

CEQA ADDENDUM

***EL DORADO COUNTY TGPA/ZOU
FINAL PROGRAM EIR***

PREPARED FOR:

El Dorado County Community Development Services,
Long Range Planning
2850 Fairlane Court, Building C
Placerville, CA 95667

PREPARED BY:

ICF International
630 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

(Revised November 2018)

Introduction

At its public hearing on December 15, 2015, the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors (Board) certified the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update (TGPA/ZOU) project and approved that project. The Board was subsequently sued over the adequacy of the FEIR.

On July 25, 2018, the El Dorado County Superior Court issued a writ of mandamus that directed the County to partially decertify the FEIR only as it relates to the specific responses to comment numbers O-1-54 to O-1-58, O-1-70, O-1-62, I-37-14, I-37-16, I-37-23, and I-37-24 in the FEIR Chapter 9, Responses to Comments), and the portion of the FEIR [Executive Summary Section ES.5 (Potential Areas of Controversy/Issues to be Resolved)] related to the disagreement between the California State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection and the County concerning the project and the requirements to comply with Government Code, Sections 65302(g)(1) and 65302(g)(3)(C). This addendum to the FEIR complies with the mandate of the court.

The addendum addresses the court-mandated changes in the order of their occurrence in the FEIR. A discussion of the disagreement between the County and the California State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection has been added to the FEIR's Executive Summary under Section ES.5, *Areas of Controversy/Issues to be Resolved*. The FEIR's responses to the specified comments have been revised per the direction of the court and are found in Chapter 9, *Responses to Comments*. No other changes are being made to the FEIR.

Revisions to the Executive Summary

Introduction

The following text replaces Section ES.5, *Areas of Controversy/Issues to be Resolved* in the Final Program EIR. Text that is new in this Addendum is underlined.

Revisions to the Text of the Executive Summary

ES-5. Areas of Controversy/Issues to be Resolved

CEQA requires that an EIR identify “[a]reas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15123). Several areas of controversy and issues to be resolved related to the project have been identified; these are discussed below.

The potential to increase traffic levels on county roads and U.S. Highway 50, with particular concern over the continued application of “Measure Y” and the associated County traffic mitigation programs.

There has been significant public discussion about current and projected future level of service (LOS) on U.S. Highway 50.

El Dorado County’s updated Travel Demand Model (TDM) was used to model six roadway network scenarios for the TGPA/ZOU project. This analysis indicates that U.S. Highway 50 would not reach LOS F in 2035 under any of the six roadway network scenarios analyzed. The results of the new TDM runs are reflected in Table 3.9-13 of this FEIR.

In the 2035 horizon year, assuming all California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) planned and programmed improvements are installed, the 2014 *Transportation Concept Report and Corridor System Management Plan, United States Route 50* (2014 TCR/CSMP) forecasts that the LOS on U.S. Highway 50 from the Sacramento County line to El Dorado Hills Boulevard, El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Bass Lake Road, and Bass Lake Road to Cameron Park Drive segments would be F, F, and D, respectively. The 2014 TCR/CSMP’s long-range, ultimate concept is LOS E for all three of these segments.

Caltrans used the Sacramento Area Council of Government’s (SACOG’s) Sacramento Activity-Based Travel Simulation (SACSIM) model and other data inputs to determine transportation system performance for the 2014 TCR/CSMP. In a letter to the County dated September 25, 2013, Caltrans staff stated that the portion of the U.S. Highway 50 segment from the Sacramento County line to the El Dorado Hills Boulevard interchange currently operates at LOS F during the peak hour. Caltrans Operations staff has also stated that once the ramp metering for the westbound El Dorado Hills Boulevard on-ramp is operational, LOS on this segment may temporarily improve.

That the TDM run and 2014 TCR/CSMP reached different conclusions may be attributed to a number of factors. First, Caltrans used SACOG's SACSIM model and other data inputs for the CSMP, while El Dorado County used its updated TDM to model scenarios for the TGPA/ZOU project. SACOG's Sacramento Regional Travel Demand Model (SACMET) and SACSIM land use and roadway network assumptions are somewhat general, while the County's TDM is specifically tailored to El Dorado County. The El Dorado County TDM consists of 625 Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs - 497 in El Dorado County and 128 in Sacramento and Placer Counties). This superior zonal resolution (four times more than the 126 TAZ's in the SACMET/SACSIM) enables a much more detailed analysis of county roadways. In addition, future land uses in the TDM more accurately reflect the County's adopted General Plan land use categories as well as overall land use growth control totals. This is not the case for the SACMET/SACSIM models developed and maintained by SACOG. For example, SACMET's land use identifies the El Dorado Hills Business Park as "retail," whereas EDC's TDM more accurately depicts its uses as "industrial" and "office." SACMET also shows golf courses, churches, and storage facilities in EDC as retail. Because retail uses result in higher trip generation rates than industrial, office, golf course, and church uses, these discrepancies could lead to differences in roadway impacts if not corrected.

