042 (EIR): In their reports, EPS includes projections for future employment. These projections are based in part on historic trends, but are largely focused on projected population and housing unit growth.

Response to Comment 281-1043 (EIR): The EIR does not evaluate the contributions of the rafting and kayaking industry to the County's economy.

Regarding the potential environmental effects of recreational use of the County's rivers, please refer to Response to Comment 281-213 and pages 5.5-135 through 5.5-139 of Volume 1 of the EIR. Extensive analysis of the potential effects of recreational use on the South Fork of the American River was completed for the El Dorado County River Management Plan (2001), which is available for review through the County General Services Department, Division of Airports, Parks, and Grounds.

Regarding the potential environmental effects associated with pulsed flows outside of the natural period of adequate flows, the County does not control the release of water from the dams on those rivers used by recreational boaters. As noted in the El Dorado County River Management Plan, which details the regulation of recreational boating on the South Fork of the American River, streamflow in the most heavily used reach has not been in a natural state or unimpaired since the 1850s and 1860s. Flow impairments are numerous and complex, resulting from actions by a number of different entities. Potential environmental effects associated with changes in flow regime have been and will continue to be evaluated as part of the actions of those entities responsible for changes in flow (e.g., Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) relicensing).

Response to Comment 281-1044 (EIR): The success rate of small business in El Dorado County was not evaluated in the EIR because such information was determined to be unrelated to environmental impacts under CEQA. See Objectives 10.1.5 and 10.1.7 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

Response to Comment 281-1045 (EIR): The EIR did not evaluate the effect of Internet commerce on the success of local businesses, transportation patterns, and certain age

categories as such analyses were determined to be unnecessary to complete an environmental analysis of the proposed General Plan alternatives. Electronic commerce may result in improved environmental conditions over time.

Response to Comment 281-1046 (EIR): The County is not especially unique in the Sierra Nevada foothill “belt” in its reliance on a major east-west highway and in its topography. In the land use forecasts, EPS evaluates the extent to which access and topography may affect housing development (which is related to job creation). Please refer to the “Residential Allocation/Absorption” discussion beginning on page 44 of the March 2002 EPS report (contained in Appendix B of Volume 3 of the EIR).

Response to Comment 281-1047 (EIR): The EIR does not include the requested detailed information related to economic development in the County as such information was not determined to be necessary to complete the CEQA analysis of the General Plan. Please refer to the Economic Development Element in the draft General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-1048 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-1047.

Response to Comment 281-1049 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-1047. The draft General Plan alternatives each contain policy direction to preserve the historic nature of those areas currently supporting historic communities. All four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives propose to establish a historic design review process through which projects, including remodeling as well as new proposals, would be subject to historic design guidelines and review for compliance with those guidelines. By taking this step, the County may preserve and even enhance the historic atmosphere that pervades much of the County.

Response to Comment 281-1050 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-1047. Through its existing programs, the County Office of Economic Development can identify and encourage the development of appropriate and desired new businesses in the County.

Reuse of vacant commercial space can be encouraged through land use and zoning designations. For example, by maintaining the nonresidential (e.g., commercial) designations of vacant parcels that may be particularly well suited to nonresidential use, the County can encourage the reuse of such parcels for the type of use they are best suited. By encouraging this type of “infill” nonresidential development, the need for identifying additional (new) nonresidential land may not be as great.

Response to Comment 281-1051 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 280-152 and 281-1047.

Response to Comment 281-1052 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-1042. The amenities identified by the commenter are, for the most part, the subject of environmental topic areas in the EIR. As such, impacts of development under the General Plan alternatives on these topic areas are evaluated throughout the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-1053 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-1047 and 281-1052.

Response to Comment 281-1054 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-1047.

Response to Comment 281-1055 (EIR): The County does maintain some information regarding cultural resources. However, the official database of this information is maintained by the North Central Information Center (NCIC) at California State University, Sacramento. Please refer to Response to Comment 281-550 for additional details. Also, the issue of a list of cultural resources in the County is mentioned in Mitigation Measure 5.13-1(f), which calls for the compilation of a cultural resources listing of resources that may be of importance to the County but are not included in the NCIC files.

Response to Comment 281-1056 (EIR): Please refer to the Parks and Recreation Element and Economic Development Element of all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 281-1057 (EIR): Information about listed historic properties in El Dorado County is provided in Tables 5.13-1 and 5.13-2 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-1058 (EIR): Section 5.13 of Volume 2 of the EIR describes the present framework for historic preservation and describes the impacts of the General Plan alternatives on these resources.

Response to Comment 281-1059 (EIR): The museums and commissions mentioned operate strictly in an advisory capacity with regard to cultural resources in the County. The Planning Department and Planning Commission are required to review specific projects to determine whether they would have environmental impacts, including impacts on cultural resources.

Response to Comment 281-1060 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-1059.

Response to Comment 281-1061 (EIR): The County's involvement in preservation of cultural resources is described in Section 5.13. In general, this extends more to preservation of historic sites rather than educational programs.

Response to Comment 281-1062 (EIR): County regulations relating to cemeteries relate to all such facilities; no special treatment is afforded to old cemeteries unless they

are designated as historic sites. The General Plan does not contain specific policies addressing cemeteries; therefore, the EIR does not address this issue.

Response to Comment 281-1063 (EIR): The land use compatibility review identified in Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b) would allow for potential incompatibilities between various land uses to be considered.

Response to Comment 281-1064 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 281-1063.

Response to Comment 281-1065 (EIR): New Policy 7.5.1.1, described on page 5.13-20 of Volume 2 of the EIR, provides for suitable buffers and setbacks as the situation warrants. This measure would apply to cemeteries as well as to historic buildings, structures, or other cultural sites.

Response to Comment 281-1066 (EIR): Cemeteries are allowed in the following zone districts, either by right or by special use permit: R1, R1A, R3A, R2, RM, RE-5, RE-10, RT, all RA zones, C, CP, I, and A. With the exception that existing cemeteries are designated PF, the General Plan does not specify compatible land use designations for cemeteries. Utilizing the above list of zone districts in which they would be permitted, the following land use designations would likely to found to be appropriate: PF, C, I, MFR, HDR, MDR, LDR, RR, and NR for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives; PF, C, I, MFR, HDR, MDR, LDR, RL, and NR for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative; and PF, C, I, MFR, HDR, MDR, LDR, RL, NR and A for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Response to Comment 281-1067 (EIR): The comment regarding the Lake Tahoe Basin is noted for the record. Environmental impacts within the Tahoe Basin are addressed in Section 5.14 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-1068 (EIR): The four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are evaluated throughout the topic-area sections of the EIR. Impacts of the other eight alternatives are evaluated in Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 281-1069 (EIR): The General Plan EIR analysis is by definition cumulative in that it examines impacts associated with Buildout of the General Plan. Additionally, Section 7.1 of Chapter 7 (Other CEQA Considerations) examines regional cumulative issues.

Response to Comment 281-1070 (EIR): Growth-inducing impacts of the General Plan alternatives are evaluated for all topic areas in Section 7.2 of Chapter 7, Other CEQA Considerations.

Response to Comment 281-1071 (EIR): Significant irreversible environmental effects of the General Plan alternatives are described in Section 7.3 of Chapter 7, Other CEQA Considerations.

LETTER 282: ART MARINACCIO

Response to Comment 282-1 (GP): The commenter's detailed history regarding the numerous parcels owned by his client in the Salmon Falls Road area is noted. The commenter's preference for the land use designations proposed in the 1996 General Plan Alternative as they apply to his client's parcels (APNs not specified) is noted as well and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. None of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives propose limiting transfer of development rights to areas within Community Regions. See Policy LU-7f and Response to Comment 253-7.

LETTER 283: ART MARINACCIO

Response to Comment 283-1 (EIR): Please refer to Master Responses 3 and 8.

Response to Comment 283-2 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 6. To the extent that commenter believes particular mitigation measures and/or alternatives should be rejected, it is important to provide the County with substantial evidence to support the recommendations. The comment suggests that staff is opposed to such findings. Rather, the staff is aware that such findings may be necessary to support the final action by the Board of Supervisors.

Response to Comment 283-3 (EIR): It is assumed that the reference to “2-9” is to page 2-9 in Volume 1 of the EIR, which is a page of the summary table. The commenter refers to the proposed mitigation as “staff recommendations.” However, the measures proposed are potential solutions to identified environmental impacts; staff has not presented recommendations regarding these mitigation measures. The commenter’s support for a meeting with LAFCO is noted.

Response to Comment 283-4 (EIR): The commenter is opposed to the treatment of the issue of separation of communities as an environmental issue. This is noted for the consideration of the decisionmakers. Because this issue has implications for traffic and circulation, conversion of agricultural lands, and impacts on natural and biological resources, the staff supports analysis of it within the EIR.

Response to Comment 283-5 (EIR): CEQA requires the County to identify significant impacts associated with the proposed General Plan alternatives and to propose measures to mitigate those impacts. Impact 5.1-3 in the EIR concludes that there is a significant potential for substantial land use incompatibilities under all of the General Plan alternatives, because of the wide range of uses permitted to proceed without review for conformity with the General Plan. Mitigation Measure 5.1-3 proposes a General Plan conformity review process for all development projects in the County. The mitigation measure is proposed to comply with the requirements of CEQA in terms of reducing an identified environmental impact. Staff has not made a determination as to whether to recommend this or any other mitigation measure or particular General Plan alternative for adoption.

Response to Comment 283-6 (EIR): The commenter indicates that a minimum of 10 hearings are merited to review the mitigation measures. The staff is assuming a total of 12 hearings. Please see Response to Comment 67-13. The commenter’s concerns and opinions regarding the viability of proposed mitigation and political stance of the EIR is noted. Subsequent to the release of this Response to Comments document, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will ultimately reach decisions about the feasibility of the mitigation measures, and which alternative is preferred. Please refer also to Master Response 6.

Response to Comment 283-7 (EIR): The commenter expresses concerns about the EIR mitigation measures, and issues support for the “1996 Land Use Alternative”. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 283-8 (EIR): The commenter expresses concerns that the document and adoption process are not being adequately considered. The commenter supports the 1996 General Plan Alternative with no modifications and only those mitigation measures from the prior EIR, as adopted by the Board of Supervisors, as the best plan. These comments are noted for the record. The commenter also indicates that a process for getting changes to the General Plan after adoption should be identified. The County Code already identifies a process for General Plan amendments, and this is the process that would be followed for a subsequent amendment.

