



# COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

## PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

<http://www.edcgov.us/DevServices/>

---

**PLACERVILLE OFFICE:**

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

**BUILDING**

(530) 621-5315 / (530) 622-1708 Fax

[bldgdept@edcgov.us](mailto:bldgdept@edcgov.us)

**PLANNING**

(530) 621-5355 / (530) 642-0508 Fax

[planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)

**LAKE TAHOE OFFICE:**

924 B Emerald Bay Rd

South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

(530) 573-3330

(530) 542-9082 Fax

### MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** June 19, 2017

**TO:** Board of Supervisors  
Don Ashton, Chief Administrative Officer  
Creighton Avila, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

**FROM:** Roger Trout, Interim Director of Planning and Building

**SUBJECT:** **Community Planning in FY17/18 Budget**

---

---

**Recommendation:** If community planning is included in the FY17/18 Budget, the Interim Director of Planning and Building recommends that we focus on updating design guidelines for one community. This would be consistent with CEDAC's recommendation, would serve as a feasible pilot project, and would streamline economic development in that community.

**Introduction:** An analysis of Community Planning was the subject of the April 4, 2016 Staff Report to the Board of Supervisors from David Defanti, Assistant Community Development Agency Director. In that report, four examples of current community planning discussions were analyzed for cost, staffing, and schedule. They are summarized in Table 1, but were identified as nothing more than staffs' best guess.

**Table 1: Estimates for Four County Community Plans**

Community	Staff (FTE annual)	Time	Consultant Cost
Cool	0.3 to 0.5	1-2 years	\$100,000
Diamond Springs/El Dorado	0.3 to 0.5	1-2 years	\$100,000
El Dorado Hills	0.3 to 1	2-4 years	\$100,000
Shingle Springs	0.3 to 0.5	1-2 years	\$100,000

In Exhibit 3 of the April 4, 2016 staff report, examples of staff, time, and cost from nearby community plans were identified. They are summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2: Summary of Community Planning Efforts.**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Staff (FTE annual)</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Placer County, Sheridan Community Plan	0.33	2 years	\$125,000
Placer County, Granite Bay Community Plan	1	3 years	\$750,000
Placer County, Tahoe Basin Area Plan	0.2	6 years	\$1,650,000
Nevada County, Soda Springs Area Plan	1	2 years	\$550,000
San Luis Obispo County, San Miguel Community Plan	Not listed	6 years	\$400,000
San Luis Obispo County, Los Osos Community Plan	1 plus 2-4 part time	4 years	\$350,000
Sacramento County, Arden Arcade Community Action Plan	Not listed	5.5 years	Over \$1 million
Sacramento County, Fair Oaks Boulevard Corridor Plan	1-2	5 years	\$200,000

**Adopted Design Guidelines:**

The County has adopted four Design Guidelines: Historic Design Guide (1980), Community Design Guide (1981), Sierra Design Guide (1982), and Missouri Flat Design Guidelines (2008). The Missouri Flat Design Guidelines took two years to complete, required \$70,000 in consultant costs, and 74 hours of planning staff time.

**Adopted Community Plan:**

The Meyers Community Plan was adopted in 1993. It took over three years to adopt and significant amendments were made in 1995 and 1998. A major revision has been in process since 2012, with final adoption scheduled for early 2018. Estimated staff time is in the hundreds of hours.

**Community Area Plans:**

Between 1975 and 1985, the County adopted 24 Community Area Plans that were also a form of community planning. The Area Plans were funded by federal planning grants, had three dedicated staff, and required Environmental Impact Reports. They operated as a component of the County General Plan and Zoning map for each community. Although the Area Plans' were successful at implementing community planning, the weakness in the Area Plans was that they did not serve as "comprehensive" and "internally consistent" General Plans. This was because

the Area Plans were focused on land use while the County General Plan is required to include other elements in order to be a legally sufficient General Plan. The following separate documents, along with the 24 Area Plans, made up the County General Plan at that time:

1. Long Range Plan
2. Scenic Highways Element
3. Housing Element
4. Public and Seismic Safety Element
5. Open Space and Conservation Element
6. Noise Element
7. 1969 General Plan
8. Recreation Element
9. Bikeway Master Plan
10. El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan

**Fiscal Year 16/17 Budget:** In FY16/17 the County budgeted \$100,000 to support community planning. However, two members of the Long Range Planning team that were focused on community planning left the County during this time period. No consultants were hired during the year and those funds were not expended. Long Range Planning continued to communicate with various communities and has created a form (Attachment A) to gather further information from communities that show interest in community planning.

**Fiscal Year 17/18:** The Budget for Fiscal Year 17/18 contains no additional funds or staff for community planning. The Board established priorities for the FY 17/18 Budget on April 19, 2017 and community planning was not identified as a high priority. The FY 17/18 Budget includes a reduction in 1.2 FTE positions that were previously within Long Range Planning and partially dedicated to community planning. There is currently one vacancy in Long Range Planning that is anticipated to be filled in FY 17/18.

**Recommendation:** If community planning is included in the FY17/18 Budget, the Interim Director of Planning and Building recommends that we focus on updating design guidelines for one community. This would be consistent with CEDAC's recommendation, would serve as a feasible pilot project, and would streamline economic development in that community.

CEDAC recommended that the FY17/18 Budget for community planning include \$75,000 and 175 hours of staff time. As noted previously, the Missouri Flat Design Guidelines cost \$70,000 and 74 hours of staff time.