The TDM more accurately depicts land uses than SACOG's regional land use dataset because of the availability of detailed use information that is documented and maintained by the County in its own parcel dataset. An extensive review process involving checks with aerial imagery was performed where land uses in the SACOG dataset did not match the use information in the County parcel data set. Given its more regional multi-county modeling domain, SACOG applied generalized land use categories for specialized uses (i.e., golf courses, churches and storage facilities) that are difficult to identify and confirm at a regional scale that involves millions of parcels across a six-county area.

Second, Caltrans and El Dorado County collect and use traffic counts differently to model future transportation system performance. Caltrans conducts freeway counts throughout the year, with some locations counted continuously. Locations that are not counted continuously are sampled every 3 years at different times during the count year. Final volumes are adjusted by compensating for seasonal influence, weekly variation, and other variables. Caltrans' reported counts are Annual Average Daily Traffic, which, by definition, counts for a year divided by 365 days. El Dorado County collects traffic counts annually for more than 70 roads within the county. Count information is available in three formats: Hourly Traffic Count Reports, Annual Traffic Count Summary, and Five Year Traffic Count Summary (<http://edcapps.edcgov.us/dot/trafficcounts.asp>). Annual Daily Traffic Counts are calculated by taking the average of a 1- to 5-day, non-holiday weekday count, as required by the County's General Plan.

Third, Caltrans is planning for the future of the State Highway system while El Dorado County is tasked with the planning, improvement, and maintenance of the local roadway network. It should be noted that Caltrans identifies LOS E as the concept LOS for the U.S. Highway 50 segment from the Sacramento County line to the El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road interchange; however, Caltrans projects LOS F on the segment in the future without identifying improvements to meet its concept LOS E, while El Dorado County is tasked with maintaining LOS E on U.S. Highway 50 as required by the General Plan.

Caltrans and El Dorado County also differ in determining the amount and distribution of future development. Caltrans determines the annual growth from all applicable travel demand models in the analysis area as well as from linear regression analysis of historical traffic volumes, and then applies the traffic growth to the baseline conditions to determine the 20-year volumes. El Dorado

County determines an appropriate 20-year residential growth forecast by considering the amount and distribution of growth that has historically occurred within the county, future demand and market trends, General Plan policies regarding how and where to accommodate future growth, location and availability of developable parcels, as well as other factors. The County's TDM is used to model future transportation system performance based on forecasted residential, commercial, and employment growth and planned roadway improvements identified in the County's 20-year Capital Improvement Program which are consistent with General Plan policies, inclusive of Policy TC-Xa (Measure Y).

The Project would not make any changes to Measure Y. El Dorado County continues to update and maintain the Traffic Impact Mitigation fee and capital improvement programs that are integral to implementation of Measure Y. The provisions of Measure Y were adopted by initiative in 2008 and are slated to expire December 31, 2018 by the terms of the initiative. Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would extend the term of the initiative indefinitely after that date unless subsequently amended by vote of the El Dorado County electorate.

The availability of adequate surface water and groundwater supplies to serve future development, particularly in the western county. This concern is heightened by the current drought.

The discussion in Section 3.10, *Water Supply*, presents information on the public water supply in average and dry years, and the drought plans of the public water districts in the western slope of the county. It also analyzes the impact of the Project on groundwater supplies. In the long term, the county does not have sufficient surface water supplies to meet projected demand. Within the fractured rock geology of western El Dorado County where public water is not available, groundwater supply is unreliable. As a result, development outside of the areas served by the water districts would adversely affect short- and long-term groundwater supplies.

Loss of the county's rural character as a result of higher-density residential development in Community Regions and Rural Centers, and more intensive uses in rural areas.

Approval of the TGPA would allow increased residential density in areas designated for mixed-use in comparison to the existing General Plan. In addition, proposed changes in slope restrictions under the TGPA and ZOU would enable certain development to occur on slopes that cannot be used under the existing General Plan and Zoning Ordinance provisions. The ZOU would allow a variety of agricultural marketing and other nonagricultural uses in rural areas upon approval of conditional use permits. It would also expand the range of uses allowed by right as home occupations. All of these proposed changes have the potential to alter the county's rural character where such development would take place.

Consideration of General Plan amendments for development projects that would result in large new developments if approved is a controversial issue that has been associated with the Project. Specifically, the Central El Dorado Hills, Dixon Ranch, Lime Rock Valley, San Stino, and Village of Marble Valley proposed development projects are controversial proposals. However, these are privately initiated proposals, not parts of nor dependent upon the TGPA and ZOU, and will be evaluated in separate EIRs as required by law. The Board of Supervisors will review these development proposals independently from the TGPA/ZOU. In keeping with CEQA practice to include proposed projects as part of the cumulative impact analysis, they are considered in Chapter 5, *Other CEQA Requirements*.

The assertion by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection that the targeted General Plan amendments must include revisions to the Public Health, Safety and Noise Element to address fire safety concerns along with the significance to the change in zoning in high or very high wildfire areas.