Response to Comment 283-9 (EIR): The State of California has not indicated that it intends to relinquish lead agency status for SMARA enforcement. While it is possible that the County will be redesignated as lead agency, there is no evidence to suggest that this will occur. The referenced section of the EIR describes the regulatory setting of the General Plan. Since the regulatory requirements under SMARA would be the same regardless of the lead agency designation, no change to the EIR text is necessary.

Response to Comment 283-10 (EIR): The commenter is correct that mineral resources may be developed on lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management as well as lands managed by the U.S. Forest Service. Lands managed by the Bureau of Reclamation also contain mineral resources. The text of the EIR has been revised accordingly, as provided in Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 283-11 (EIR): Measure A and the State laws referenced by the commenter have been in effect together since Measure A was adopted in 1978 and no legal challenges to their joint implementation and administration have been filed. The staff is not aware of any legal authority that would authorize mineral development in an MRZ zone where the development is not authorized by applicable local ordinances.

Response to Comment 283-12 (EIR): The commenter is correct that the General Plan alternatives and the EIR have been prepared with recognition of the State Geologist’s classification of Mineral Resource Zones in El Dorado County. Recently, the State Mineral Resource classification has been updated as Open File Report 2000-03 referenced by the commenter. The EIR has been updated to reflect this change. In addition, each of the General Plan alternative Land Use Diagrams has been updated. Please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document. The commenter’s view regarding the legal relationship between Measure A and State law concerning identification of mineral resources is noted and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 21.

Response to Comment 283-13 (EIR): The referenced table shows, based on data from the County’s Geographic Information System, the acreage of each land use designation in lands with the –MR (Mineral Resource) overlay. The table has been updated based on the new Mineral Resource Zone designations released by the State Geologist. Please refer to Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document and Master Response 21. The table is not intended to reflect any assumption regarding Measure A.

Response to Comment 283-14 (EIR): Beginning on page 5.9-65 of Volume 2, the EIR discusses the effect of proposed land use designations in each alternative on potential development of mineral resources in the -MR overlay. The EIR identifies this as a significant impact and proposes mitigation to revise the land use designations or amend Measure A to reduce the likelihood of conflicts between mineral development and sensitive surface uses.

Response to Comment 283-15 (EIR): The commenter is correct that Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(h) would require the County to remove the –MR overlay designation from lands with a base land use designation of OS. The discussion under Impact 5.12-1 addresses the loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat. As noted on pages 5.12-47 and 48 of Volume 2 of the EIR, the –MR overlay designation is not considered compatible with protection of wildlife habitat because of potential long-lasting adverse effects on wildlife populations. The potential for such adverse effects could be reduced by prohibiting future mining activity on OS lands, which Measure 5.12-1(h) suggests.

The proposed –MR overlay boundaries on each of the General Plan Land Use Diagrams are different from what is identified in Open File Report 2000-03 in a number of locales, consistent with guidance provided in Section 2715 of the Public Resources Code (PRC) (a portion of SMARA). This section states that provisions of SMARA do not limit the power of the County “to regulate the use of buildings, structures, and land as between industry, business, residents, open space (including agriculture, recreation, the enjoyment of scenic beauty, and the use of natural resources), and other purposes.” PRC Section 3676(c)(2) indicates that a lead agency must “clearly delineate identified mineral deposits and those areas targeted by the lead agency for conservation and possible future extraction.” Many nonOS parcels would still retain the –MR overlay and maintain compatibility with mineral resource extraction as defined in the General Plan alternatives, thus identifying those areas of the County targeted for mineral resource conservation and possible future extraction.

Response to Comment 283-16 (EIR): The commenter expresses strong concerns about the justification for oak retention policies. This is noted for the record. Please refer also to Master Response 18.

Response to Comment 283-17 (EIR): The commenter indicates these policies would impair the ability to meet other goals of the General Plan, including affordable housing and job creation, and would have resultant economic impacts. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the decisionmakers during their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 283-18 (EIR): It is true that the buildout scenario (by definition) is a worst-case analysis. The EIR examines both buildout and the General Plan horizon year of 2025, which is more of an intermediate forecast. The land use forecasting used during adoption of the previous General Plan was one of the issues raised in the Writ of Mandate as being flawed. The inability to substantiate the approach taken to the forecasting for the General Plan adopted in 1996 was a main reason the land use forecasting contained in Appendix B of Volume 3 of the EIR was completed. Please refer also to Master Response 3.

Response to Comment 283-19 (EIR): The commenter expresses concerns about the assumptions of the land use forecasting and references growth on the western slope as evidence that the forecasts are irrelevant. The forecasts, in fact, acknowledge the potential growth associated with the executed Development Agreements for all scenarios. This is also explained in the Project Description, on pages 3-9 and 3-21 of Volume 1 of the EIR.

Regarding the 2001 Project Description, at the time of the first EPS analysis (March 2002), it remained a primary alternative. Please refer also to Master Response 4.

Response to Comment 283-20 (EIR): Page 38 of Appendix B-1 of Volume 1 of the EIR states: "SACOG's population projection assumes that both the Writ of Mandate and Measure Y will affect the growth rate in the County, and as a result their population forecast is significantly lower than DOF." It goes on to explain that the EPS forecasts do not make these same assumptions, and that the end results differ. It also explains that current demand continues to be met by the thousands of units already approved, such as the Development Agreement units.

Response to Comment 283-21 (EIR): The commenter is advocating the use of the DOF forecasts rather than those prepared in 2002 by EPS. The EPS numbers were reviewed and considered in a public review process in 2002. A decision was made at that time to use these numbers as the basis for the General Plan process, including the CEQA review. As stated in the EPS report contained in Appendix B of Volume 3 of the EIR (page 39), the numbers take into account historical growth rates, market research, and already-approved projects. As such, they are considered to be more accurate than the DOF numbers. The EPS report also described the DOF numbers and the much lower projections developed by the Sacramento Council of Governments (SACOG). This information was included in the EIR to ensure that the public and County decisionmakers understood the range of projections that had been developed.

The commenter suggests that if actual population growth rates match the DOF projections rather than the EPS projections, the projected 2025 development levels may be reached in 2015. This comment is noted and will be considered during deliberations regarding the General Plan. As noted by the commenter, such an outcome would not affect the validity of the plan. Because of uncertainty regarding the pace of development, the EIR

evaluated impacts associated with full buildout of the plan alternatives as well as impacts expected at 2025 development levels.

Response to Comment 283-22 (EIR): The commenter expresses an opinion that General Plan alternatives allowing less overall development potential than the 1996 General Plan Alternative would be built out much earlier than 2025. This could then lead to the need to consider a General Plan update earlier than would be required should the 1996 General Plan Alternative be adopted. This opinion is based on a view that a plan cannot limit the rate of growth. The analysis in the EIR identifies a number of General Plan policies that could have the effect of limiting the rate of growth (e.g., policies requiring the availability of water supplies and infrastructure). The commenter's opinion is noted and will be considered during deliberations concerning the General Plan.

Response to Comment 283-23 (EIR): Findings cannot be developed until a majority of the Board of Supervisors has given staff direction regarding a preferred General Plan and associated components that are to be adopted. Please refer also to Master Response 6 and Response to Comment 283-2.

Response to Comment 283-24 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 282-23.

Response to Comment 283-25 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 282-23.

LETTER 284: ART MARINACCIO, REPRESENTING NUNGESSER TRUST, THE BAER FAMILY AND CORA WHITE

Response to Comment 284-1 (GP): The oral requests referred to by the commenter are documented in Table A-3 of Volume 3 of the EIR (Appendix C.1 of this Response to Comment document contains a revised version of this Table). Also, please refer to Response to Comment 51-56, which takes in the request on behalf of Cora White.

The commenter's preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative as it applies to his clients' parcels is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 284-2 (GP): The commenter's accounting of the historic treatment of this parcel-specific request and the suitability of including this parcel within the Placerville Community Region will be considered by the decisionmakers.

The commenter has requested that, at the very least, the 1996 General Plan Alternative land use designation, Low Density Residential (LDR), should be adopted for the subject parcel (APNs 051-140-06, 67, 68, 69, 79, 77, and 78). That alternative does not include the parcels in the Placerville Community Region, which the commenter is also requesting. The parcels are designated LDR (4) and Rural Lands (RL) (2) in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. All six parcels are designated RL in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. Assignment of the RL designation is not inconsistent with surrounding land uses. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Regarding joint planning with the City of Placerville, recognizes the importance of maintaining dialogue regarding how development in the County may affect the City and vice versa, is recognized. The No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives include direction to coordinate with entities such as the City of Placerville (Policy 2.2.2.5). For the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the EIR assigns a mitigation measure to address the subject of County-City interaction (Mitigation Measure 5.1-1). Please refer also responses to Letter 129.

Response to Comment 284-3 (GP): The commenter supports the retention of the LDR designation for his client's parcels (APNs 060-031-03, 36 [was -23], 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41 [was -29]), as contained in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. The parcels are designated Natural Resource (NR) and Rural Lands (RL) in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that

Alternative. The parcels are designated NR in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. Assignment of the NR designation is not inconsistent with surrounding land uses.

Response to Comment 284-4 (GP): The commenter requests the Low Density Residential (LDR) designation within an identified Community Region for APNs 090-070-12 and 090-220-05, 24, and 26. The request is included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcels are designated LDR, RL and NR. That alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcels are designated LDR and RL. For the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers, which were generally more limited in size and extent. The subject property was not included in the Shingle Springs Community Region. Furthermore, the LDR designation is not permitted in Community Regions. Note that one of the parcels referenced by the commenter, 090-190-01, is not owned by the landowner he represents in this comment. That landowner has submitted a parcel-specific request (see Letter 232).

Response to Comment 284-5 (GP): As the commenter notes, the Planning Department and Planning Commission undertook an extensive review of site specific requests during the previous General Plan process (which ended in January 1996 with adoption of a General Plan). Those requests granted by the Planning Commission and included in the final Land Use Diagram adopted in 1996 are all included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative and thus were considered as part of the Land Use Diagram. A detailed review process for those parcel-specific requests not granted during the previous examination, was not undertaken. This does not preclude the owners of parcels falling into this category from repeating their requests to the decisionmakers during the current General Plan process.