Adoption of a set of Design Guidelines for one community would serve as a pilot project and allow the County to complete a small scale, short term (one-year) project. This would allow the County to evaluate the feasibility of the concept for other communities. This would also be within the capabilities of the existing staffing of the Long Range Planning team.

A set of Design Guidelines, subject to CEQA review, would streamline the process for commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family development in that community. Pursuant to Section

130.52.030.B of the Zoning Ordinance, the approval of a Design Review Permit is ministerial when in compliance with adopted Design Standards. Design Review Permits that are ministerial would be processed faster and with more certainty than a discretionary Design Review Permit that is subject to additional CEQA review.

Alternatively, other community planning efforts would likely be beyond the current capacity of the Long Range Planning staff, take many years to complete, and could exceed reasonable cost. (See Table 2.)

The Long Range Planning Prioritization list for FY 17/18 (Attachment B; endorsed by the Board February 28, 2017) included “Design Standards for Multi-Family Residential & Commercial” but did not identify the scope, cost, or time. Soon thereafter, on April 21, 2016, the County received a proposal to update the County’s Community Design Guide (Attachment C: Mintier Harnish and ORR Design). The cost estimate ranged from \$373,000 to \$448,000, with optional components, such as individual community design guidelines for \$25,000 to \$30,000 each. Long Range Planning staff had estimated that it would take two years to complete by 0.5 FTE staff. Customized standards for individual communities would then take an additional 6 months each. It should be noted that Long Range Planning did not allocate staff for this task in FY17/18.

Additional information regarding recent history of community planning is Table 3.

**Table 3: History of Community Planning Discussions Since 2009**

Year	Summary
2009	Community and Economic Development Advisory Committee (CEDAC) presented the Board with a draft framework for a document that outlines the process for how a community plan would be created and adopted. At that time, the County had initiated a comprehensive update of the Zoning Ordinance and the first 5-year review of the General Plan. The Board postponed implementation of General Plan Goal 2.4 and Policy 2.4.1.2 until the General Plan 5-year review was completed in 2011. Community planning was addressed in the General Plan 5-year review and considered throughout the Zoning Ordinance Update to ensure a framework for community planning was included.
2012	The County executed a contract with AIM Consulting to assist CEDAC with community planning. CEDAC collaborated with several communities that were either developing a strategic economic vitality plan or pursuing economic development strategies. Over the next two years, AIM partnered with CEDAC and other community organizations to identify their unique needs and the best strategies for assisting with this effort.
May 2013	Staff presented the Board with an update on the Community Identification process and discussed how it related to the General Plan, and the role of the County and CEDAC in that process. (See Legistar File: 13-0561, Attachment A)
July 2013	County staff held an initial meeting to discuss community identity, visioning and implementation plan concepts. Approximately 35 people attended this meeting, with representation from all known communities undergoing some form of

Year	Summary
	community planning discussions: Cameron Park/Shingle Springs, El Dorado Hills, El Dorado/Diamond Springs, Coloma/Lotus, Cool/The Divide, Camino, Pollock Pines, Fair Play/Pleasant Valley, and Meyers. The goal of this meeting was to determine types of community needs that could ultimately be addressed through an adoptable and enforceable community plan. Subsequent conversations with more than 40 people from nine community areas surfaced interesting trends that focused on economic development, lodging and signage for expanded tourism, and broadband internet availability. Other common concerns noted the need for “facelifts” in commercial areas and the County’s aging population.
Summer 2013	County initiated the Cultural and Community Development Grant Program. This program encouraged tourism, agriculture, and economic development in the County by supporting promotional, cultural, and community activities, including projects that facilitate community planning and community identification. Approximately \$80,000 was provided to various community groups for community projects and programs from the General Fund through Transient Occupancy Tax.
November 2013	The CAO provided the Board with an update on the Community Vision and Implementation (CVIP) process, including a presentation by AIM Consulting. (See Legistar File: 13-0561, Attachments 2A – 2D)
June 2014	The CAO provided the Board with an update on the development of a Community Planning Guide, which included a public working draft of the guide. (See Legistar File: 13-0561, Attachments 3A – 3F)
August 2014	AIM Consulting with County staff support held nine community meetings to present the draft Community Planning Guide and receive public feedback. Meetings were held in Cameron Park, Camino, Coloma, Cool, Diamond Springs, El Dorado Hills, Fairplay, Pollock Pines and Shingle Springs. Input from the Meyers community was provided by telephone. Over 110 community members participated in the feedback sessions. The draft guide was refined to incorporate comments received.
November 2014	County staff presented the final Community Planning Guide to the Board and discussed next steps for implementing General Plan Goal 2.4. (See Legistar File: 13-0561, Attachments 4A – 4D; the Community Planning Guide is Attachment 4B). The Community Planning Guide is also posted on the County website at: <a href="http://www.edcgov.us/Government/LongRangePlanning/CommunityPlanning/Community-Based_Planning.aspx">http://www.edcgov.us/Government/LongRangePlanning/CommunityPlanning/Community-Based_Planning.aspx</a> .
March 2016	The Board adopted a Strategic Plan with five goals: Infrastructure, Economic Development, Public Safety, Good County Governance, and Healthy Communities. The Strategic Plan Infrastructure and Economic Development goals include direct references to community planning.
April 2016	County staff presented the Board with a detailed staff report that provided background and overview of community planning discussions, and presented five preliminary options for the Board to consider. Based on public input and Board discussion, the Board requested staff to prepare additional information focused on Options 3 and 5. (See Legistar File: 13-0561, Attachments 5A – 5B)