The California State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (Board of Forestry) and the County differ on whether provisions of Government Code Section 65302 require the County to review and update the Health, Safety and Noise Element of the General Plan to address fire safety concerns as part of the TGPA. Government Code Section 65302 (g)(1) lists specific requirements for general plan safety elements and Section 65302 (g)(3) requires a general plan safety element be reviewed and updated as necessary to address updated statutes regarding fire safety, upon the next revision of the housing element on or after January 1, 2014. The County General Plan Housing Element was last revised in 2013, and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) on November 13 of that year. Under Government Code Section 65588, the Housing Element is valid for an eight-year planning period and will not require revision until 2021. The Housing Element is not being amended as part of the TGPA, therefore the provisions of Government Code Section 65302(g)(3) mandating review and update of the safety element do not apply. Consistent with the County's position, the trial court in the case of Rural Communities United v. County of El Dorado concluded that Board of Forestry review of the TGPA was not required (Decision, page 227), and also determined that the County's Safety Element complied with state law as it related to evacuation routes, minimum road widths, structural clearance standards and emergency water supply requirements. (Decision, page 231.)

The TGPA is a targeted amendment to the County's General Plan. It is not intended to include all possible amendments. The County will undertake future amendments to the General Plan to ensure that it is consistent with the requirements of the Government Code. However, the amendments requested by the Board of Forestry are not part of the project.

The Board of Forestry expressed concern as to whether or not the regulatory changes and density and intensities allegedly part of TGPA/ZOU created unacceptable risks to the public. As discussed below, the TGPA did not substantially change land use densities or intensities, with the limited exception of the Mixed Use district, and the County safety requirements address public safety considerations. At present, the General Plan includes extensive policies for fire safety in its Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element. For example, the following policies under "Goal 6.2, FIRE HAZARDS. Minimize fire hazards and risks in both wildland and developed areas."

- Policy 6.2.1.1: Implement Fire Safe ordinance to attain and maintain defensible space through condition of tentative maps and in new development at the final map and/or building permit stage.
- Policy 6.2.1.2: Coordinate with the local Fire Safe Councils, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and federal and state agencies having land use jurisdiction in El Dorado County in the development of a countywide fuels management strategy.
- Policy 6.2.2.1: Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps shall be consulted in the review of all projects so that standards and mitigation measures appropriate to each hazard classification can be applied. Land use densities and intensities shall be determined by mitigation measures in areas designated as high or very high fire hazard.
- Policy 6.2.2: The County shall preclude development in areas of high and very high wildland fire hazard or in areas identified as "urban wildland interface communities within the vicinity of Federal lands that are a high risk for wildfire," as listed in the Federal Register of

August 17, 2001, unless such development can be adequately protected from wildland fire hazard, as demonstrated in a Fire Safe Plan prepared by a Registered Professional Forester (RPF) and approved by the local Fire Protection District and/or California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

- 6.2.3.1: As a requirement for approving new development, the County must find, based on information provided by the applicant and the responsible fire protection district that, concurrent with the development, adequate emergency water flow, fire access, and fire fighting personnel and equipment will be available in accordance with applicable State and local fire district standards.
- 6.2.3.2: As a requirement of new development, the applicant must demonstrate that adequate access exists, or can be provided to ensure that emergency vehicles can access the site and private vehicles can evacuate the area.
- 6.2.3.4: All new development and public works projects shall be consistent with applicable State Wildland Fire Standards and other relevant State and federal fire requirements.
- 6.2.4.1: Discretionary development within high and very high fire hazard areas shall be conditioned to designate fuel break zones that comply with fire safe requirements to benefit the new and, where possible, existing development.
- 6.2.4.2: The County shall cooperate with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and local fire protection districts to identify opportunities for fuel breaks in zones of high and very high fire hazard either prior to or as a component of project review.
- 6.2.5.1: The County shall cooperate with the U.S. Forest Service, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and local fire districts in fire prevention education programs.
- General Plan Implementation Measure HS-B states that the County will “[w]ork with the local FireSafe 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.”

In addition, General Plan Policy 6.1.1 provides that the County’s Multi-jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) “shall serve as the implementation program for the coordination of hazard planning and disaster response efforts with the County and is incorporated by reference in this [Public Health, Safety, and Noise] Element.” The LHMP sets goals and implementation strategies to coordinate multi-agency evacuation route planning, as well as tracking the status of evacuation route planning and maintenance efforts within individual jurisdictions in the County. The LHMP also addresses minimum road widths, structural clearance standards, and emergency water supply requirements when it cites the State’s Fire Safe Regulations, established pursuant to Public Resources Code sections 4290 and 4291, as the County’s method of implementing fire safety regulations in the County since 1993. Pursuant to Public Resources Code sections 4290 and 4291, CalFire adopted the Fire Safe Regulations which set standards for: (1) road design and signage to allow for fire equipment access and road identification; (2) minimum water supply for emergency fire use; (3) fuel breaks and greenbelts; and (4) minimum defensible space around habitable structures. The County respectfully disagrees with the Board of Forestry to the extent the Board believes that the County lacks sufficient policies, regulations and standards as required by law or to address safety considerations in areas at risk for wildland fires.