LETTER 285: SHAPLEIGH R. MATHER

Response to Comment 285-1 (GP): The commenter is expressing support for the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 286: WILLIAM AND SHAPLEIGH RANKIN MATHER, MATHER TREE FARM

Response to Comment 286-1 (GP): The commenters are expressing support for the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 287: ART MARINACCIO, REPRESENTING HOWARD MILLER, PROSPECT INVESTMENT COMPANY

Response to Comment 287-1 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 66-21.

The commenter is requesting application of the Multifamily Residential MFR) land use designation to APNs 327-110-04, -06; 327-120-19, -21, -22. The parcels are identified as Commercial on all the General Plan alternatives because they are identified as commercial as part of the Missouri Flat Master Circulation and Funding Plan (MC&FP). Any change to this designation would require a change to the MC&FP; it is not appropriate to propose changes to the MC&FP during a General Plan update. The commenter also requests that the subject properties be recognized as eligible for multifamily use in a commercial zone. All of the General Plan alternatives contain provisions for mixed residential and nonresidential uses. For mixed use on lands that are nonresidential (e.g., Commercial), the nonresidential use must be the primary use. If the subject parcels retain their Commercial land use designation and Commercial zoning, pursuit of a mixed use development would be allowed under any of the General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 287-2 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 66-21. The commenter's opinion that staff adamantly opposes facilitation of commercial use of the subject property is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

LETTER 288: DIANE MURILLO

Response to Comment 288-1 (GP): EPS identified the basic regions (Market Areas) in the County where people seek to locate homes and businesses (EPS 2002). There are many levels of sub-regions within the County, but the main purpose of the market areas used by EPS was to distribute anticipated growth in the County for analysis purposes. The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding the appropriateness of the Green Valley/Missouri Flat Road area for residential development are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

LETTER 289: DIANE MURILLO

Response to Comment 289-1 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment expressing a desire for a planned community near the Placerville Center of Cosumnes River College are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan. Please refer also to Response to Comment 288-1.

LETTER 290: GARY PETERS

Response to Comment 290-1 (GP/EIR): The commenter is expressing support for addressing the Writ of Mandate items associated with the 1996 General Plan Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 3.

LETTER 291: GEORGE E. PHILLIPS, ATTORNEY AT LAW, REPRESENTING JTS COMMUNITIES AND THE GIDARO GROUP

Response to Comment 291-1 (GP): The commenter requests that the Rural Residential (RR) land use designations as adopted in the 1996 General Plan for APNs 087-010-06, 12, and 16 and 087-030-32 and 41 be maintained. It should be noted that the land use designation applied to the subject parcels in the 1996 General Plan Alternative (which is the same as that adopted in 1996) is Rural Residential, not Low Density Residential. Based on the contents of the letter, it is assumed that the commenter's request to have the Low Density Residential (LDR) designation applied to his property was an error. .

Response to Comment 291-2 (GP): The commenter requests a land use designation for APNs 108-020-03 and 108-050-19 and 31 that would allow one dwelling unit/5 to 20 acres. None of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives include a land use designation that meets this criterion. This land use designation was included in the 2001 Project Description which is not one of the equal-weight Alternatives. The Low Density Residential (LDR) designation associated with the equal-weight Alternatives allows one dwelling unit/5 to 10 acres. Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcels are designated Natural Resource (NR) and Rural Lands (RL). The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the 1996 General Plan and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives, the RL designation assigned to these parcels is not inconsistent with the surrounding land uses.

Response to Comment 291-3 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 2. The General Plan EIR did not evaluate the potential effects of land use designation changes for individual parcels. It would be impractical to perform such an analysis for the parcel-specific request outlined by the commenter in this Response to Comments document. Section 5.1 of the EIR (Volume 1) explains how the land use designations and policies of each of the General Plan alternatives would or would not exceed the significance thresholds referenced by the commenter. Because the project evaluated on the EIR is adoption of a General Plan in its entirety, the evaluation must focus on the effects of the plan as a whole. Focusing on a specific parcel could mask impacts that are relatively small on an individual basis but that may be significant when viewed in the context of the entire plan. As noted in Responses to Comments 291-1 and 291-2, depending upon what the commenter actually seeks for the property, it appears that this request(s) may be met by adoption of the 1996 General Plan Alternative, which was evaluated in the EIR.

Response to Comment 291-4 (EIR): The analysis of plan and policy consistency provided in Table 5.1-5, beginning on page 5.1-23 of Volume 1 of the EIR, shows that the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives are consistent with the plans and policies of other jurisdictions. Mitigation Measure 5.1-1 is intended to ensure that the County coordinates with adjacent jurisdictions to avoid land use conflicts. No changes to the DEIR are necessary in response to the commenter's concerns.

Response to Comment 291-5 (EIR): The EIR does not evaluate the impacts of existing development patterns on land uses desired in the County; it evaluates the impacts of proposed development patterns and General Plan policies on environmental resources. The agricultural-residential development patterns that would continue to dominate some areas of the County are not identified as having a significant land use impact. Impact 5.1-2, beginning on page 5.1-36, finds that, except for the 1996 General Plan Alternative, General Plan policies and implementation of land uses shown on the Land Use Diagrams would not result in substantial alteration or degradation of land use character by 2025. The 1996 General Plan Alternative at 2025, and all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives at buildout, would result in a significant impact on land use character because the permitted development levels and densities would lead to widespread residential development throughout the Rural Regions, conflicting with General Plan strategies to “reflect the significant differences in characteristics between the principal land use planning areas of Community Regions, Rural Centers, and Rural Regions.”

Response to Comment 291-6 (EIR): With respect to the impacts of the 1996 General Plan in particular, the EIR explains (page 5.1-47 of Volume 1) that the development patterns authorized by that alternative would lead to relatively dense development between El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park and around the El Dorado/Diamond Springs area, leading to a gradual merging of those communities and a loss of community character. The development densities permitted under the 1996 General Plan Alternative at 2025, and under all four equal-weight General Plan alternatives at buildout, would result in development pressure on properties of 5-10 acres and larger because, in many instances, the financial benefits of subdividing would be greater than the benefits of continuing agricultural operations or owning large acreage of undeveloped property. This trend has been observed in El Dorado County and other portions of the greater Sacramento region and is the basis for concerns regarding conversion of agricultural and open space lands to residential use. No reduction in allowed land use densities is proposed to mitigate this impact. Mitigation Measure 5.1-2 proposes developing a program to maintain distinct separators between developed areas. The program would involve allowing transfers of development rights and creating incentives for voluntary consolidation of separate smaller agricultural operations into larger operations that can be sustained over the long term.

Response to Comment 291-7 (EIR): The commenter references the EIR’s discussion of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative. That alternative seeks to maintain U.S. Highway 50 at no more than six lanes and to ensure that traffic congestion levels remain at Level of Service E or better. In order to achieve those objectives, that alternative must limit the number of new parcels that may be created in the County. This is because of the substantial development that could be allowed to occur on parcels that have already been created but not developed and on parcels that have not yet been created or developed but have a vested right to do so under development agreements or other approvals. The commenter’s view that the existing commitments of the County do not justify imposing limitations on creating new parcels is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. These restrictions

are not included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative which are also analyzed in the EIR and may be adopted by the Board.

Response to Comment 291-8 (EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-4 through 281-7.

Response to Comment 291-9 (EIR): The conclusion of Impact 5.1-2 is that the development patterns under three of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives would not substantially adversely affect community character, either urban/suburban or rural, because of the restrictions on development provided by General Plan policies or by the Writ of Mandate (No Project). The analysis is not weighted either for or against the protection of urban/suburban or rural communities, but evaluates the change in character from the existing condition that would occur under the various alternatives.

Response to Comment 291-10 (EIR): Clustering of development is encouraged under all of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. For example, Policy 2.2.2.6E of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives states in part: "Place the primary emphasis on clustering intensive land uses to minimize impact on various natural and man-made resources, minimize public health concerns, minimize aesthetic concerns, and provide for the creation of open space lands and other community land uses." The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives contain Policy LU-3a, "The County shall promote clustered, compact, and pedestrian- and transit-oriented development." These policies encourage, but do not require, clustered development to protect open space and retain separation of communities. To add further protection, Mitigation Measure 5.1-2 proposes an analysis of parcel sizes and the creation of a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program to increase the protection for separate community areas.

Response to Comment 291-11 (EIR): The commenter reinforces the statement in Mitigation Measure 5.1-2 that, in some areas of the County, some parcels may be designated for agriculture but may not be large enough to support viable agricultural operations. The purpose of the mitigation measure is to identify these parcels and, where possible, to consolidate them to improve the viability of agricultural operations in these areas.

Response to Comment 291-12 (EIR): The commenter's concurrence that 10-acre parcels are adequate to buffer agricultural operations from adjacent residential uses is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 291-13 (EIR): The one-time division of existing legal parcels referred to by the commenter is a defining element of the proposed Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. The intent of this restriction is to limit the amount of traffic congestion that could otherwise occur under more intensive development.

Response to Comment 291-14 (EIR): The production amount and value of livestock identified in Tables 5.2-1 and 5.2-2 of Volume 1 of the EIR are strictly harvested values. The costs of moving cattle to summer grazing areas are not included in these calculations.

Response to Comment 291-15 (EIR): The commenter references page 5.2-9 of Volume 1 of the EIR and questions the information regarding development pressures upon the grazing industry in the County. The discussion of development pressures on page 5.2-9 provides background (setting) information about possible ways in which development in an area may affect agricultural activities. This trend is well documented throughout the Central Valley and elsewhere and does not relate specifically to grazing. While the detailed information about grazing industry costs may be of general interest, it would not be relevant to consideration of the impacts of future development associated with the General Plan.

Response to Comment 291-16 (EIR): The thresholds of significance for agricultural resources identified on page 5.2-23 of Volume 1 of the EIR are those provided in the Environmental Checklist, Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Chapter 2, Sections 15000-15387). The threshold for loss of agricultural land that would be established by the County under General Plan Policy 8.1.3.4 and Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(c) may provide an opportunity to differentiate conversion impacts based on economic viability.

Response to Comment 291-17 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 291-1 and 291-2.

LETTER 292: STEVEN PROE, EL DORADO COUNTY TAXPAYERS FOR QUALITY GROWTH

Response to Comment 292-1 (GP/EIR): The commenter's concern with the format used to present the plan alternatives and the environmental information is noted.

