



# COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

## LONG RANGE PLANNING

---

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667  
Phone (530) 621-4650, Fax (530) 642-0508

Date: February 24, 2015

To: Board of Supervisors

From: Shawna Purvines, Principal Planner

**Subject: Consider General Plan amendments to the El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Shingle Springs, and El Dorado-Diamond Springs Community Region Boundary Lines**

---

### **PURPOSE**

On December 9, 2014, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to prepare a Resolution of Intention (ROI) to consider amending the General Plan Land Use Maps to contract the Community Regions lines for Shingle Springs and the Green Valley Corridor using maps submitted by a Shingle Springs resident and an El Dorado Hills/Rescue area resident. The draft ROI and associated maps are attached (Attachment 6B); the ROI and maps propose General Plan amendments to the Community Region lines for Shingle Springs, El Dorado/Diamond Springs, Cameron Park and El Dorado Hills.

The Board also directed staff to return to the Board with options to fund the proposed General Plan amendment. A discussion and recommendation regarding funding options is provided below.

Finally, the Board began discussing staff priorities and provided staff with some direction. Since this discussion did not take into account a number of other County-initiated land use and transportation projects being managed by Long Range Planning (LRP), staff recommended having a comprehensive discussion about project prioritization during today's hearing. A discussion and recommendation regarding project prioritization is provided below.

### **BACKGROUND**

The Board has received a number of requests from members of the public to amend specific Community Region lines in Camino/Pollock Pines, Shingle Springs, and the north El Dorado Hills/Cameron Park area along Green Valley Road. Attachment 6C provides a chronology and summary of the 12 Board hearings held from 2009-2014 regarding these requests.

On December 9, 2014, the Board directed staff to prepare a ROI to consider amending the General Plan Land Use Maps to contract the Community Regions lines for Shingle Springs and

the Green Valley Corridor using maps submitted by a Shingle Springs resident and an El Dorado Hills/Rescue area resident.

On December 16, 2014, during the “Open Forum” period of the Board’s Agenda, members of the public asked that a similar General Plan amendment be considered for Camino/Pollock Pines. The County’s Targeted General Plan Amendment (TGPA) project includes a proposed change to the Camino/Pollock Pines Community Region: the change would eliminate the Community Region line and replace it with three Rural Centers. The TGPA is scheduled to be at the Board for final consideration in June 2016. Should the Board want to initiate a separate General Plan amendment for Camino/Pollock Pines, the draft ROI would need to be revised.

## **DISCUSSION**

The maps attached to the ROI (Attachment 6B; Exhibits A-C) propose General Plan amendments that would modify Community Regions and Rural Centers by: (1) eliminating the Community Region line from Shingle Springs and converting portions of Shingle Springs to a Rural Center, and; (2) removing specified areas from the El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Shingle Springs and El Dorado-Diamond Springs Community Regions and applying the General Plan Platted Lands overlay on certain areas contiguous to those communities. These proposed General Plan amendments are substantially similar to the General Plan amendments proposed via the recent Measure O voter initiative. The County Chief Administrative Office (CAO) staff provided the following overview to the Board on August 26, 2014 regarding the General Plan amendments sought by the Measure O initiative:

*One direct effect of this measure’s conversion of certain areas from Community Regions to Rural Centers or Rural Regions is that the development standards applicable to the subject areas will change because the General Plan prescribes different standards for Community Regions, Rural Centers, and Rural Regions. Analysis would be required to determine fiscal, safety and other effects (e.g., revisions to applicable capital improvement plans) resulting from such changes, including changing roadway Level of Service (“LOS”) standards from E to D and reducing required response times for fire districts, sheriff, and ambulances.*

*The measure could have the indirect effect of reducing the amount of opportunities and land available for residential development within Community Regions as contemplated in the General Plan. Such a reduction could potentially lead to the underutilization of existing infrastructure (roads, water, and sewer).*

*Finally, by applying the Platted Lands overlay to the specified areas, the measure would potentially freeze the land use designation for those areas. The indirect effect on adjacent parcels, however, is unclear. It is possible that parcels adjacent to the Platted Lands would also be affected because the Platted Lands overlay precludes adjacent parcels from using the existence of the Platted lands overlay as precedent to expand or establish new incompatible land uses.*

As noted in the CAO’s staff report, the overview presented was at a limited depth due to several constraints, including the number of other initiatives also being reviewed, the complex nature of the initiative, and the short time available for the review. A comprehensive review of all related General Plan text, maps and other County Ordinances would be completed as part of the proposed project that would be initiated by the attached ROI.