The TGPA/ZOU does not substantially alter land use density or intensity under the 2004 General Plan with the limited exception of the Mixed Use district. As part of the EIR, County staff estimated the potential additional development at 257 units, approximately 1% in addition to anticipated

growth. The method of reaching the estimate of 257 units is described in Final EIR Section 8.5, Master Response 4: Scope of the Project. (Legistar 11-0356: staff report 18K, p. 93 of 169. No substantive changes are being made to the Land Use Element's map.; The zoning changes that are part of the ZOU translate prior zoning to the new Zoning Ordinance's zones, consistent with the Land Use Element and does not reflect a material change to growth otherwise allowed for by the 2004 General Plan. In addition to reducing zoning densities, some parcels were rezoned to more intensive districts as a result of the ZOU. Where more than one zoning district was consistent with the General Plan, the County selected the least intensive zoning district consistent with the General Plan. (Legistar 11-0356: staff report 11A, p. 14). The TGPA/ZOU does not materially change the County's growth potential or build-out assumptions as provided for the 2004 General Plan. The growth assumptions contained in the Housing Element of the General Plan are therefore unchanged by the TGPA/ZOU project.

The Board of Forestry did not comment on the Notice of Preparation for the TGPA/ZOU EIR. Its comments arose in the context of a comment on the draft EIR. Because the Board of Forestry's concerns were not known at the time the draft EIR was prepared, they could not have been included in the draft EIR as an area of controversy.

Including the Board of Forestry's concerns as an area of controversy in the TGPA/ZOU Final EIR is a clarification that does not rise to a significant change requiring recirculation of the TGPA/ZOU EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The Board of Forestry's comments relate to policy considerations already addressed in the General Plan, as discussed above, and do not identify a new significant impact on the environment. Similarly, they do not identify a substantial increase in the severity of an impact. Furthermore, in light of the extensive fire safety policies already in the General Plan, the Board of Forestry's comments do not suggest a project alternative or mitigation measure substantially different from what was previously analyzed.

The Board of Forestry encourages the County to work with the Board through the TGPA/ZOU and CEQA process. The County will cooperate with the Board of Forestry in the future as it refines its General Plan policies and works on Implementation Measure HS-B. However, the changes requested by the Board of Forestry are not required by statute as of this time and are outside the scope of the project being evaluated in the TGPA/ZOU EIR.

Revisions to Chapter 9, Responses to Comments

Introduction

The following are revised responses to select comments received on the El Dorado County TGPA/ZOU Draft Program EIR. The comment letters themselves are found in Chapter 9, *Responses to Comments* of the Final Program EIR under the same alphanumerical identifiers as below.

Revisions to the Text of Chapter 9, Responses to Comments

O-1-54

This comment is on Policy 2.4.1.5, which reads as follows:

Policy 2.4.1.5 The County shall implement a program to promote infill development in existing communities.

- A. Project sites must be consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.
- B. Project sites may not be more than five acres in size and must demonstrate substantially development has occurred on 2 or more sides of the site.
- C. Project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species.
- D. Approval of a project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.
- E. The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

Implementation Measure LU-Q provides more specifics as to the content of the future program, as follows:

Measure LU-Q

Promote Infill Development: The program shall be linked to land-use, housing, air quality, transportation and circulation strategies that support development within existing communities, reduce vehicle miles traveled, increase energy efficiency, and encourage the development of affordable housing. The program shall include, but not be limited to:

- a) Adopt criteria to be used within existing communities with developed areas currently capable of being served by public water and public or private sewer;
- b) Provide incentives for residential and commercial infill development including financial incentives for pedestrian-oriented and transit-friendly design features;

- c) Amend the zoning code to include a new Traditional Neighborhood Design zone within Commercial and Multi-Family Land Uses;
- d) Support medium and high density residential or mixed use development along commercial and transportation corridors;
- e) Develop and utilize approved standard plan types (i.e. zero-lot line, duplex with carriage house unit over garage, z-lot, bungalow, etc.) to streamline the approval process for infill projects. Standard plans shall include various housing and commercial types and styles. Standard plan(s) approved as part of a project shall be compatible with neighboring residential or commercial district patterns for which the development is located; and
- f) Develop or update, as considered necessary, applicable community plans, specific plans and design guidelines to incorporate pedestrian-oriented, transit-friendly, and or energy efficient configurations design as primary goals.

The purpose of Policy 2.4.1.5 is to promote infill development consistent with existing general plan density and intensity standards. “Infill” is a planning term describing development that is surrounded by existing developed areas. It is located on sites that are not developed, but are otherwise located in developed areas. Infill is considered desirable because it is generally easier to serve with public utilities and services than development that is outside developed areas.

By its own terms, this policy does not change the density or intensity of land uses. The density and intensity standards for a given infill site are those found in the General Plan land use designation. The updates to community plans, specific plans, and design guidelines referred to in the policy description are future updates that would conform these plans and guidelines to this General Plan policy. The updates are not intended to change current land use designations or zoning density and intensity standards.