In order to ensure that the public and the Board of Supervisors had a full range of options available when deliberating the specific policies to be adopted as a General Plan, the Board directed staff to prepare and analyze four alternatives to be drafted and analyzed at an equal level of detail. This was consistent with the direction of the Writ of Mandate, which invalidated the EIR for the General Plan adopted in 1996 for failing to consider a sufficient range of alternatives. To facilitate public review, the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives were published as separate documents to ensure that there was no ambiguity regarding the policies that were and were not included in a particular alternative. In addition, a database showing the proposed land use designation of every parcel in the County under each alternative was posted on the County website. The website also included a summary document describing the key policy differences among the alternatives.

To facilitate public understanding of the environmental effects of the alternative plans, the County evaluated each alternative in an equal level of detail. The impact analysis in the EIR was organized by resource categories (e.g., Land Use, Agriculture, Visual Resources, etc.). Within each resource category, the EIR first presented general background information applicable to all the alternatives to ensure that the reader would be familiar with the types of issues to be addressed in the impact analysis. This discussion was followed by a listing of the thresholds of significance applicable to that resource area. The EIR then evaluated each alternative with reference to each threshold of significance. Where necessary, mitigation measures were proposed to mitigate significant impacts associated with a particular alternative. The General Plan Team determined that this approach would allow the public and decisionmakers to most easily understand the effects of the alternatives and the differences among the alternatives.

This Response to Comments document shows the changes made to the EIR in Chapter 2.0 and changes made to the various General Plan alternatives in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 292-2 (GP/EIR): It is not clear what "Individual Elements" the commenter is referencing as this term is not used in the General Plan alternatives or in the EIR and no examples are provided. Each General Plan alternative contains various elements as required by State law and reflecting policy guidance from the Board of Supervisors. As noted at page 3-14 of the EIR, the General Plan alternatives contain identical elements except that the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives each contain a Tahoe Element (the other two alternatives address Tahoe issues through a goal and set of policies in the Land Use Element). Except where changes have been noted in Chapters 2.0 or 5.0 of this Response to Comments document, the various elements of

the General Plan alternatives are referenced consistently throughout the EIR and General Plan alternatives.

Response to Comment 292-3 (GP/EIR): The EIR and the General Plan documents were available on the County website and on CD-ROM in Adobe Acrobat PDF file format. The documents were made available by chapter rather than in their entirety because prior experience is that members of the public found the large data files to be slow to load and/or cause personal computers to crash. Individuals using documents on the County website were able to “cut and paste.” Documents produced on CD-ROM did not have this feature.

Response to Comment 292-4 (GP): The Land Use Diagrams were designed to show land use designations. Land ownership is not addressed on the General Plan Land Use Diagrams. The location of the Georgetown Divide Public Utility District was inadvertently omitted from Figure PS-1. A corrected figure is presented in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document. Section 5.7 of the EIR provides information regarding the jurisdiction and landholdings of various public service providers.

Response to Comment 292-5 (GP): The map described by the commenter does not appear to be included among the figures in the General Plan documents. However, the disclaimer language cited in the comment is routinely included on documents prepared by the County Surveyors office in order to inform users of those documents that the information presented has not been prepared as a formal survey document or that the information presented represents a “snapshot in time.” The information for the map used as the base map for the General Plan Land Use Diagram is derived primarily from Assessor’s plat maps, the U.S. Geologic Survey, survey data from recorded subdivision maps, and data developed during surveys of County roads. These data sources are routinely used for general planning purposes and provide a level of detail and accuracy that is adequate for planning. The commenter’s question suggests that use of the term “map” in the documents to describe the land use and other diagrams in the General Plan could lead to expectations of a level of detail that is not feasible or necessary for a General Plan level document. Accordingly, the land use and circulation maps have been renamed as land use and circulation diagrams to reflect the level of detail that is presented. Please see Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 292-6 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 292-7.

Response to Comment 292-7 (GP/EIR): The maps, diagrams, and data used in the General Plan alternatives and in the EIR are based on the County Assessor’s Parcel Database. That database includes all parcels known to exist in the County, including parcels created pursuant to a certificate of compliance. Therefore, all parcels for which a certificate has been issued are taken into account in projecting future development levels and other parcel-based analyses in the General Plan. The General Plan website includes an index showing the proposed designation for each parcel under the various General Plan alternatives. This index does not distinguish parcels for which a certificate of compliance has been issued because that information is not relevant to the policy

questions before the Board. The website information also represents the parcel base as it existed at the time the NOP was released.

Response to Comment 292-8 (GP/EIR): The impacts of developing all known existing parcels, whether established by a subdivision, certificate of compliance, or other means, are analyzed throughout the EIR. In particular, the No Project Alternative considers the impacts that could occur if no new residential parcels were created in the County.

Response to Comment 292-9 (GP/EIR): All parcels on record with the County Assessor's Office are shown on the Land Use Diagram. While there may be parcels that were created by historic private land transactions, the County does not know and cannot readily determine where those parcels may be or whether they would qualify as a legal parcel for the purposes of development.

Response to Comment 292-10 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 281-376 and 281-377.

Response to Comment 292-11 (GP): The issues the commenter raises regarding substandard local roadways and driveways are at a level significantly more detailed than is appropriate for a General Plan. Implementation Measure TC-C in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives requires revision of the County Design and Improvements Manual to address these issues. Please refer also to the policies of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives – Objective 3.1.2 and Policy 3.1.2.1.

Response to Comment 292-12 (GP/EIR): The County's design standards include the fire safe provisions for access, as contained in the County's Fire Safe Regulations, approved by the State Fire Marshall on May 30, 1991. Revisions to these standards, as required by Policy 3.1.2.1 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, and Implementation Measure LU-H, TC-C, and HS-B, must comply with applicable State and federal requirements.

Response to Comment 292-13 (GP/EIR): The EIR analyzes the effects of various types of "by right" development in Impact 5.1-3. The impact of ranch marketing on agricultural uses is discussed in Impact 5.2-2.

Response to Comment 292-14 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Responses to Comments 292-11 and 292-13. Also, please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 292-15 (GP): This is a General Plan level document. The General Plan is not proposed to include detailed information such as the location of trails and trail easements owned by the County. More detailed information on trail alignments and proposed trail alignments would be presented in the Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan and Bikeways Master Plan, to be updated pursuant to Implementation Measure PR-E in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives and Policies 9.1.2.2, 9.1.2.6, 9.1.2.7, and 9.1.2.9.

Response to Comment 292-16 (GP): Please refer to Responses to Comments 292-10 through 15.

Response to Comment 292-17 (GP/EIR): No policies in the General Plan alternatives or impact analyses in the EIR were based on a designation of “urban” by the Census Bureau. The General Plan and EIR take into account the existing and projected population of the County as well as the existing, projected, and planned levels of population in the County over the planning horizon based on the information available at the time the Notice of Preparation was issued. (See, for example, the Land Use Forecasts in Appendix B of Volume 3 of the EIR.) Because these factors affect virtually the entire analysis, the commenter is referred to the General Plan alternatives and the EIR for a complete assessment of how the County’s existing development patterns affect the General Plan alternatives and the impacts associated with those alternatives.

Response to Comment 292-18 (GP): Words that are not defined in the glossary of either the No Project Alternative or the 1996 General Plan Alternative or in the text of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative or the Roadway Constrained Six Lane “Plus” Alternative are intended to be interpreted in accordance with the public’s everyday understanding of the word. The word suburban is defined by Webster’s Revised Unabridged Dictionary (1998) as “Of or pertaining to suburbs; inhabiting, or being in, the suburbs of a city.” Suburb, in turn, is defined as “an outlying part of a city or town; a smaller place immediately adjacent to a city.”

Response to Comment 292-19 (GP/EIR): Because of the extreme sensitivity of Lake Tahoe and the severity of the threat to its quality, the Tahoe Basin is subject to a unique set of land use controls, governed by the bi-state Tahoe Regional Planning Compact. The present version of the Compact, adopted in 1980, required the development of environmental threshold carrying capacities to serve as the basis for land use planning in the Basin. The thresholds, adopted in 1982, cover nine environmental parameters and include 36 specific threshold indicators for the Basin alone. The General Plan Team determined it was not feasible to undertake a comparable study for the entire county as part of the General Plan process.

Response to Comment 292-20 (GP/EIR): The Land Use Forecasts in Appendix B of Volume 3 of the EIR describe for each alternative the number of parcels projected to be created by 2025 (due to expected market forces), as well as the total number of parcels that could be created by lot splits and other forms of subdivision given the land use designations of each alternative. These forecasts formed the basis of the analysis in the EIR. It was not possible to include in these forecasts the number of new parcels that might be created by certificates of compliance. New parcels are created by a certificate of compliance when the County is presented with evidence that a parcel not currently recorded as a parcel was created by a qualifying private land transaction prior to 1972. Certificates of Compliance may also be issued for parcels created after 1972 pursuant to County Ordinance No. 4632, codified as Chapter 16.76 of the El Dorado County Code. In order to project the number of certificates of compliance that could be issued it would be

necessary to analyze all documents recorded with the County Recorder's Office prior to 1972 to determine which of those transactions would qualify for issuance of a certificate of compliance. This was not a feasible undertaking. Note that because the issuance of a certificate of compliance depends on the status of the prior land transactions, the number of certificates that may ultimately be issued will not be affected by the General Plan alternative that is ultimately adopted.

Response to Comment 292-21 (GP/EIR): This comment requests that earlier comments made by the organization be included as comments on the plan alternatives and the EIR. Because no comments were attached it is not possible to respond.

LETTER 293: JOHN B. WILBANKS, AICP, RRM DESIGN GROUP, REPRESENTING G-3 ENTERPRISES

Response to Comment 293-1 (GP): The information regarding the physical setting of the subject parcels (APNs 109-010-09, 10, 13, and 14 and 109-020-04, 05, 06, and 20) and their suitability for residential development is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. It should be noted that APN 109-020-17, which the commenter identifies as belonging to his client, does not appear in the Assessor's current records. The parcel was deleted in 1995 and the subsequent "paper trail" does not correspond to any of the properties owned by United States Intermodal, which is the listed landowner for the other parcels.

Response to Comment 293-2 (GP): The commenter's request to identify the subject parcels as Low Density Residential (LDR) was not included in any of the General Plan alternatives. In the 1996 General Plan and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, seven of the eight parcels are designated Rural Residential (RR)/Rural Lands (RL). The remaining parcel is designated Open Space (OS) in the 1996 General Plan Alternative and Natural Resource (NR) in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. In the 1996 General Plan Alternative, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, all eight parcels are designated RL. For this Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal.