Year	Summary
May 2016	Staff prepared a preliminary budget for Options 3 and 5 for the Board to consider during the FY 2016/17 budget discussions.
June 2016	The Board allocated \$100,000 in the FY 2016/17 budget for Long Range Planning to utilize for community planning efforts. However, the Board did acknowledge that the \$100,000 was not adequate funding to complete any of the options presented to the Board on April 4, 2016.
February 2017	Staff presented the Board with the Long Range Planning Project Prioritization Matrix for FY 2017/18. Community Planning was included on the matrix; however only the Meyers Area Plan was noted for completion in late 2017. The other Community Planning components (per General Plan policies) timeframe were noted as “TBD” pending Board approval of funding in the FY 2017/18 budget.
April 2017	Staff submitted a supplemental budget request to the CAO’s office for FY 2017/18 funding to be allocate to community planning, specifically for preparing countywide community design guidelines and standards (Option 3 that was presented to the Board on April 4, 2016). The supplemental budget request was for \$1 million, with \$250,000 budgeted each year over four fiscal years. The proposed funding sources were 50% General Fund and 50% Transient Occupancy Tax. The CAO’s office did not include this supplemental budget request, due to other County higher priorities.

**Discussions with Individual Communities**

In early 2016, staff met with members of the following four communities that asked the County to initiate some form of community planning effort for their respective geographic areas: Cool, Diamond Springs/El Dorado, El Dorado Hills, and Shingle Springs. The staff report presented to the Board on April 4, 2016 included summaries of staff’s understanding of these community members’ objectives for a community planning effort within their community. (See Legistar File: 12-1203, Attachment 5A, pages 4 – 7). The staff report noted that the summaries were not intended to be comprehensive and should not be construed as representative of the entire community. The intent was to give the Board a preliminary understanding of what some active community members were discussing. Should the Board initiate one or more community planning efforts, there will need to be broader discussions with a greater representation of each community to fully define a scope for each community planning effort. Prior to 2016, there were community planning discussions with members of Cameron Park and Pollock Pines (which are summarized on pages 7 and 8 of the April 4, 2016 staff report).

In March 2017, the Shingle Springs Community Alliance submitted an email to the Board of Supervisors noting support of development of design standards for commercial and multi-family development. Also in March 2017, a community planning workshop was held in Cool, which was funded by a Strategic Growth Council grant awarded to the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). The workshop was well attended by stakeholders and community

members. The consultant is working on completing the final report which will be shared with the community for ideas on next steps in the community planning process.

## **Meyers Area Plan**

In 2012, an update to the Meyers Community Plan was initiated. Since that time, hundreds of community members have contributed to the update by providing input at ten community workshops and three public hearings. An informal Meyers Community Advisory Council (MCAC) was formed and met over the course of almost a year to work through updating the existing Meyers Community Plan to produce a complete Draft Meyers Area Plan. In August 2015, the fourth draft of the Meyers Area Plan was presented to the Board. The Board authorized staff to proceed with preparation of the environmental impact report (EIR) required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). After the environmental phase is completed, five public adoption hearings are required to finalize the Area Plan. The update to the Meyers Community Plan and related process has become very contentious. Nearly five years has been spent on this effort, which has been costly and has required substantial County staff time. The Environmental Document is scheduled for release in July 2017 with hearings to start in November and end in March 2018.

Area Plans are not the same as Community Plans. Area Plans are intended to be written by local governments, community groups and other land managers to implement the Regional Plan at the local level. Between 1975 and 1985, the County prepared Area Plans for 24 local communities within the County. Those Area Plans represented the County General Plan and Zoning Map for those areas. The adoption of the 1996 General Plan and current 2004 General Plan superseded the Area Plans. For reference purposes only, scanned copies of these Area Plans are posted on the County website, on the Community-Based Planning webpage under Supporting Documents: [http://www.edcgov.us/Government/LongRangePlanning/CommunityPlanning/Community-Based\\_Planning.aspx](http://www.edcgov.us/Government/LongRangePlanning/CommunityPlanning/Community-Based_Planning.aspx).

### Attachments:

- Attachment A – Community Planning Consultation Checklist
- Attachment B – Long Range Planning Project Prioritization Matrix Fiscal Year 2017/18
- Attachment C – Community Design Guide Update; Preliminary Draft Work Program



# Attachment A

## El Dorado County Community Development Services

### Community Planning Consultation Checklist

General Plan Goal 2.4 directs the County to maintain and enhance the character of existing rural and urban communities, emphasizing both the natural setting and built design elements which contribute to the quality of life, economic health and community pride of County residents. To implement this goal, General Plan Policy 2.4.1.2 directs the County to work with members of each community to develop community design guidelines for discretionary development projects which will apply to each community identified in Policy 2.1.1.1, and also to Rural Centers identified in Policy 2.1.2.1 to the extent possible. This checklist is an important tool to help communities achieve these goals.