The comment asks questions about the meaning of other zoning terms used in Implementation Measure LU-Q: Traditional Neighborhood Design and Zero lot line or Z-lot. These terms describe development and design standards, and are not related to density or intensity. As stated in Policy 2.4.1.5, “Project sites must be consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.”

- “Traditional Neighborhood Design” is an urban design term referring to development characterized by a rectilinear street pattern; local streets and sidewalks designed to encourage walking and bicycling, with appropriate vehicle speeds; convenient connections between land uses to encourage walking and bicycling rather than driving for short trips; and a mix of housing types. It refers to the design of new subdivisions and neighborhoods; density and intensity of development continue to be governed by the General Plan and zoning. As a future action, the County intends to adopt traditional neighborhood design standards as part of its site planning and design manual.
- “Zero lot line” or “Z-lot” development allows buildings to be located on one of a parcel’s side lot lines, rather than requiring buildings to be set back from both side lot lines. The resulting building has only one side yard. The density and intensity of development of a zero lot line or Z-lot development continue to be governed by the General Plan and zoning.

Policy 2.4.1.5 and its Implementation Measure LU-Q would not change the allowable density and intensity standards of the General Plan. In other words, it would not change the level of growth and

development assumed in the impact analysis. Because the impact analysis in the EIR is based on future development consistent with the General Plan, no change to the water supply analysis is necessary.

O-1-55

This comment is on Policy 2.4.1.5, which sets out the basic criteria for infill development. Although the policy will encourage infill, it does not mandate that new development occur on infill sites. The impact analysis assumes that El Dorado County will develop in conformance with the General Plan, including land uses, density, and intensity as set out in the General Plan's Land Use Element.

The policy has been evaluated in the context of the potential impacts of future development under the General Plan. Infill development would not result in a more intensive level of development, nor development outside of areas identified for future development under the General Plan. The General Plan was therefore utilized as the basis for analyzing the future impacts of infill development. Please see Master Response 1: Specificity of Environmental Review for a discussion of the level of detail that is reasonable for a program EIR.

Infill would not have any greater level of impact than the impacts projected to occur under the General Plan. Development occurring in infill sites and locations would still be required to conform to General Plan standards and zoning requirements. Implementation of Policy 2.1.4.5 would encourage development to occur at vacant sites within existing developed communities consistent with the Land Use Element and all other County policies and ordinances. The impacts of infill are one aspect of the impacts resulting from future development under the General Plan, as described in the EIR. As such, the mitigations identified in the EIR also cover the impacts of the infill policy. The overall EIR analysis is not affected by whether such development occurs at infill sites or in other locations.

The information on which the EIR analysis, including analysis of the infill policy, is based is cited in the text of the EIR and identified in Chapter 7, References Cited. Additional information supporting the analysis is found in Appendix D, Traffic Modeling Methodology.

O-1-56

This comment is on Policy 2.4.1.5. The TGPA/ZOU EIR describes Policy 2.4.1.5 as follows: "This policy would set criteria for and identify infill sites and opportunity areas and provide, through an implementation measure, incentives for development of these vacant/underutilized areas. Implementation may support the use of mixed use and "formbased" codes. These policy changes would not include amending the land use designations or increasing the densities currently provided for in the General Plan."

As discussed in responses to comments O-1-54 and O-1-55, Policy 2.4.1.5 would not increase development density or intensity beyond that which is allowed by the General Plan's land use designation for a given infill site. The comment asks questions about the meaning of additional zoning terms used in Policy 2.4.1.5 and in the EIR's description of potential outcomes of implementation of Policy 2.4.1.5. These terms are not related to density or intensity. As stated in Policy 2.4.1.5, "Project sites must be consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations."

- The term “opportunity area” refers to sites that are surrounded by existing development and therefore would be potentially available for infill development.
- “Mixed use” refers to development including more than one land use; typically, residential and neighborhood commercial uses, but also a mix of residential densities. Mixed use is required to conform to the use, density, and intensity standards set out in the General Plan.
- “Formbased codes” refers to a type of zoning code that relies on design standards (i.e., height, setback, building design, street width, etc.) rather than the traditional zoning ordinance’s prescriptive list of allowable uses to describe the development that could be allowed. A formbased code would be subject to the density, intensity, and other development standards of the General Plan. However, it can offer greater design flexibility for mixed use developments in comparison to a traditional zoning ordinance. The County has not adopted any formbased codes, but may propose to do so in the future. If it does, that proposal would be subject to additional CEQA review.

Infill would be facilitated by a future infill program still to be developed by the County, as described in response to comment O-1-57. Please see the response to comment O-1-57 for further detail.