The commenter observes that surrounding properties are identified as LDR. It should be noted that much of the area referred to by the commenter is within the Marble Valley Development area, for which a development agreement and tentative subdivision map have been previously approved. The LDR designation of those parcels included in the Marble Valley Development area represents the approved densities under the development agreement and tentative map.

Response to Comment 293-3 (GP): The commenter's primary preference for the 1996 General Plan Alternative and secondary preference for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are noted for the record, as is his opposition to the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. It is assumed, based on the contents of the letter, that the commenter would not support the Land Use Diagram associated with the No Project Alternative. While that alternative uses the same diagram as the 1996 General Plan Alternative, restrictions associated with the No Project Alternative would prevent any future subdivision.

Response to Comment 293-4 (GP): The commenter's opinion that the 1996 General Plan Alternative fairly designates the subject properties, with the exception of APN 109-

020-04, is noted for the record. APN 109-020-04, which was previously owned by the Federal Government, carries the designation of Open Space on the 1996 General Plan Alternative Land Use Diagram. In the No Project Alternative and 1996 General Plan Alternatives, the designations are the same as the current General Plan; no changes were made.

Response to Comment 293-5 (GP): In the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the land use designation of the subject APN 109-020-04 is consistent with other parcels in the vicinity. In this alternative, there is a “band” of Rural Land (RL) between the Marble Valley area and existing LDR associated with the Cameron Park area. One of the goals of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is to lower densities in the County’s Rural Regions. This was accomplished by identifying areas, such as the one in which this parcel occurs, as RL.

Policy LU-4c is intended to prevent the expansion of Community Regions and Rural Centers simply because infrastructure may be present. It is recognized that some areas have public water and sewer service but they may be outside of identified Community Regions and Rural Centers. Other factors that may influence the existence of Community Regions and Rural Centers and their boundaries include, but are not limited to, policy direction of the decisionmakers, availability of services, existing uses, parcel sizes and distribution, potential environmental impacts, and topographic features.

Response to Comment 293-6 (GP): The subject parcel (APN 109-020-04) is identified as Natural Resources largely because of policy direction provided in Policy LU-1b. That policy limits all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under this Alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 293-7 (GP): The commenter may provide additional comments at hearings before the Planning Commission and before the Board of Supervisors. Target dates for the hearings are February for the Planning Commission and late spring (distributed throughout April, May, and June) for the Board of Supervisors. Currently, it is anticipated that there will be six hearings before each decision-making body. Please refer also to Response to Comment 67-13.

LETTER 294: CYNTHIA L. SHAFFER

Response to Comment 294-1 (GP): The comment accurately reflects the land use designation of the commenter's property under the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 294-2 (GP): To a degree, the comment reflects the rationale for the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives, although no computer modeling was used in the development of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. For a more thorough discussion of the methodology used for the development of these alternatives, please refer to Section 3.3 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 294-3 (GP): The concerns and opinions expressed in the comment regarding clustering and development of low and medium-density residential are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 294-4 (EIR): Intersections are the critical nodes that connect and interconnect individual roadway segments of the system and are usually the critical means of ensuring that the roadway system operates adequately. However, when planning a roadway system for an entire county for 20+ years in the future, transportation planners often rely on roadway segment analysis. This approach is taken due to the uncertainty of forecasting future conditions (especially at the intersection turning movement level) as well as cost constraints of preparing a countywide plan based on intersection analysis. Given the size of El Dorado County and the purpose of the General Plan, the travel demand forecasting and roadway segment LOS analysis approach was designed to identify the location and extent of the roadway system. Under this approach, intersections are unlikely to become a constraint because sufficient right-of-way at intersections will be required to accommodate the maximum intersection size based on the recommended circulation diagram. For example, if two four-lane roadways intersect, then sufficient right-of-way will be available for an exclusive right-turn lane, two through lanes, and two exclusive left-turn lanes on each approach. As part of the General Plan implementation, intersection analysis will be used when designing intersection improvements and when conducting project specific traffic impact analysis.

Response to Comment 294-5 (EIR): The EIR evaluated LOS impacts using a common LOS C threshold as well as the LOS thresholds established by the specific policies of each General Plan alternative. Impact 5.4-2 identifies the roadway segments that do not meet the LOS C criterion.

Response to Comment 294-6 (GP): Public hearings before both the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will be held as a part of the final adoption process of the General Plan. Please refer also to Response to Comment 67-13.

LETTER 295: GARY AND MYRNA SPARKS, SEVEN RIVERS, INC.

Response to Comment 295-1 (GP): The commenters request the Low Density Residential (LDR) designation for APN 067-051-02, as shown on the 1996 General Plan Alternative Land Use Diagram. In the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the parcel is designated Natural Resource (NR). This Alternative contains policy direction to limit all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b). This affected the assignment of land use designations under that Alternative. In the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, the parcel is designated Rural Lands (RL). For this Alternative, in general, growth was directed into the Community Regions and Rural Centers. Any increase in density in the Rural Regions would circumvent that goal. While there is LDR in the vicinity, the RL designation is not inconsistent with the designations on surrounding lands. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

Information provided by the commenters regarding the suitability of the parcel for higher density residential development is noted for the record. Please also refer to Letter 109 and its response, which address the same parcel.

Response to Comment 295-2 (GP): While it is true that, in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, there are parcels identified as Medium Density Residential (in the Community Region to the south) and LDR in the area, the land use designation of the subject parcel (RL) is consistent with that of other similarly sized parcels in the vicinity. One of the goals of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is to lower densities in the County's Rural Regions. This was accomplished by identifying areas, such as the one in which this parcel occurs, as RL. The commenters' concerns and opinions regarding a potential reduction in the development potential of the property and the suitability of the parcel for higher density development is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations.

Response to Comment 295-3 (GP): The subject parcel is identified as Natural Resources largely because of policy direction provided in Policy LU-1b. That policy limits all residential subdivision to a maximum of four parcels (Policy LU-1b), which affected the assignment of land use designations under this Alternative. Please refer to Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 295-4 (GP): The commenters may provide additional comments at hearings before the Planning Commission and before the Board of Supervisors. Target dates for the hearings are February for the Planning Commission and late spring (distributed throughout April, May, and June) for the Board of Supervisors. Currently, it is anticipated that there will be six hearings before each decision-making body. Please refer also to Response to Comment 67-13.

LETTER 296: ELLEN DAY, TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION OF EL DORADO COUNTY

Response to Comment 296-1 (GP): The commenter is expressing support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan. Please refer to Response to Comment 217-4.

Response to Comment 296-2 (GP/EIR): The commenter is incorrect in characterizing the 1996 General Plan as “Court-approved.” In the Writ of Mandate issued July 19, 1999 the Court ordered the County to “void and set aside Resolution 10-96 by which the County adopted Findings of Fact, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and the General Plan.” The Court also ordered that the County “void and set aside Resolution 7-96 by which the County certified the final environmental impact report for the General Plan.” The Court stated that if the “County proceeds to re-approve a General Plan, the County must prepare an environmental document to remedy the CEQA deficiencies identified [in the Writ of Mandate] and in the Court’s Ruling.” (Writ of Mandate, page 9). The Court then identified some limited purposes for which the County could continue to use the General Plan adopted in 1996 pending the adoption of a new General Plan. “...though in all other respects that General Plan will cease have legal standing after the Board of Supervisors, pursuant to this Writ of Mandate, sets aside its approval thereof.” (Writ of Mandate, page 14.)

The General Plan Team recognizes that Judge Bond did not find that the text and maps of the 1996 General Plan violated the substantive requirements of State planning and zoning law; if it had been found to violate those laws it would not have been analyzed as a legally viable alternative. Please refer to Master Response 3.

Response to Comment 296-3 (GP/EIR): Responses to all comments as requested.

Response to Comment 296-4 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 296-5 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 296-6 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Master Responses 3 and 6.

Response to Comment 296-7 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 283-18.

Response to Comment 296-8 (EIR): Please refer to Master Response 6.

Response to Comment 296-9 (GP): The commenter is expressing support for Objective 5 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative (page 7 of that document) related to supply of residential and nonresidential land uses. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the decisionmakers.

Response to Comment 296-10 (GP): Public involvement is an important component of the process. Please see the discussion of “Public Process” in Master Response 8.

Response to Comment 296-11 (GP): The commenter's opposition to the No Project Alternative is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 296-12 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative based on the amount of growth it could accommodate is noted for the record. Please refer also to Response to Comment 296-18.

Response to Comment 296-13 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative based on the Vision statements is noted for the record. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative have been subjected to considerable public involvement as noted in Response to Comment 296-10. The Vision Statements for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative can be found on page 7 of each of the respective drafts.

Response to Comment 296-14 (GP): The commenter's support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative based on the Economic Development Element is noted for the record and will be considered by the decisionmakers.

Response to Comment 296-15 (GP): As presented in the draft General Plan alternative documents, the Housing Element includes a number of programs intended to facilitate the development of affordable housing. These include provisions for fee deferral and fee waivers. There are funding challenges associated with the construction of all types of housing, not just that affordable to very low or lower income households. Additional analysis of the costs associated with General Plan policy implementation would not necessarily yield any information likely to change the approach taken in the Housing Element. The policies and programs presented in the Housing Element present a number of solutions to the affordable housing problem. The State Department of Housing and Community Development has commended El Dorado County on this approach (please refer also to Response to Comment 94-3).

One of the solutions presented in the draft Housing Element is an inclusionary housing requirement. Professional opinion on the subject varies, with as many success stories published as claims in the negative, such as that presented by the commenter. Past County efforts to encourage the voluntary construction of affordable housing were unsuccessful. By developing an inclusionary requirement, the County may then be more likely to see the successful construction of more affordable housing.

Response to Comment 296-16 (GP): As noted in Response to Comment 296-15, the challenges associated with development fees are acknowledged. However, a number of these fees are beyond the control of the County. The bulk of fees collected by the County are road impact fees, which are necessary to complete roadway improvements needed as a result of development. Still, even with the road impact fees collected, the County is currently experiencing a roadway improvement funding shortfall; see pages 5.4-15 and 5.4-16 of Volume 1 of the EIR. Other County fees, such as Building Department, Planning

Department, and Environmental Management Department fees, are necessary to cover the cost of processing and monitoring development applications, and offset the costs to the County's taxpayers. The Housing Element contains an implementation measure that addresses the streamlining of development application processing (Measure HO-N). However, unless federal law, State regulations, and County ordinances change in a manner that reduces (or eliminates) the need for County review, there will remain a need to collect fees in support of development applications.