**Applicant** \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Phone \_\_\_\_\_

**Proposed Plan Location**  
(street address and distance to nearest county maintained roadway ) \_\_\_\_\_

What components would the community consider for a community plan? (check all that apply)

**Specialized districts:**

- Live-work districts
- Signage districts
- Historic preservation districts
- Lighting or landscaping districts
- Outdoor art districts
- Park/Open space districts
- Mixed use districts

- Streetscape improvement districts
- Public space/outdoor dining districts
- Architectural/special design districts
- Riparian corridor districts
- Scenic Corridor districts
- Parking districts

**Other Community Design Components:**

- Community Gardens/greenbelts
- Pedestrian and/or bike paths and trails
- Parks and Recreation areas
- Form-based codes
- Others (Specify \_\_\_\_\_)

Please provide a detailed description of the proposed community plan. Include a separate map showing the proposed boundaries of the area to be included in the community plan. (Attach separate maps/ pages as necessary. Electronic copies, if provided, should be in PDF format)





# El Dorado County Community Development Services Community Planning Consultation Checklist

## Review by Key Stakeholders:

In order to ensure broad community involvement in the proposed plan, the proposed plan should be reviewed by, at minimum, the following key stakeholders listed below that would have a potential interest in the project. Please check all that apply, and include explanations as necessary. Depending on the size and scope of the proposed plan, additional review by other groups not shown below may be required.

- A majority of property/business owners within the proposed plan area (attach documentation)
- Local community leaders within the proposed plan area (specify who and when contacted)
- Financial organization(s) potentially funding proposed improvements
- Community-based organizations representing residents and/or business owners either living or working within the proposed plan area (Include a list of \_\_\_\_\_)
- organization(s) and residents/business owners represented by those organization(s)*
- Local government agencies/organizations (specify which ones and date/person(s) contacted)
- A cross-section of the population to be served within the proposed plan area (e.g. youth, senior citizens, home/business owners, tourists, etc.) (Specify: \_\_\_\_\_)
- Other individuals/groups and/or organizations directly affected by the proposed plan (Specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

### DECLARATION:

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that this consultation and all information submitted as part of this consultation are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I certify that I have been authorized by property and/or business owner(s) within the proposed plan area to represent this consultation and understand that should any information or representation be submitted in connection with this consultation be incorrect or untrue, El Dorado County ("County") may rescind any recommendations resulting from this consultation and/or take other appropriate action to invalidate the proceedings of this consultation. I further understand that County comments and/or recommendations arising from the consultation do not apply to any modifications to the proposal or its components that occur after the meeting. (Original signature required)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signed By At \_\_\_\_\_ County On \_\_\_\_\_ Date

## Attachment B

<b>LONG RANGE PLANNING PROJECT PRIORITIZATION MATRIX FISCAL YEAR 2017/18</b>  <b>Major County-Initiated Land Use and Transportation Projects</b> <b>Managed by Community Development Agency Long Range Planning (LRP) Division</b> <b>Endorsed by Board of Supervisors 2/28/17</b> <i>(Revised 3/13/17 to incorporate Board direction on 2/28/17)</i>				COUNTY STRATEGIC GOALS						
				Priority: Get things done by finishing what we've started	Priority: Set Strong Countywide Foundation	Priority: Good Governance	Priority: Economic Development	Priority: Infrastructure	Priority: Public Safety	Priority: Healthy Communities
				Intent: Prioritize projects already initiated by Board and currently underway	Intent: Prioritize projects that address key issues affecting entire county	Intent: Prioritize projects that achieve best process for decision-making & follow rule of law	Intent: Prioritize projects that directly improve economic development	Intent: Prioritize projects that provide public facilities	Intent: Prioritize projects that protect the community	Intent: Prioritize projects that improve health, well-being & self sufficiency
LRP's Major County-Initiated Land Use and Transportation Projects	Timeframe	Project Prioritization	Estimated Annual FTE	Is project currently in process?	Does project address an issue affecting entire county?	Is project required by General Plan, policy, law or other mandates?	Does project directly improve Economic Development?	Does project support provision of infrastructure & public facilities?	Does project help protect the community?	Does project support programs & services that improve health of communities, residents, visitors?
Cameron Park Drive Interchange Alternatives Analysis	Complete late 2017/early 2018	1	0.3	Yes	Maybe	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Affordable Housing Ordinance	Complete late 2017	1	0.3	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
<b>Community-Based Planning</b>		1								
1) Meyers Area Plan Update	Complete late 2017		0.2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
2) Design Standards for Multi-Family Residential & Commercial	TBD		0.5	No	Yes	Maybe	Maybe	Yes	No	Yes
3) Opportunity Areas [GP Policies 2.1.4.1 - 2.1.4.4]	TBD		0.3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Maybe	Maybe	Maybe
<b>Community Identification [GP Policy 2.4.1.2]; Mixed Use Development Phase III - Combining Zone Overlay [GP Policies 2.1.1.3, 2.1.2.5, 2.2.1.2]; Infill Development [GP Policy 2.4.1.5]; Infill Incentive Ordinance [Measure HO-2013-4]; Physical and Visual Separation of Established Communities [GP Policies 2.5.1.1 - 2.5.1.3]</b>	TBD									
Biological Resources Policy Update	Complete early 2017	1	0.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
SB 743 Implementation (Vehicle Miles Traveled CEQA Metric)	TBD	1	0.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Maybe	Yes	No	No
Water Report	July 2017	1	0.1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Development Projects Review Process (related Board Policy J-6)	TBD	2	0.2	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Maybe	No	Maybe
Missouri Flat Area Master Circulation & Funding Plan (MC&FP) Phase II	TBD	2	0.25	Yes	No	Maybe	Yes	Yes	Maybe	No
Cultural Resources Ordinance [GP Policy 7.5.1.1]	Complete late 2017	2	0.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Scenic Corridor Ordinance [GP Policy 2.6.1.1]	Complete late 2017	2	0.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
El Dorado Hills Business Park Marketability	Complete mid 2017	2	0.2	Yes	No	No	Yes	Maybe	No	Maybe
Agricultural "Opt-In" Program Phase II	TBD	3	0.2	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Subtotal FTE from above (1)			4.55	(1) Subtotal does not include estimated FTE for Community-Based Planning efforts listed under Opportunity Areas.						
Subtotal FTE from next page (2)			10.6	(2) Subtotal does not include estimated FTE for Storm Water Trash Amendments.						
<b>Total Est. FTE Needed (3)</b>			<b>15.2</b>	(3) Total does not include estimated FTE for Community-Based Planning efforts listed under Opportunity Areas, and Storm Water Trash Amendments.						
<b>Total Approx. FTE Available (4)</b>			<b>11 - 12</b>	(4) Total does not include one vacancy (1.0 FTE)						