O-1-57

This comment is on Policy 2.4.1.5, which sets the stage for a future infill program that will encourage infill development. Implementation Measure LU-Q describes the various incentives referred to in the EIR’s description of Policy 2.4.1.5. These yet-to-be-developed incentives include:

- Providing unspecified financial incentives for pedestrian-oriented and transit-friendly design features in residential and commercial infill development.
- Adopting a new Traditional Neighborhood Design zone within Commercial and Multi-Family Land Uses in the future that would provide greater design certainty, thereby reducing permitting time.
- Developing and utilizing pre-approved standard plan types (i.e. zero-lot line, duplex with carriage house unit over garage, z-lot, bungalow, etc.) to streamline the permit approval process for infill projects.

Density bonuses and streamlining could be additional incentives to infill, but would apply to other types of development as well. By state law, the County is required to grant a residential density bonus and other incentives for any residential project that meets the criteria set out in California Government Code Sections 65915-65918. In return, the developer must ensure that a portion of the residential units are available for very low-, low-, and moderate-income occupants.

The TGPA/ZOU EIR is a program EIR. Streamlining, particularly streamlining of CEQA review, is allowed under State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 - 15162 (subsequent EIR, supplemental EIR, addendum) and 15168 (program EIR). Under these sections, later projects that are within the scope of a program EIR are not required to prepare a subsequent or supplemental EIR unless there have been substantial changes in the project or its circumstances, or substantial new information becomes available that was not known at the time the program EIR was certified, any of which indicates that the later project would have a new or substantially more severe impact not disclosed in the program EIR. These provisions apply to all later projects, not only infill projects.

O-1-58

This comment is on Implementation Measure LU-Q, which describes in general how the County will encourage infill development. When the County drafts an infill program, more specific incentives will be identified. The County has not begun to draft the infill program at this time. See the response to comment O-1-54 explaining that the infill program will not change density and intensity provisions under the General Plan, including the Land Use Element policies.

O-1-62

This comment is on Section 130.30.060 - Hillside Development Standards; 30 Percent Slope Restriction of the Zoning Ordinance, which allows construction on parcels with slopes exceeding 30 percent in accordance with standards found in the Hillside Land Use Standards of the Design and Improvements Standards Manual. The comment suggests that a map of areas of the county with private land over 30 percent slope would enable planners to estimate the scope of impact of development. A map of private lands with 30 percent slopes would substantially overstate the extent of potential development areas. There are a great number of variables that dictate whether a land owner chooses to develop on slopes in excess of 30 percent. These variables include the area within the parcel that is not on slopes over 30 percent (thereby avoiding the need to develop on the slope), the cost and feasibility of installing septic systems on slopes over 30 percent (which in itself is subject to site soil characteristics and the feasibility of alternative system designs), the cost and feasibility of designing a home on a steep site, and the relative cost of development on steep slopes in comparison to building on available sites that do not require special designs, Please also see the response to comment O-1-278 which also addresses potential development on slopes of over 30 percent (and was upheld by the trial court – see pages 63-65 of the decision). A site-specific analysis, including the on-site review suggested by the commenter, is not reasonable for a county-wide policy-based project, such as the TGPA/ZOU for which a program EIR has been prepared. Also please see response to comment O-1-68 and Master Response 5: Practical Constraints on Future Development Under the TGPA/ZOU.

O-1-70

This comment is regarding potential drinking water (groundwater) contamination from home occupations. Home occupation standard 10 (Zoning Ordinance Section 130.40.160, subsection C.10) requires approval by the County Environmental Management Department and applicable fire department of any materials used or manufactured as part of the home occupation before a business license can be issued. This will ensure that any potentially hazardous materials are properly stored and disposed, and that the potential hazard, if any, to adjoining properties is considered and necessary restrictions are imposed by the County or fire department.

Groundwater contamination may result from a variety of sources or activities, not all of which are a function of or are subject of county regulated activities. For example, a well may be subject to contamination because it is improperly sealed. This would not be a function of activities resulting from home occupations on nearby properties. Depending upon the cause, an affected well owner may have recourse through the County Zoning Ordinance or public health regulations or through enforcement of private rights pursuant to California groundwater or nuisance law.

The question regarding why the special use permit system is being abolished relates to a policy decision by the Board of Supervisors. The Board has decided to allow certain home occupations by

right and others subject to administrative or conditional use permits, as illustrated in Table 130.40.160.1 – Home Occupation Use Matrix. Those uses with the highest potential for incompatibility require still require a conditional use permit. In addition, the Zoning Ordinance specifically prohibits more potentially intrusive home occupations on parcels less than one acre in area (Section 130.40.160, subsection F).

The following response is provided for informational purposes. The zoning ordinance’s Home Occupations provisions effectively create three levels of County review depending on the intensity of the type of home occupation (see 130.40.160 – Home Occupations, subsections C, D, F, and G, and Table 130.40.160.1 – Home Occupation Use Matrix of the Zoning Ordinance). Relatively innocuous home occupations are allowed by right, more intense home occupations require approval of an administrative permit, and the most intense home occupations are subject to approval of a conditional use permit. These permits are subject to appeal by neighbors under Zoning Ordinance Section 130.52.090.