Response to Comment 296-17 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 261-61 for a discussion of the cost implications of the various proposed fees and the competing factors to be weighed by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in deliberating the appropriate mitigation measures to be included in the adopted General Plan. The comment states that the EIR provides no justification for the mitigation measures listed. The commenter is referred to the discussion of each identified measure in the EIR by topic area. A summary of the rationale for each of the fees referenced is discussed below.

Oak Tree Removal Permit Fee – This mitigation measure is proposed to mitigate impacts to oak woodland habitat as described beginning on page 5.12-61 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

General Plan Consistency Determination Fee – This mitigation measure is proposed to ensure that land uses in the County are compatible with one another and with the policies of the General Plan as described beginning on page 5.1-62 of Volume 1 the EIR.

Housing Trust Fund Fee – This is included as part of the Housing Element to provide a pool of funds to support development of housing for families of moderate and lower income. The Housing Element notes that despite numerous housing approvals in the last ten years market forces have not been adequate to ensure development of sufficient housing affordable to families with moderate or lower incomes (i.e., families of four earning less than \$70,000 per year).

Park and Ride Lot Fee – Park and Ride lots are proposed as part of each General Plan alternative (see, e.g., Policy 3.9.1.3 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives) to encourage carpooling and transit use to reduce freeway congestion to allow more development to occur before triggering unacceptable levels of service on county roadways. The EIR finds that the existing commuter bus service has capacity problems because of insufficient park-and-ride facilities. A fee is proposed to reduce that impact (page 5.4-65, Volume 2, EIR).

Biological Corridor and Environmental Fee – The Important Biological Corridor overlay designation in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative does not propose a fee but would require projects to be designed in a manner that could increase costs. The justification for such a program is discussed in the EIR at

pages 5.12-50 to 52. There is no “Environmental Fee” proposed in connection with the Important Biological Corridor.

Regional Park Fee – The Regional Park Fee is proposed to provide funding to develop regional parks to serve county residents. The EIR finds that increased development in the County could lead to a significant shortfall in park capacity. This is discussed beginning at page 5.7-74 of Volume 2 of the EIR.

Integrated Natural Resources Management Fee -- The EIR finds that the development contemplated by each of the General Plan alternatives will have numerous significant impacts to a range of biological resources. It proposes a comprehensive Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan. The rationale for this recommendation is discussed in the EIR beginning at page 5.12-56 of Volume 2.

Fuel Management General Plan Conformity Review -- There is no fuel management conformity review required. Such a review would only be triggered in association with removal of oaks or grading, neither of which would typically be needed for fuel management.

The commenter’s view that requiring development fees to mitigate these impacts is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as they deliberate the feasibility of the mitigation programs and whether those programs should be funded by tax revenues instead of development fees.

Response to Comment 296-18 (GP): The commenter’s opinion that County facility planning should be coordinated with the General Plan population projections is noted.

Response to Comment 296-19 (EIR): The commenter is correct. Please refer to Master Response 6.

Response to Comment 296-20 (GP/EIR): The staff concurs that a General Plan should be “general”. The various alternatives fit this description. The commenter’s opinion is noted; however a specific response is not possible without more information about where the commenter feels there is too much detail.

Response to Comment 296-21 (GP): The commenter identifies why they support the 1996 General Plan Alternative and why they oppose the other alternatives. The information is noted for the record.

Response to Comment 296-22 (GP): The commenter is correct that the Court rejected the petitioners’ challenges to the validity of the Circulation Element in the General Plan adopted in 1996. The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative was prepared in response to the portion of the ruling requiring additional alternatives to that plan to be analyzed. Because of the planned constraint of a six-lane U.S. Highway 50 and strict level of service requirements that are an integral component of the Roadway Constrained

Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative, that alternative also includes a Land Use Diagram that limits the extent of potential development to reduce the likelihood of unacceptable roadway congestion. The No Project, 1996 General Plan, and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives all use the general approach in the original 1996 General Plan of using concurrency policies to ensure that development levels and transportation infrastructure remain correlated.

Response to Comment 296-23 (GP): The commenter’s support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

LETTER 297: ALAN TOLHURST

Response to Comment 297-1 (EIR): Refer to Master Responses 13 and 14.

Response to Comment 297-2: The commenter requests that the issuance of building permits in the Tahoe Basin be limited based on water supply in the same way as in the rest of the County. Water supply in the Basin is discussed on page 5.14-19 and 5.14-20. To address the problem of water shortages caused by new development, Mitigation Measure 5.5-1 would require that, prior to issuance of a building permit or other approval, the applicant demonstrate that water supplies from existing supply sources are adequate and physically available to meet the highest demand that could be permitted by the approval on the lands in question. This policy would apply throughout the County, including the Tahoe Basin.

LETTER 298: BENJAMIN I. TRESSER, ESQ., REPRESENTING TRESSER FAMILY TRUST

Response to Comment 298-1 (GP): As the commenter notes, APNs 319-260-65 and 66 are identified as Industrial under all of the alternatives except the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. That Alternative does not allow the assignment of Industrial to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcels are not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the Industrial land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The information provided by the commenter regarding the suitability of the parcels for industrial use and his preference for the No Project, 1996 General Plan, or Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives as they apply to his parcels are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. Please refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 299: STEPHAN C. VOLKER

Response to Comment 299-1 (EIR): Responses to specific comments made in this letter are set forth below.

Response to Comment 299-2 (EIR): Responses to specific comments are set forth below. The referenced pages summarize both significant and less-than-significant impacts.

Response to Comment 299-3 (EIR): Regarding the analysis of impacts to Caples, Silver and Aloha Lakes, please see the Response to Comment 299-19.

The creation of Important Biological Corridors (“IBCs”) in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is one of several proposed strategies for mitigating impacts to wildlife habitat. The -IBC overlay designation includes over 70,000 acres of land encompassing core areas for wildlife forage, cover and migration, and areas of relatively intact native vegetation in more urbanized areas of the County. The -IBC overlay would provide continuous corridors of vegetation and habitat, connecting areas of more extensive natural vegetation or areas subject to greater environmental protection. The commenter states that the corridors will not be effective in ensuring seasonal wildlife migration because they run north-to-south rather than east-to-west. The purpose of the -IBC overlay is to preserve substantial connectivity and wildlife movement opportunities where they are most threatened, i.e., in areas dominated by high- and medium-intensity uses. The east-west corridors used by deer for seasonal migration are within the Natural Resources designations and are not substantially threatened by development.

The commenter also states that the EIR fails to assess the impact of allowing smaller parcels within deer migration corridors. This issue was analyzed in the EIR (see EIR pages 5.12-99 through -100 of Volume 2). Most of the critical deer herd habitat is designated for 40- to 160-acre minimum lot size; much of this land is owned by the USFS (see Exhibit 5.12-7) and is expected to remain virtually free of urban development or other human-made barriers to wildlife movement. This will allow ample opportunities for migratory deer to move between critical winter and summer habitat. A small portion of critical winter habitat is within areas designated for medium intensity (10-40 acre minimum) and high intensity (5-10 acre minimum) land uses under the various General Plan alternatives. The ability to further increase minimum lot sizes in those areas is significantly limited by existing parcelization. As shown on the diagrams in Appendix E.2 of this Response to Comments document, most of the small area of critical winter habitat that is not within a Natural Resources or Open Space designation contains existing parcels of 10 acres or less. The remainder is primarily designated for 10-acre minimum parcel sizes, particularly under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. As discussed in the EIR, 10-acre parcels are usually sufficient to allow deer migration, provided that the majority of the parcel is left in a mostly natural state. Complete alteration of existing habitat and the use of deer-proof fencing and other human-made barriers can restrict deer movement, even on larger parcels. It is not anticipated that these kinds of changes will be prevalent in this region

since much of the land located between critical winter and summer habitat for migratory deer is designated as Natural Resources and owned by the USFS. In areas where higher intensity uses could impact migratory deer habitat, proposed mitigation such as the –IBC overlay and the Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (“INRMP”) would allow for development restrictions (such as fencing limits) that are more specifically targeted at protecting migration corridors than a blanket parcel size requirement.

Response to Comment 299-4 (EIR): The commenter expresses the opinion that the proposed mitigation for oak woodlands would be less effective than the “replacement” mitigation proposed in the EIR for the General Plan adopted in 1996. The proposed measures, 5.12-1(f) and 5.12-1(k), would require either that a certain percentage of onsite canopy be retained and that lost canopy be replaced at a 1:1 ratio (Option A), or that funding be provided to preserve existing habitat at a 2:1 ratio (Option B). The EIR acknowledges that habitat will be lost under either option, and that this is a significant impact. Option B was proposed because preservation of large, contiguous blocks of habitat is considered to have greater overall value to wildlife than retention of smaller patches of habitat on individual lots. The funds generated under this option would be used by the County to preserve woodlands in the County identified as important habitat under the INRMP proposed as Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(d) and (i). Please refer to Master Response 18.

Mitigation Measures 5.12-1(d) and (i) set forth criteria for identifying, protecting and acquiring important habitat under the INRMP. The commenter notes that there is no timeline for implementation of the INRMP. This was an inadvertent omission from the DEIR. The 5-year implementation timeframe for the INRMP proposed in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives was intended to be included in the more detailed INRMP policies proposed as Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(d) and (i). The measure has been revised to correct this error (please see Chapter 2.0 of this Response to Comments document).

The EIR acknowledges that significant impacts could occur in the “lag” time prior to the full implementation of programs such as the INRMP that require development under the proposed policies, and proposes mitigation for those impacts. Under Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(c), the County would be required to apply the specific canopy retention standards set forth in “Option A” pending implementation of the INRMP. Please refer to Master Responses 5 and 18.

Response to Comment 299-5 (EIR): The commenter asserts that because the INRMP will be developed after adoption of the General Plan, the Open Space Element of the General Plan will not contain an open space inventory as required by law. The proposed General Plan alternatives each identify and map various types of open space and biological resources that are to be protected or managed in accordance with the open space policies in the Conservation and Open Space Element and other elements. For example, all of the alternatives identify certain areas (through a land use designation or overlay district) as either Open Space, Natural Resources, Agricultural lands, or Ecological Preserve. These designations, together with applicable open space policies

and implementation programs, comprise a comprehensive open space plan meeting the statutory requirements for Open Space Elements. The more detailed and specific inventory of important habitat that would be developed under the INRMP is not required to be included in the General Plan by statute, but is offered as additional protection for biological resources.