Revised: 3-13-17

<b>Other Major Long Range Planning Projects and Ongoing Responsibilities (FY 2017/18)</b>	<b>Estimated Annual FTE</b>
<b>Administration</b>	
General Administration: Contract Initiation and Administration, Invoice Processing, Public Inquiry Responses, Preparation of Legistar Items, Presentations and Staff Reports, Web Page Management, Budget Preparation and Monitoring, Records Management, Invoice Processing, etc.	1.2
Public Records Act Requests	0.05
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1.25</b>
<b>Storm Water/Water Quality requirements per County's NPDES permit</b>	
Register catchments in Lake Clarity Crediting Program (ongoing)	
Maintenance of High Priority Storm Drain Systems (ongoing)	
Assess operations & maintenance activities for pollutant discharge potential (ongoing)	
Implement Kerata Field Assessment Tool (ongoing)	
Inventory & assess maintenance condition of post construction BMPs (ongoing)	
Post Construction Storm Water Management Program (ongoing)	
Build and deploy custom BMP Sizing Tool (ongoing)	
Class room presentations with Splash (ongoing)	
Produce revised Pollutant Load Reduction Plan to achieve 21% load reduction	
Choose Trash Amendment Compliance track and begin implementation plan	
Begin building West Slope Asset Management Tool with Transportation Division	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>3.0</b>
Trash Amendments (CA Environmental Protection Agency, State Water Resources Control Board, "Water Quality Control Plan for the Ocean Waters of California to Control Trash and Part 1 Trash Provisions of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California") <i>* Note: Project initiation pending notification from State requiring implementation; est. FTE is 1.0</i>	<i>*See Note</i>
<b>Land Use</b>	
2016-2019 County Strategic Plan - Implement Healthy Communities Goal (collaboration w/HHSA)	0.02
2016-2019 County Strategic Plan - Implement Economic Development Goal (collaboration with CAO Office)	1.0
2016-2019 County Strategic Plan - Implement Good County Governance Goal	0.02
Housing Element Implementation - project support (meeting with property owners, developers, financiers, etc.) and Oversight of First Time Homebuyer program, Housing Rehabilitation program, Choice Voucher Program and other funding programs	1
2021 Housing Element Comprehensive Update (Initiate process in 2018)	0.7
Processing three applications for proposed specific plans	0.7
General Plan Annual Progress Report (2016 Calendar Year)	0.06
General Plan Housing Element Annual Report (2016 Calendar Year)	0.06
State and Board annual reports for Housing and land development	0.05
Interdepartmental working groups including but not limited to: Housing, Economic Development, Transportation, etc.	0.05
External Agency Coordination (e.g., EDCTC, SACOG, Water Agency) related to land use projects	0.05
Synchronization of Data and Reports for Water Resources (Purveyors, Policies, Plans, Ordinances)	0.05
TGPA-ZOU - Lawsuit (and anticipated Biological Resource Policy Update)	0.05
Design Improvements Standards Manual/Land Development Manual (DISM/LDM)	0.05
Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities (DUCs) - Updates to Land Use and Housing Elements	0.05
2030 and 2050 Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Targets - incorporate policies in General Plan or separate Climate Action Plan	0.05
General Plan Safety Element Update - Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Strategies; Vulnerability Assessment	0.05
General Plan - Environmental Justice Component [Senate Bill 1000, Leyva]	0.05
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>4.06</b>
<b>Transportation</b>	
2016-2019 County Strategic Plan - Implement Infrastructure Goal	0.05
Traffic study scoping/review for public projects (e.g. courthouse, sheriff facility, CIP projects) and private applications	0.3
Updating intersection needs list (e.g. signals, stop controls, etc.)	0.02
Travel Demand Model maintenance/updates (incorporate TGPA-ZOU changes, SACOG MTP, etc.)	0.5
CIP Mid-Year and Annual Updates	0.5
TIM Fee Annual Update	0.25
General Plan Implementation as Result of Measure E	0.25
Inter-jurisdictional and regional coordination (EDCTC, SACOG, Caltrans, Connector JPA, neighboring jurisdictions)	0.15
Prepare for Implementation of SB 743	0.1
Traffic engineering support for various design teams and traffic operations group	0.2
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>2.32</b>
<b>Other Major Long Range Planning Projects and Ongoing Responsibilities TOTAL</b>	<b>10.63</b>