Recourse for residents to “close down” a home occupation that is not compliant with zoning standards is through the County zoning violation provisions which apply in all zoning districts. Reported violations will be investigated and pursued by the County’s code enforcement staff. In addition, the business license provision for "Grounds for refusal or revocation" (El Dorado County Ordinance Code Section 5.08.090) provides that if there is a violation of regulations, the County can revoke the home occupation’s business license. Subsection F establishes the following as grounds for revocation: “The violation of any State or Federal law or any County ordinance regulating the business, the construction, alteration or repair of buildings and sewage disposal systems used in the business or regulating the use of the land upon which the business is operated” General Plan Policy 8.2.4.2 provides general guidance for the home occupation regulations embodied in the Zoning Ordinance. The standards for home occupations are described in the zoning ordinance at Section 130.40.160 – Home Occupations, subsections C, D, F, and G. The various home occupation provisions are analyzed in EIR Section 3.6, *Land Use and Planning*. The analysis considers the effect of these standards in reducing those impacts.

The specific standards for accessory structures are set out in Zoning Ordinance Section 130.40.030 – Accessory Structures and Uses and their development is not deferred. The draft Zoning Ordinance was available for public review during the TGPA/ZOU proceedings.

The County does not enforce Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions (CC&Rs). CC&Rs are not enacted by the County and are not part of any County code, and exist as private contractual rights and responsibilities between property owners. Ordinarily, recorded restrictions are enforceable between private parties notwithstanding a conflict with city or county zoning regulations.

Zoning Ordinance section 130.40.170 – Lodging Facilities provides the standards for lodging facilities. Subsection E.4 provides that a health resort and retreat center is limited to “up to 20 guestrooms.” A large home that serves as a health resort and retreat center would be subject to zoning ordinance requirements. This possibility was considered in the TGPA/ZOU EIR’s impact analysis.

Special Purpose zones are found in Chapter 130.25 of the Zoning Ordinance. Section 130.25.010 (Zones Established; Applicability, subsection C defines the special purpose zones. These zones are: Recreational Facilities, Low Intensity; Recreational Facilities, High Intensity; Transportation Corridor; and Open Space. See section 130.25.020 for the Matrix of Allowed Uses. The uses allowed in these zones were analyzed at a program level in the EIR.

I-37-14

This comment relates to the Bass Lake parcel, asserting that the parcel is proposed for RFH zoning in an area where RFH zoning is not compatible. Prior to the ZOU, the Bass Lake parcel (APN 115-400-21) was zoned RF (Recreational Facility). As part of the zoning code reorganization undertaken by the 2015 ZOU, the RF zone was eliminated and replaced with two RF zones: RFH (Recreational Facilities, High-Intensity) and RFL (Recreational Facilities, Low-Intensity). In response to public comments received during the DEIR comment period (March 24, 2014 through July 23, 2014), and the Partial Recirculated DEIR comment period (January 29, 2015 through March 16, 2015), the County reviewed the proposed rezone of APN 115-400-21 from RF to RFH and determined that the proposed RFH classification was indeed outside a Community Region, as a result of a mapping error on the March 2014 Public Review Draft Zoning Maps.

The proposed RFH classification was inconsistent with the Board of Supervisors May 25, 2012 TGPA-ZOU zone mapping criteria for parcels located outside a Community Region. As a result, the zoning for APN 115-400-21 was corrected to Recreational Facilities, Low-Intensity (RFL) for consistency with the General Plan and Project objectives. The Bass Lake parcel rezone was included in the Planning Commission's recommendation that was presented to the Board on November 10, 2015 (*Legistar File 11-0356, Attachment 18B, p.8*). On November 13, 2015, the Board approved staff's recommendation which included the rezone of this parcel to RFL and this zone change was included in the final project approved by the Board on December 15, 2015.

The RFL Zone is consistent with the land use/zoning designation of this parcel in the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (EDHSP) Zoning Map (Figure 5 on page 22), approved by the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors on July 18, 1988, According to the Site information on the Zoning Map, Village "R" is zoned as Open Space/Recreation. Section 17.68.020.C of the prior Zoning Ordinance defined "Open Space Land" to mean "parcels or areas of land which are generally unimproved and devoted to and essential for: preservation of recreational enjoyment areas."

Section 6.2.1 (Natural Open Space) in the EDHSP states the following: "Uses allowed will be restricted to those which have a minimal impact on the open space character, such as jogging, hiking, and horseback riding. Limited recreational facilities may be included in both the public and private open space areas where such facilities are compatible with the open space character."

An analysis of the uses allowed in the RFL Zone identified the following new recreational uses that were not allowed in the prior RF Zone:

- Parks: Day Use (allowed by right)
- Parks: Nighttime Use (Admin Permit required)
- Marina, motorized craft (CUP required)
- Ski Area (CUP required)
- Off Highway or Off Road Recreation Area (CUP required)
- Outdoor Entertainment (CUP required)
- Outdoor Sports and Recreation (Admin Permit/CUP required)
- Private Recreation as part of approved development plan/subdivision (allowed by right)

- Resource Protection and Restoration (allowed by right)
- Special Event, Temporary (TUP required)
- Trail Head Parking or Staging Area (Admin Permit/CUP required)

The RFL Zone does not allow the following uses that were allowed in prior RF Zone: ballfields; playgrounds; and parking lot, public.