### Requirement for General Plan Consistency

State law (Government Code 65300.5) requires General Plans to maintain internal consistency, both between General Plan elements and within each element itself. Existing General Plan text and policies related to the proposed General Plan amendments (Attachment 6D) will need to be reviewed to ensure the proposed General Plan amendments are consistent with existing General Plan text/policy; should any inconsistencies be found, the proposed General Plan amendments to the Community Region line or the existing General Plan text/policy language would need to be revised to maintain internal consistency.

### Environmental Review

An Initial Study will be prepared. Issues identified in the Initial Study, along with any other requirements for consistency with plans and policies, would be addressed through the environmental review process. The Initial Study will determine the appropriate level of environmental document to prepare for this project (i.e. Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report [EIR]).

### Project Priority

The Board began discussing LRP priorities during the December 9, 2014 hearing and provided the following direction: “Staff is given the following as priorities from the Board (not in priority order and may be modified): Land Use Policy Programmatic Update, Sign Ordinance, General Plan Biological Policy Review, Community Region Boundary Lines.” As part of the discussion on the motion, Board members also noted that the Major Capital Improvement Program and Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee update was a top priority. Since this discussion did not take into account a number of other County-initiated land use and transportation projects being managed by LRP, staff recommended having a comprehensive discussion about project prioritization when the draft Community Region line ROI was brought to the Board.

To that end, staff has prepared a draft matrix (Attachment 6E) to help the Board prioritize all existing and proposed County-initiated land use and transportation projects managed by LRP. The matrix evaluates each project relative to how it addresses four key priorities:

1. Get projects done by finishing what we've started
2. Economic development
3. Set strong countywide foundation
4. Address requirements

These four priorities are based on key messages staff has heard repeatedly from the Board and County leadership. The matrix shows how the County-initiated land use and transportation projects managed by LRP could be prioritized based on achieving these four priorities. The project list, four priorities, and analysis contained within the matrix are offered as a starting point for discussions.

In order to prioritize these projects and the related workload and budget, staff recommends the Board:

1. Review the draft matrix, including the project list, the four priorities, the analysis regarding how each project works towards implementing identified priorities, other LRP projects and ongoing responsibilities, and the resulting recommended project prioritization;

2. Modify the matrix (including the project list, four priorities, analysis, project prioritization, etc.), if necessary, to better reflect the Board's priorities, and;
3. Endorse a final matrix or list that prioritizes all County-initiated land use and transportation projects managed by LRP and direct staff to return to the Board every six (6) months to provide an update and reprioritize as necessary.

Understanding the Board's project priorities will help staff to better align budgeting and staffing decisions with Board expectations.

### **Funding**

The County did not budget for this expense in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014/15 budget. The largest cost variable for this project is the unknown level of analysis required pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA costs could range from \$10,000-20,000 in staff time (100-200 hours @~\$100/hr.) to prepare a Negative Declaration, up to \$150,000 in consultant costs if an EIR is necessary. The Initial Study prepared by staff will determine the appropriate level of environmental document to prepare for this project; however, staff and counsel analysis to date indicates that an EIR may be necessary (Attachment 6F). The Board could allocate money from the General Fund contingency to fund this analysis or discuss funding as part of the FY 2015/16 budget. Given the County's current budget situation and the outlook for FY 2015/16, staff recommends discussing funding for this project as part of the FY 2015/16 budget rather than using General Fund contingency.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Board:

- 1) Endorse a final matrix or list that prioritizes all County-initiated land use and transportation projects managed by LRP and direct staff to return to the Board every six (6) months to provide an update and reprioritize as necessary;
- 2) Adopt the draft Resolution of Intention (Attachment 6B; Exhibits A-C) prepared for proposed General Plan amendments to contract the Community Region lines for El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Shingle Springs and El Dorado-Diamond Springs;
- 3) Discuss funding for processing this project as part of the FY 2015/16 budget, and;
- 4) Determine the Community Region Boundary Lines Project's priority and preferred method for processing based on staff and funding availability.