Revised: 3/13/17

# Attachment C

## EL DORADO COUNTY

### COMMUNITY DESIGN GUIDE UPDATE PRELIMINARY DRAFT WORK PROGRAM

*Prepared by*

#### MINTIER HARNISH AND ORR DESIGN

The following work program outlines a process for updating El Dorado County's existing Community Design Guide (1980) to include a menu of architectural design, public spaces, streetscape elements, and prototypes for commercial, including office, and multifamily development projects. The Community Design Guide (Design Guide) update process will consider, incorporate, and update the County's other existing design guidelines documents. Upon adoption, the updated Design Guide will supersede and replace older countywide design guidelines and standards and will incorporate existing, individual community design guidelines (e.g., Missouri Flat) and provide a process and structure for creating customized design guidelines/standards that fit the unique character of other communities. Finally, the process to prepare the Design Guide will include outreach to stakeholders and community members. The resulting Design Guide will undergo environmental review before being adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

#### **TASK 1 PROJECT INITIATION/RECONNAISSANCE**

##### **Task 1.1 Kick-Off Meeting**

The Consultants will attend a kick-off meeting with County staff to review the County's objectives and expectations for each project component and the finished product, and to discuss key issues of integration and consistency with existing and future plans, ordinances, and programs. At the meeting it is assumed the County will provide the Consultants with all relevant documents plans, strategies, ordinances, and reports/studies that directly or indirectly influence the design of commercial and multifamily developments within the county.

##### **Task 1.2 Affected County Departments Consultation**

The Consultants will prepare for County staff review a memo that describes the design elements that are likely to affect various County operations (e.g., Public Works, Transportation, and Fire). The memo will provide the basis for early consultation with various County staff and stakeholders to identify specific County requirements and standards with which design elements must not conflict, and to identify any County department initiatives, policies, or programs that the design guidelines may help implement (e.g., Low Impact Development, Complete Streets). It is assumed County staff will provide documentation and input regarding initiatives, policies, or programs that may be effected by the Design Guide, and a level of acceptable change to enable the development of mixed-use projects.

##### **Task 1.3 Existing and Draft Document/Ordinance Review and County Reconnaissance**

The Consultant will review existing documents and identify parts or concepts from existing guidelines that will be incorporated into the new Design Guide. The Consultants will also review recent projects and how they addressed currently adopted design guidelines. In coordination with County staff, the Consultant will survey and review the geography of the County to assess the natural and built environment in which the

design guidelines will be applied, as well as the architectural characteristics of existing communities. Based on input and findings from Tasks 1.1 and 1.2, the Consultants will prepare a summary of the program elements that will guide the development of the Design Guide (i.e., project parameters, expectations, and objectives).

### **Task 1.4 Stakeholder Interviews**

The Consultants will conduct interviews with key stakeholders (e.g., elected officials, commission members, and developers, architects, engineers, business groups) to gain a clear understanding of the issues and expectations for the Design Guide. The list of interviewees would be developed in consultation with County staff. The Consultants, on behalf of the County, will prepare a form letter from the County inviting identified individuals to participate in the interviews and conduct follow-up communications to confirm their involvement.

As part of each interview, the Consultants will solicit input on a range of issues and opportunities the project should consider, challenges facing the communities and development projects, and other key interest areas of each stakeholder. These interviews will produce candid, practical advice for the Consultants and County staff, and help make the Design Guide update process and products be more effective and relevant. The Consultants will conduct interviews over a two-day period. The Consultants will also prepare a summary of interview results, which will identify general themes, issues, and ideas without attribution to individual interviewees.

### **Task 1.5 Public Outreach Strategy**

The Consultants will develop a public outreach strategy that sets forth the tools, techniques, and activities the County will use to create support for the project and the resulting Design Guide. The Strategy will outline when the Consultants and/or County staff will conduct steering and advisory committees, public workshops, events, and public hearings. While the specifics will be defined through coordination with County staff, outreach methods would, at a minimum identify methods and tools for providing opportunities to inform and educate the public about the process and options, steps for interaction and engagement to gather input, and points for verification of the process and direction on key topics from decision-makers. For example, the outreach strategy and program could include, but not be limited to:

#### Education and Information

- Project brand and logo
- Project-specific website
- Social media updates (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, YouTube)
- Contact list of stakeholders and interested community members
- Frequent e-Blast updates
- Project newsletters

#### Interaction and Engagement

- Community workshops at key locations in the county
- Web-based online forum linked to the project website

#### Validation and Direction

- Committee and commission meetings
- Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors meetings

### **Task 1.6 Community Workshop #1: Issues, Concerns, and Opportunities**

The Consultants will work with County staff to conduct a Community Workshop to identify issues, concerns related to existing form and character of El Dorado County communities and to gather feedback on

community expectations for the design and character of commercial and multifamily developments. The Consultants will work with the County to develop a workshop guide and script that sets for the specific agenda and techniques used for the workshop. The Consultants will also assist with publicizing the workshop.

### **Task 1.7 Steering and Advisory Committee Meetings (Staff led)**

### **Task 1.8 Planning Commission and Board Update (Staff led)**

## **TASK 2 DRAFT PROTOTYPES, GUIDELINES, AND GRAPHICS**

### **Task 2.1 Develop Commercial and Multifamily Prototype Styles**

The Consultants will work with the County to define up to twelve (12) development prototypes or styles that will be used to organize different design features and program elements. The prototypes will address design features commonly dealt with on an undeveloped greenfield site or infill site, and remodel/reuse of an existing residential or commercial structure/site. The prototypes will also consider the likely “commercial” and “multifamily” developments that are allowed under the Zoning Code.