Response to Comment 299-6 (EIR): Table 5.4-7 of Volume 1 of the EIR contains a direct comparison of peak hour LOS for existing and 2025 conditions for roadway segments that are impacted by each General Plan alternative. Appendix D of Volume 3 of the EIR contains a complete comparison of existing and 2025 roadway segment LOS for all study roadway segments. The transportation analysis methodology and assumptions were included in the EIR to fully disclose this important information to reviewers.

The commenter states that the EIR concludes, without explanation, that the 1996 General Plan Alternative would have a less severe impact on traffic under buildout than the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The EIR does not make this conclusion. The table at the top of the page 5.4-52 of Volume 2 ranks the severity of impacts by alternative for 2025 and buildout conditions. For buildout conditions, the 1996 General Plan Alternative is identified as having the worst impact, which is based on the projected population levels of each alternative as discussed previously on page 5.4-41.

Response to Comment 299-7 (EIR): The commenter expresses the opinion that the EIR does not analyze an alternative with significant environmental advantages over the other alternatives. The EIR analyzed four equal-weight General Plan alternatives at an equal level of detail (No Project, 1996 General Plan, Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus”), and six other alternatives at a comparative level of detail (plus two other alternatives considered legally infeasible). The Environmentally Constrained Alternative was not determined to be the environmentally superior alternative. Alternative #12, the Compact Development Alternative, is the environmentally superior alternative. Alternative #12 would have less severe impacts than even the No Project Alternative in all impact categories except water supply and noise (which would be more severe), and human health and safety and Lake Tahoe Basin (which would be equal). Alternative #9 (Modified El Dorado Hills Development South of U.S. Highway 50) would also be environmentally superior to the No Project Alternative. See EIR, Volume 2, Chapter 6 and Table 6-1.

Although not the environmentally superior alternatives, the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives also offer significant environmental advantages over the 1996 General Plan Alternative. The commenter’s statement that all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives have “identical levels of environmental impact after mitigation in virtually all categories of impact” is incorrect. It is true that in many cases, the determination of whether an impact is significant or less than significant after mitigation is the same for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives. This is due in part to the substantial amount of development that is expected to occur as a result of existing commitments (which is the same for each alternative and results in many impacts being significant and unavoidable). However, even where

impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable for all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives, the severity of those impacts varies substantially among the alternatives. These differences are illustrated by the significance tables provided at the beginning of each impact analysis, which rank the relative severity of the impact for each alternative before and after mitigation. As shown in Table 6-1, the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is superior to all of the other equal-weight alternatives, including the No Project Alternative, in at least six impact areas (Land Use; Agriculture and Forestry; Geology and Soils; Noise; Biological Resources; and Cultural Resources). The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative also has significant environmental advantages over the 1996 General Plan Alternative. See Table 6-1.

Response to Comment 299-8 (EIR): The commenter suggests that the County has failed to comply with the portion of Judge Bond's ruling that states "in any reanalysis or supplemental analysis prepared by the County...the County must analyze the 'No Project' alternative in a manner that clearly discloses the population impacts of the General Plan in relation to current county population as well as in relation to what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the General Plan were not approved." The EIR "discloses the population impacts of the General Plan in relation to current population" by comparing the impacts of each of the alternatives to the existing setting in the County, including the existing population. The EIR analyzes "what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the General Plan were not approved" by analyzing the growth that could occur if the Writ of Mandate remains in effect until 2025. The Plan adopted in 1996 as constrained by the Writ of Mandate is the No Project Alternative because it is the regulatory scheme that would remain in effect if the County took no action to adopt a General Plan. Please see Table 3-2 in Volume 1 of the EIR.

Response to Comment 299-9 (EIR): The commenter states that findings relating to the feasibility of mitigation measures, such as those made in connection with the 1996 General Plan and found by Judge Bond to be inadequate, are required to be made in the EIR itself. This is incorrect. These findings are made by the decisionmaking body after the EIR is certified and before a decision on the project is made. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a) (3). Because feasibility findings are required only for mitigation measures that would mitigate or substantially lessen significant environmental impacts and are not adopted, it would be premature to make such findings at this juncture.

Response to Comment 299-10 (EIR): The commenter states that certain mitigation measures calling for the development of specific standards in the future, such as development of a scenic corridor ordinance, do not allow for adequate public review. The project before the County is the adoption of a General Plan, a planning document that is necessarily general in nature. The function of a General Plan is not to prescribe all of the land use and environmental standards in the County, but to set general policies and provide direction for implementing those policies through more specific land use regulations. As discussed in Master Response 2, relegation of more specific regulatory details and requirements to implementing plans, regulations, and ordinances is common practice at the General Plan level. In the case of the scenic corridor ordinance

requirement cited by the commenter (which is not a proposed mitigation measure but part of the project description for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative), the proposed policies set the parameters for scenic resource protection – e.g., the identification and protection of scenic corridors along rivers and major roadways, no structures or roads on ridgelines that would break the skyline, etc. (Policies LU-6a through 6e) – which would be implemented through the adoption of a specific ordinance (Implementation Measure LU-F). To facilitate the implementation of these policies during the interim period prior to the adoption of the ordinance, Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(a) has been revised to specify an interim review process for discretionary projects visible from important public scenic viewpoints identified in the EIR.

Response to Comment 299-11 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-3.

Response to Comment 299-12 (GP/EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 198-15.

Response to Comment 299-13 (GP): The current County standards apply to the entire west slope area of the County and do distinguish between rural and urban areas, however the primary distinction is with the utilization of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks in urban areas, versus gravel shoulders and drainage ditches in rural areas. The roadway width standards necessary to accommodate traffic volumes, emergency vehicles, bicycles, etc., are similar in either setting. Any revised standard would have to consider the need for on-street automobile parking, curb, gutter and sidewalk in high-density urban development areas such as El Dorado Hills or Cameron Park, just as it would have to consider a standard that recognizes those improvements may not be appropriate on a low-density rural development in the Georgetown, or Mt. Aukum areas. All of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives contain requirements for the County to revise its road standards (Implementation Measure TC-C in the Environmentally Constrained and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternatives; Objective 3.1.2 and Policy 3.1.2.1 in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives). The development of revised standards for road width will take into account all aspects of road design including such items as safety, capacity, aesthetics, bicycle and pedestrian needs, environmental impacts, etc. Please refer to Responses to Comments 198-9, 198-10, and 292-10.

Response to Comment 299-14 (EIR): The Court found that the County failed to adequately support its finding that reducing the maximum densities of certain land use designations in the 1996 Alternative was infeasible. This EIR analyzes various alternatives and mitigation measures that would result in reduced densities, both at a general countywide level and in specific areas where a density reduction could lessen particular environmental impacts.

Two of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives considered in the EIR are based on a reduced density of development – the No Project Alternative and the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus” Alternative. Except for existing commitments, new subdivisions would be prohibited under the No Project Alternative and capped at four new

parcels for each existing parcel under the Roadway Constrained Alternative. These restrictions would have the effect of significantly reducing residential densities for parcels that are not included in existing commitments: the projections of new housing units on these parcels at 2025 and buildout respectively are as follows:

| New Units: Remaining Capacity | No Project | Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" | Environmentally Constrained | 1996 General Plan |
|--|-------------------|--|--|------------------------------|
| 2025 | 6,869 | 11,274 | 17,725 | 17,926 |
| Buildout | 14,955 | 27,087 | 40,513 | 64,127 |

The analysis of the No Project Alternative reflects the impacts that would occur with the greatest possible reduction in residential density. The Roadway Constrained Alternative reduces densities between 33 to 37 percent compared with the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, and 37 to 42 percent compared to the 1996 General Plan Alternative, depending on the timeframe. The alternatives thus present impact scenarios for a range of countywide residential density options.

The Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives additionally contain alternative Land Use Diagrams which place a more lands in lower density designations than in the 1996 General Plan Alternative, including a new Agricultural Lands designation in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative that contains a 20-acre per dwelling unit minimum parcel size. Reconfiguring the boundaries of higher density land use designations to reduce their area was determined to be a more effective method of avoiding environmental impacts through density reduction than simply reducing the maximum allowable densities for the 1996 General Plan Land Use Diagram. Density reductions were focused in areas where those reductions would have the most environmental benefit based on identified constraints, and to direct higher density development toward existing developed areas and areas with the greatest infill opportunities. This approach resulted in a reduction in total residentially-designated area from 127,551 acres in the 1996 General Plan Alternative to 74,404 acres in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, with a greater than 50 percent reduction in the combined area of medium- and high-density residential designations. For some of the more rural market areas in the County, these differences are even more pronounced. These differences are discussed in more detail in the EIR on pages 3-23 to 3-32 of Volume 1, and are illustrated by Tables 3-4 and 3-5.

In addition, many of the proposed policies and mitigation measures would result in reductions of residential density on an area-specific or parcel-by-parcel basis, depending on the specific environmental constraints in an area or the potential impacts of a particular development project. For example, proposed restrictions on development of slopes to minimize erosion and other impacts will reduce the effective density of some parcels (see, e.g., Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(b).) Level of Service and concurrency policies will have the effect of reducing development density to a level that is compatible with the availability of

roadway infrastructure. Several mitigation measures specifically provide for targeted reductions in allowable density as part of an overall mitigation strategy. (See, e.g., Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b) (growth control mechanism to reduce traffic impacts may include changes in allowed development intensities); Mitigation Measure 5.12-3(b) (lands within –IBC Overlay subject to increased minimum parcel size)). This approach is tailored more specifically to the particular impacts at issue and was determined to be more desirable and effective at mitigating those impacts than an across-the-board density reduction not tied to any particular impact, which could have the effect of being under-protective in some areas of the County and over-protective in others.

A discussion of the issue of density reduction as mitigation, which was one of the issues raised in the Writ of Mandate, was inadvertently omitted from Appendix G of the DEIR (EIR Volume 3). New text has been added to DEIR Appendix G which is reprinted in Appendix C.2 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 299-15 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-3.

Response to Comment 299-16 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-4.