Most of the new recreational uses allowed in the RFL Zone are unlikely uses for the Bass Lake parcel. Parks: Day Use seems to have the most potential for use of the Bass Lake parcel, based on current plans of the El Dorado Hills Community Services District (CSD). Please see the response to comment I-37-16 for a discussion of the status of the CSD's plans for the site.

The TGPA-ZOU EIR was a programmatic EIR, and did not analyze the environmental impacts at specific sites. Because there are no specific projects proposed for the parcel under the TGPA/ZOU, a specific environmental analysis of the rezone of APN 115-400-21 would be speculative. Note also that the reasonably foreseeable future land uses (as represented in the policies of the CSD's *Park and Recreation Facilities Master Plan* discussed in the response to comment I-37-16) are not substantially different between the pre- and post-ZOU zoning. This supports the conclusion that the ZOU does not significantly change the development potential of APN 115_400_21 and therefore would not increase the impact of future development.

I-37-16

The comment references a 2003 comment letter from the Department of Fish and Game (now Department of Fish and Wildlife) regarding a past proposal for the Bass Lake Regional Park. The plan for the Bass Lake Regional Park referenced in the comment is no longer under consideration. Further, it is not proposed as part of the TGPA/ZOU. The Department of Fish and Wildlife did not comment on the TGPA/ZOU project.

At this time, Bass Lake and its immediate surroundings continue to provide habitat and foraging area for birds. It is within the recognized year-long range of the bald eagle, a California-listed "endangered" and "fully protected" species, as mapped by the California Wildlife Habitat Relationship System on map B113, available for review at <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/data/cwhr>.

Currently, the El Dorado Hills Community Services District (CSD) is in the process of acquiring the property for use as a regional park. The extent to which the future regional park may affect bird habitat will be directly related to the final design of the park. The discussion of the future regional park in Chapter III of the CSD's June 2016 *Park and Recreation Facilities Master Plan* states that the CSD will "support implementation and preparation of a natural resources management plan for this site to enhance the health of the Bass Lake ecosystem." The CSD will be required to prepare a CEQA analysis prior to adopting any plan for the regional park. That analysis will include a site-specific biological survey and information review to determine the resource value of the site and the potential impacts of the future regional park plan. Based on the CSD's policy to support preparation and implementation of a natural resources management plan for the future regional park, the results of the biological resources study can be expected to be considered in the development of that plan, the CEQA analysis will be required to include mitigation (and an alternative if an EIR is required) for any residual significant biological impacts of the future regional park plan.

The TGPA land use designation of LDR and ZOU zone of RE-5 would permit a regional park. Please see response to comment I-37-14. The proposed regional park is not part of the TGPA/ZOU, and the TGPA/ZOU does not make a substantive change to the prior general plan and zoning designations for this parcel.

The TGPA/ZOU EIR examines the potential effects on habitat and wildlife at a program level and is not parcel specific. Chapter 3.4, *Biological Resources*, of the EIR discloses that impacts on habitat (Impact BIO-1) and special status species such as bald eagle (Impact BIO-2) will be significant and unavoidable. Please see Master Response 1: Specificity of Environmental Review for a discussion of the level of detail that is reasonable for a program EIR.

I-37-23

Please see the response to comment I-37-16. As described in detail in response to comment I-37-16, the proposed Bass Lake Regional Park is not part of the TGPA/ZOU project and therefore is not subject to analysis in this EIR. As noted in response to comment I-37-16, the extent to which the future regional park may affect bird habitat will be directly related to the final design of the park and the CSD will be required to prepare a CEQA analysis prior to adopting any plan for the regional park.

I-37-24

Please see the response to comment I-37-16. As described in detail in response to comment I-37-16, the proposed Bass Lake Regional Park is not part of the TGPA/ZOU project and therefore is not subject to analysis in this EIR. The CSD is acquiring this site and will adopt its own plan for the regional park after a public process and preparation of a CEQA document. The CSD's *Park and Recreation Facilities Master Plan* indicates that the future plan will take ecosystem values into consideration.

Because the future Bass Lake Regional Park is not a part of the TGPA/ZOU it is not analyzed in the TGPA/ZOU EIR. The potential impacts of the future regional park are not known at this time and cannot be known until the CSD prepares a park design. Because the future regional park is not proposed under the TGPA/ZOU, its design is the responsibility of another agency and the design is unknown. Therefore, there is no requirement for the TGPA/ZOU EIR to examine an alternative design for the park. If the CSD finds through its own CEQA process that its proposed design for the regional park could result in a significant impact on the Bass Lake ecosystem, then it may analyze a suitable alternative in an EIR that the CSD may prepare for its regional park project.