### **Task 2.2 Develop a Menu of Design Features**

For each commercial and multifamily prototype/style, the Consultants will develop detailed menus of specific design features, categorized within common elements of urban form/character. It is expected that the design features will use existing County design guidelines as a starting point (e.g., 1981 Community Design Guide, Historic Design Guide, 1982 Sierra Design Guide), as well as community-specific design guidelines and plans (e.g., 2008 Missouri Flat Design Guidelines, 1993 Meyers Community Plan). The design features will also consider and build upon standards and guidelines in the County’s recently adopted Zoning Code (2015) and 2015 Mixed-Use Design Guidelines.

The urban form/character elements and design features will be accompanied by descriptions of the expected results and/or desired outcomes as well as the types of graphics, sketches, or photographic tools that could be used to illustrate each feature. Specific design features will address common design elements, including, but not limited to area context; building placement and orientation; historic features in small communities such as Georgetown, El Dorado, Diamond Springs and Camino; connectivity, circulation, and parking; bicycle and pedestrian amenities; interface with the public realm; open space and public art; architecture, building massing, scale, and form; design details (e.g., façade, roofing, signage, lighting, materials, colors).

### **Task 2.3 Develop Architectural Themes**

The Consultants will develop up to ten (10) architectural themes for the various characters of communities in El Dorado County. The themes will define the architectural styles and elements that development projects should emulate. The themes will build upon themes defined for existing communities (e.g., Missouri Flat – Agrarian, Craftsman, Gold Rush) and define additional themes (e.g., Railroad, Sierra, Tuscan). It is expected that through community plans or community-specific design guidelines, communities will select the themes that best fit their local context and character.

### **Task 2.4 Develop Design Feature Performance Standards**

Using the urban form/character elements and menu of design features, the Consultants will develop performance standards and a corresponding point system that provides certainty in the project design and design review process. The performance standards will be designed to enable users to rank a project’s ability to achieve conformity with the design guidelines. The Consultants will work with County staff to determine an acceptable minimum level of conformity to be considered consistent with the guidelines, as well as the ranking of the various design features within the point system.

**Task 2.5 Identify Potential Zoning Code Amendments**

Based on the work in Tasks 2.1 through 2.3, the Consultants will identify alternative standards and requirements in the Zoning Code that should be changed or created in order to support the design features and/or performance standards. These code changes will be identified and documented in a technical memorandum provided to County staff for review and confirmation.

**Task 2.6 Community Workshop #2: Alternative Design Concepts**

The Consultants will work with County staff to conduct a Community Workshop to evaluate present findings and option from Tasks 2.1 through 2.5. During the workshop, participants will be presented with various options and engaged in discussions about tradeoffs and expected outcomes of implementing various guidelines and standards. The Consultants will work with the County to develop a workshop guide and script that sets for the specific agenda and techniques used for the workshop. The Consultants will also assist with publicizing the workshop.

**Task 2.7 Steering and Advisory Committee Meetings (Staff led)****Task 2.8 Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors Update (Staff led)****PHASE 3 PREPARE THE DRAFT DESIGN GUIDE AND CODE AMENDMENTS****Task 3.1 Prepare Design Guide Table of Contents and Outline**

The Consultants will develop a table of contents for the updated Design Guide that organizes the work developed in previous tasks. Using the table of contents, the Consultants will prepare an outline for the Design Guide in layout form that identifies and organizes the graphics, illustrations, and text that will be developed for the Administrative Draft Design Guide. The Consultants will provide the table of contents and outline to County staff for review. It is assumed that County staff will approve the outline prior to the Consultants compiling the Administrative Draft Design Guidelines; however, the Guidelines could be organized as follows:

- Introduction
  - Purpose and Objectives
  - Applicability
  - How to Use this Document
  - How this Document was Prepared?
  - Maintaining and Updating the Design Guide
- County and Community Context
  - Applicable Projects and Zones
  - Community Character
  - Commercial Context and Character
  - Multifamily Context and Character
  - Mixed Use Context and Character
  - Assumptions for Commercial, Multifamily, and Mixed-use)
- Design Standards and Guidelines (Commercial, Multifamily, Mixed-use)
  - Site Planning and Amenities
  - Mobility and Access
  - Building Design and Form
  - Landscaping
  - Parking
  - Utilities
  - Signage
  - Lighting
  - Noise and Odor

- Historic Preservation
- Hillsides
- Architectural Themes
  - Agrarian
  - Gold Rush
  - Craftsman
  - Railroad
  - Sierra
  - Tuscan
  - *Others?*
- Design Prototypes
  - The Example Community
  - Using the Prototypes
  - Commercial, Multifamily, Mixed-use Prototypes
- Community-Specific Design Guidelines
  - Community-Specific Design Guidelines Structure and Organization
  - *Community-Specific Design Guidelines*
- Process and Performance Standards
- Implementation and Recommendations

### **Task 3.2 Administrative Draft Design Guide**

Using the Design Guide outline developed in Task 3.1, the Consultants will prepare an Administrative Draft Design Guide for County staff review. The Consultants envision that the Design Guide will include a set of highly illustrated guidelines (text, photos, sketches, and illustrative site plans), including, at a minimum, a description of the authority and applicability of the guidelines, flexibility of implementation and benefits of conformity, organization and use, applicable zones and use types affected (e.g., commercial development), the process for using the guidelines in development design (i.e., by developers/applicants) and project review (i.e., by County staff), and a detailed menu of design features characteristic of commercial and multifamily developments.