Response to Comment 299-17 (EIR): The commenter asserts that the EIR rejected without analysis a proposed 20-acre minimum lot size for parcels adjacent to grazing lands. The 20-acre minimum proposed by the commenter was considered in the EIR and was determined to be less desirable and less effective than the mitigation proposed, which requires instead a minimum setback of 200 feet (or greater if necessary based on site-specific conditions) and a prohibition on the creation of new parcels adjacent to designated agricultural lands (unless the size of the new parcel would be large enough to allow for an adequate setback from the surrounding agricultural parcels for any incompatible uses). See Mitigation Measures 5.2-1(d) and (e). These measures address the problem of incompatible adjacent uses more directly than the 20-acre minimum proposal, while retaining greater flexibility to account for site-specific conditions. See pages 5.2-60 and -61 of Volume 1 of the EIR; and page 8 of DEIR Appendix G (revised version contained in Appendix C.2 of this Response to Comments document).

Response to Comment 299-18 (EIR): The concerns raised by this commenter and others with respect to particular mitigation measures are addressed in the responses to the comments in which those concerns are raised.

Response to Comment 299-19 (EIR): The commenter states that the EIR does not include an adequate analysis of the impacts of increased water demand on Aloha, Caples and Silver Lakes. The EIR did include such analysis on pages 5.5-53 to -54 and 5.5-145 to -147 of Volume 1. This analysis summarizes the findings of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's 2003 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Hydropower License: El Dorado Project No. 184-065. Potential impacts identified include lowered lake levels and resulting effects on fisheries and macroinvertebrate habitat, recreational opportunities, and cultural resources.

Response to Comment 299-20 (EIR): Specific concerns raised by the commenter are addressed in the responses to the comments in which they are raised.

LETTER 300: JOHN M. LATINI

Response to Comment 300-1 (GP): The purpose of developing several alternatives for the General Plan was to review different development scenarios for the County over the next 20-25 years. Although an application was filed in 1998, there is no vested right to such development. The base land use in the 1996 General Plan Alternative would allow such a project; therefore, the potential impacts associated with that development is analyzed as a part of that alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 301: MICHAEL J. McDOUGALL, MJM PROPERTIES, LLC

Response to Comment 301-1 (GP): That portion of the vision statement referred to by the commenter, which encourages “efforts to locate a four-year college”, is included in the vision statement for the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives. The emphasis was not included in the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives because the staff did not believe that establishment of a four-year college was feasible, given lower buildout population projections and the presence of an existing and expanding Community College system. However, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors could choose to add the emphasis to the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives as well as they deliberate the General Plan.

The previous request regarding specific parcels that may be suitable to support a four-year college is included in Table A-3 of Volume 3 of the EIR. Note that this table has been updated in this Response to Comments document (see Appendix C.1), though the request referred to by the commenter remains unchanged. If the County is approached by the State or a private entity proposing to construct a college or university in the County, an appropriate site could be identified at that time based on mutual goals. The County currently has no such proposal.

LETTER 302: FREDA D. PECHNER, REPRESENTING LORING BRUNIUS

Response to Comment 302-1 (GP): Of the two APNs (098-021-60 and 099-040-01) which comprise the Diamond Quarry, only a portion of APN 098-021-60 was assigned the Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay on the alternative Land Use Diagrams. These diagrams were produced prior to the State's public release of its revised mineral land classification for the County in April 2003. Consistent with State law, the newly released information is incorporated into this Response to Comments document. The revised Land Use Diagrams show both parcels as having the -MR overlay. Please also refer to Master Response 21.

Response to Comment 302-2 (GP): The current process addresses General Plan land use designations; zoning will be addressed subsequent to adoption of a new General Plan. Please refer to Master Response 7. It is assumed that when the commenter refers to "zoning", she means General Plan land use designation (in the case of the subject parcels, only a portion of 098-021-60 is zoned for industrial uses; this is different from the land use designations assigned on the General Plan Land Use Diagrams).

The subject parcels are not shown as Industrial under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative because that alternative does not allow the assignment of Industrial to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcels are not within a Community Region or Rural Center, the Industrial land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please refer to Response to Comment 51-55. The commenter's request for the maintenance of the Industrial land use designation is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during General Plan deliberations. Also, please refer to Master Response 8.

LETTER 303: STEPHAN C. VOLKER

This letter appears to be a duplicate of Letter 299 from the same author. It contains a number of errata printer codes, but the content and substance appear to be virtually identical.

Response to Comment 303-1 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-1.

Response to Comment 303-2 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-2.

Response to Comment 303-3 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-3.

Response to Comment 303-4 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-4.

Response to Comment 303-5 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-5.

Response to Comment 303-6 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-6.

Response to Comment 303-7 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-7.

Response to Comment 303-8 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-8.

Response to Comment 303-9 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-9.

Response to Comment 303-10 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-10.

Response to Comment 303-11 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-11.

Response to Comment 303-12 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-12.

Response to Comment 303-13 (GP): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-13.

Response to Comment 303-14 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-14.

Response to Comment 303-15 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-15.

Response to Comment 303-16 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-16.

Response to Comment 303-17 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-17.

Response to Comment 303-18 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-18.

Response to Comment 303-19 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-19.

Response to Comment 303-20 (EIR): Please refer to Response to Comment 299-20.

LETTER 304: FREDA D. PECHNER, REPRESENTING LORING BRUNIUS

Response to Comment 304-1 (GP): Neither of the two APNs (102-150-16 and 102-150-28) which comprise the Weber Quarry were assigned the Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay on the alternative Land Use Diagrams. These maps were produced prior to the State's public release of its revised mineral land classification for the County in April 2003. Consistent with State law, the newly released information is incorporated into this Response to Comments document. The revised Land Use Diagrams show both parcels as having the -MR overlay. Please also refer to Master Response 21.

Response to Comment 304-2 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 7. Please refer also to Response to Comment 302-2 regarding the assignment of the Industrial land use designation outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. In the case of the Weber Quarry, the parcels do not currently have industrial zoning but they are assigned the Industrial land use designation in all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives except the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

LETTER 305: FREDA D. PECHNER, REPRESENTING SIERRA TERRA, INC.

Response to Comment 305-1 (GP): Both of the subject parcels (APNs 095-011-49 and 095-011-50) were assigned the Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay on the alternative Land Use Diagrams. The revised Land Use Diagrams in this Response to Comments document (which were modified to reflect revised information from the State Department of Conservation) also show the parcels as having the –MR overlay.

Please refer to Master Response 7. In the case of these parcels, they are currently zoned Mineral Resource and are identified as Natural Resource on all alternative Land Use Diagrams. The Natural Resource designation specifically allows for mineral resource extraction and is compatible with the –MR overlay. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

LETTER 306: FRED A. PECHNER, REPRESENTING SIERRA TERRA, INC.

Response to Comment 306-1 (GP): Please refer to Master Responses 7 and 21. None of the alternative Land Use Diagrams apply the Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay to APNs 093-190-01 and 093-150-12, 21, and 22. Because the State Department of Conservation has not identified the parcels as important mineral resource areas in its Mineral Land Classification of El Dorado County and other supporting evidence has not been provided otherwise, the parcels have not been assigned the -MR overlay. Please also refer to Response to Comment 219-1.

LETTER 307: ERIC T. BRUNIUS, SIERRA TERRA, INC.

Response to Comment 307-1 (GP): The subject parcel (APN102-150-25) is identified as Industrial under all of the alternatives except the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. That alternative does not allow the assignment of Industrial to lands outside of Community Regions and Rural Centers. Because the subject parcels are not within a Community Region of Rural Center, the Industrial land use designation could not have been assigned in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Please refer also to Master Response 8.

LETTER 308: TERRY GHERARDI

Response to Comment 308-1 (GP): The commenter expresses support for the 1996 General Plan Alternative and gives her reasoning for doing so. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.

Response to Comment 308-2 (EIR): The revised River Management Plan and related EIR were adopted by the Board of Supervisors in November 2001. This plan and environmental analysis specifically addressed the use of the South Fork of the American River for river recreation, taking into consideration impacts caused by vehicles accessing the river corridor and parking in the corridor. The EIR specified annual water quality testing protocols and other mitigation measures to insure that the river corridor was not degraded by this continued recreational use. Since the plan was adopted river use numbers have steadily declined.

Response to Comment 308-3 (EIR): The highest numbers of river recreation users experienced on the South Fork of the American River from Chili Bar to Salmon Falls bridge was in 1995. The counts taken by El Dorado County indicated that there were approximately 105,000 commercial rafters on the river that year with approximately 42,000 other private river users. The revised River Management Plan and related EIR were based upon this highest number of users. Theoretically the river might be able to accommodate the use number referred to by the commenter of 240,000 but without further understanding about whether this number refers to use spread equally over the 12 month period or whether this number was to be accommodated within the typical boating season of April through September it would be difficult to respond further. The County River Supervisor does not project that river use numbers would ever approach this figure. The River Management Plan has specified use numbers, which, if exceeded during a season, trigger a number of additional management strategies to be implemented the following season. These management strategies were specifically developed as part of the Plan to insure that once use thresholds were exceeded, additional measures would be implemented to address increased impacts to the river and corridor. It is important to note that the numbers of river users has declined since 1995. During this past season of 2003 the number of commercial passengers is estimated to be 59,450 and the number of private boaters to be 30,400. These lower use numbers reflect national trends in this industry. The commenter also states that the speculative number of users of 240,000 exceeds recreational use on other California rivers. A comparison of other California rivers and the number of users on those rivers is not a meaningful comparison as each river used for this type of recreation has different features such as length of run, category of rapids, land use patterns, put ins and take outs that can greatly affect carrying capacity or ability to accommodate recreational use without environmental degradation.

Response to Comment 308-4 (EIR): The commenter supports tourism in Apple Hill, and expresses concern about traffic on U.S. Highway 50 and other arterials associated with this tourism. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 308-5 (GP): The commenter's concerns regarding the economic health of the County and how it has been affected by the General Plan process are noted.

Response to Comment 308-6 (GP): The commenter's concerns about the costs of General Plan-related litigation are noted for the record.

Response to Comment 308-7 (GP): Please refer to Master Response 15.

Response to Comment 308-8 (GP): The commenter's concerns regarding the publications of various organizations and the future of the County are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during their deliberations on the General Plan.

Response to Comment 308-9 (GP): The commenter's concerns about housing and continued legal disputes are noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during their deliberations on the General Plan. The Housing Element contains a number of policies and implementation measures intended to encourage construction of affordable housing. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 2-22 and 2-25.

Response to Comment 308-10 (GP): The commenter urges the County to exercise control over land use planning. This is noted for the record and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in their deliberations regarding the General Plan.