### **Task 3.2 Public Review Draft Design Guide and Code Amendments**

Based on County staff review, the Consultants will address County staff comments and prepare public review draft Design Guidelines for public and environmental review. In parallel, the Consultants will prepare draft Zoning Code Amendments based on Staff direction on Task 2.5)

## **PHASE 4 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

*See separate work program options.*

## **PHASE 5 FINAL DOCUMENTS AND ADOPTION**

### **Task 5.1 Adoption Draft Design Guide and Zoning Code Amendments**

Based on public and environmental review, the Consultants will work with County staff to prepare adoption draft Design Guidelines and Zoning Code Amendments for public hearings.

### **Task 5.2 Steering and Advisory Committee Meetings (Staff led)**

### **Task 5.3 Planning Commission Hearing**

The Consultants will attend a Planning Commission hearing for the adoption of the Design Guide, Zoning Code amendments, and certification of the CEQA documents.



### **Task 5.4 Board of Supervisors Update Hearing**

The Consultants will attend a Board of Supervisors hearing for the adoption of the Design Guide, Zoning Code amendments, and certification of the CEQA documents.

### **Task 5.5 Final Design Guidelines**

Following adoption by the Board, the Consultants prepare the final Design Guide document and update the Zoning Code. The Consultants assume County staff will attend second readings for the Zoning Code amendments. The Consultants will provide to the County all native files, graphics, and final PDF documents. The Consultants will provide the references cited in documents, if any, for inclusion in the administrative record.

## **ONGOING PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION**

The Consultants anticipate working closely with County staff throughout the process to ensure the Design Guide reflects the County's expectations and anticipated final work product. The Consultants will coordinate with County staff as necessary during key product developmental tasks via conference calls, face-to-face meetings, and other appropriate methods.

## **OPTIONAL TASKS**

### **Web-Based Design Guidelines**

The Consultants could prepare final web-based Community Design Guide. Rather than just a static hard-copy document, an interactive web-based Design Guide would emphasize ongoing implementation, tracking and monitoring, and feedback from the community. A web-based platform would be a dynamic communication and decision-making tool that provides transparency, accessibility, and efficiency. Project applicants would be able to enter their project type and location in the County and be provided with the guidelines and standards that apply to their project. The web-based plan would be highly graphical and structured and designed to meet the specific needs of the County. It would be searchable, allowing decision-makers and other users to quickly locate relevant information. The online format would allow cross-referenced links to related policies, programs, maps, or background information. Finally, the web-based Guidelines would be designed to allow for hard copy export for those who wish to review the Design Guide as a printable document.

### **Industrial and Public/Quasi-Public Design Guide**

As an option, the Consultants could prepare design guidelines/standards, architectural themes, and prototypes for industrial and public/quasi-public uses as part of the Community Design Guide. It is assumed that adding industrial and public-quasi-public uses would expand the level of effort and detail for design guidelines and standards and architectural design elements included in the report, as well as the number of prototypes.

### **Individual Community Design Guidelines**

Using the countywide Community Design Guide as a foundation, the Consultants could work with individual communities within the county to develop specific community design guidelines that tier off the countywide design guidelines. The Consultants would work with County staff to define the format and structure for the community-specific design guidelines, but it is envisioned they would follow the structure and organization defined in the Community Design Guide. The Consultants envision development of a community-specific design guidelines would include the following major subtasks:

1. Research and Reconnaissance
2. Community Workshop: Issues, Expectations, Opportunities
3. Administrative Draft Design Guidelines
4. Public Review Draft Design Guidelines
5. Community Workshop: Draft Guidelines and Themes
6. Environmental Review

## 7. Final Documents and Adoption

**Economic and Fiscal Analysis**

As an option and in conjunction with Tasks 2.1 through 2.5, the Consultants could conduct economic and fiscal analysis needed for the development of realistic and effective plans, policies, and regulations. The Consultants would develop information about market forces in order to test and shape potential development prototypes so that development parameters are in line with desired outcomes. Economic analysis services may include, but not limited to:

- Evaluating the short- and long-term economic viability of existing commercial and multifamily sites to determine development potential;
- Preparing recommendations for developing housing at various affordability levels either as stand-alone projects or within mixed-use projects;
- Conducting feasibility analysis scenarios for specific projects with community benefits, as needed;
- Determining the most successful funding model to construct shared parking for a planning area;
- Identifying incentives to attract desired uses and means of monitoring implementation;
- Preparing data analysis to support planning efforts presented in graphic formats such as maps and easy-to-understand diagrams and illustrations. Data should be structured in such a way as to feed into the County's geographic information systems (GIS);
- Evaluating opportunities for joint development (e.g. public/private partnerships); and
- Identifying and pursuing new funding (e.g. grants, private, public) opportunities.

**COST ESTIMATE**

<b>Major Tasks</b>	<b>Cost Estimate (Range)</b>	
Review and Reconnaissance	\$20,080	\$24,096
Design Guide and Zoning Code Amendments	\$209,310	\$251,172
Public Outreach	\$67,940	\$81,528
Coordination and Meetings	\$22,120	\$26,544
Direct Expenses	\$20,000	\$24,000
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$339,450</b>	<b>\$407,340</b>
Contingency	\$33,945	\$40,734
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$373,395</b>	<b>\$448,074</b>
<b>Optional Items</b>		
Web-Based Design Guide	\$30,000	\$50,000
Industrial and Public/Quasi-Public Design Guidelines	\$30,000	\$50,000
Economic and Fiscal Analysis	\$75,000	\$100,000
Individual Community Design Guidelines (Per Community)	\$25,000	\$35,000