

3 DESCRIPTION OF EQUAL-WEIGHT PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is the adoption of a General Plan for El Dorado County. California state law requires each jurisdiction to adopt a General Plan "... for the physical development of the county or city, and any land outside its boundaries which ... bears relation to its planning" (Government Code §65300). The purpose of a community's General Plan is to act as a "constitution" for land use planning and to provide a basis for sound decisions regarding long-term physical development. The General Plan expresses the community's development goals and establishes public policy relative to the distribution of future land uses, both public and private. The General Plan also provides the bridge between community values, visions and objectives, and physical decisions such as subdivisions and public works projects. The General Plan must cover a local jurisdiction's entire planning area, and address the broad range of issues associated with development.

3.2 SETTING

3.2.1 REGIONAL LOCATION

El Dorado County is located in northern California, bordered by Placer County to the north, Amador and Alpine counties to the south, and Sacramento County to the west; the state of Nevada borders El Dorado County to the east (Exhibit 3-1). The county is located in the central Sierra Nevada, east of the Central Valley. The city of Sacramento is just west of the county's westernmost border. The eastern border of the county runs through Lake Tahoe, high in the Sierra Nevada.

3.2.2 DESCRIPTION OF EL DORADO COUNTY

The county is divided geographically into two distinct regions: the west slope of the Sierra Nevada (west slope) and the Lake Tahoe Basin (Exhibit 3-2). The Eldorado National Forest is located between the two regions, further accentuating the distinct characteristics of the county and substantially influencing the county's development pattern.

U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50), running east to west, bisects the county and, along with proximity to the Sacramento region's urban core, has profoundly influenced development patterns. Recent development and population growth tends to be concentrated on the west slope along the U.S. 50 corridor, where the climate is relatively mild compared to the Lake Tahoe Basin and where development pressure is most actively felt near Sacramento County.

Exhibit 3-1
Regional Map
B&W
letter size

EXHIBIT 3-2
PROJECT LOCATION MAP
FOLD OUT
COLOR

EXHIBIT 3-2

PROJECT LOCATION MAP

FOLD OUT

COLOR

PAGE 2

Substantial development has also occurred along the south shore of Lake Tahoe, near the recreational opportunities of that area and the Nevada casinos.

PHYSICAL FEATURES

El Dorado County covers approximately 1,789 square miles (1,145,385 acres) ranging from the residential foothills of El Dorado Hills to the high Sierra Nevada mountain range. The Sierra Nevada, Middle Fork and South Fork American River, and Lake Tahoe are among the county's primary natural features. El Dorado County is traversed by several major roadways including U.S. 50 and State Routes (SRs) 49, 88, and 89. Elevations range from 200 feet above sea level at the western end of the county to 10,881 feet atop Freel Peak on the edge of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The county has considerable topographic variation, with more than half of the land area having slopes in excess of 25%.

Approximately 864,000 acres of El Dorado County are forestland (Shih 2002). Agricultural land comprised approximately 153,000 acres in 2000 (National Agricultural Statistics Service 1997). The county's two largest agricultural crops are wine grapes from the vineyards of the Fairplay and Apple Hill areas and apples from the Apple Hill and Gold Hill regions. The county is also a mining region, capable of producing a wide variety of mineral resources.

The county has a rich diversity of lakes and rivers, natural plant communities, and wildlife. A unique soil type (gabbro soils) supports an array of plant species that are rare, endangered, or declining throughout their range. A substantial number of these plant populations are protected in the Pine Hill Ecological Preserve, located in five areas totaling approximately 3,550 acres in the Pine Hill area between Cameron Park and Salmon Falls.

NONJURISDICTIONAL AREAS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE GENERAL PLAN

Nonjurisdictional lands represent areas that are controlled by agencies other than the County, and which, therefore are not subject to the provisions in the County General Plan. These areas typically have their own distinct planning processes and land use guidelines.

Nonjurisdictional areas comprise nearly half of the land area within El Dorado County. Of the total county area (1,145,385 acres), 531,923 acres are regulated by federal, state, or local jurisdictions and are not subject to County land use regulations. These lands are under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) (Eldorado National Forest, Tahoe National Forest, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit), U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) (Folsom Reservoir), U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM), other federal agencies, the California Department of Parks and Recreation, and other state agencies. Other nonjurisdictional land

includes the cities of Placerville and South Lake Tahoe. For purposes of this EIR, the Shingle Springs Rancheria (approximately 160 acres) is also considered nonjurisdictional land.¹

3.2.3 BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF THE GENERAL PLAN PROCESS

Long-range land use planning in El Dorado County commenced with the development of individual land use plans for specific areas of the county in the 1950s and 1960s. It was not until the adoption of the 1969 El Dorado County General Plan that a comprehensive countywide approach to land use planning was implemented. Subsequently, a set of 24 area plans, which represented updates to the Land Use Element of the 1969 General Plan, became the primary planning tool for the next two decades and again focused on the development of specific areas within the county. However, the area plans did not meet all of the requirements for a legally adequate general plan, such as a coordinated circulation element and housing element.

In 1989, the County began an update to its General Plan. The purposes of the General Plan update initiated in 1989 were to:

- < to develop a legally adequate General Plan with all of the necessary elements,
- < accurately reflect the urbanizing nature of part of the county,
- < clearly establish land use and development policies reflecting the goals and objectives of county residents,
- < minimize the need for future General Plan amendments, and
- < ensure internal consistency between each of the General Plan elements.

In 1992, as a result of concerns about the legal adequacy of the area plans, the County applied to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) for an extension of time for the preparation of a General Plan. OPR granted the request; subsequent extensions were granted in 1993 and 1994. In 1995, after the number of extensions allowed by OPR had been exhausted, legislation was enacted extending the time for adoption of the plan by an additional 6 months. OPR allowed the County to use a Draft General Plan it prepared in January 1994 ("Public Review Draft General Plan") to govern its land use decisions while the General Plan and its EIR were being prepared. A Draft EIR for the proposed General Plan was completed in late 1995. Following the release of the Draft EIR, the Planning Commission held hearings on the Draft General Plan and made significant changes to the proposed plan,

¹ See Footnote 1 in Chapter 1.

including more than 300 changes to the land use maps that were requested by individual landowners. The Draft EIR was not revised or recirculated after the Planning Commission's changes. The Board adopted the General Plan, in substantially the form recommended by the Planning Commission, on January 23, 1996.

WRIT OF MANDATE

The community was deeply divided over land use issues and the General Plan. Litigation challenging the General Plan and General Plan EIR was filed immediately after its adoption (*El Dorado County Taxpayers for Quality Growth, et al. v. El Dorado County Board of Supervisors and El Dorado County*). In February 1999, the Sacramento Superior Court ruled on the matter and found that the adoption of the General Plan violated CEQA in several respects. On July 19, 1999, the court issued a Writ of Mandate (Writ) setting aside the General Plan and defining the County's authority to take land use actions pending modification of the General Plan EIR.

The Writ directed the County to void and set aside its approval of the EIR for the 1996 General Plan as well as the General Plan itself. To guide land use decisions in the County pending preparation of a new EIR, the Writ requires the County to comply with the following principles:

- < No discretionary residential housing development (e.g., tentative subdivision maps, rezones, planned developments) may be approved except pursuant to development agreements (DAs) or tentative maps approved before the court decision.
- < Ministerial actions (e.g., approval of residential building permits, grading permits, final subdivision maps [where tentative maps were approved before the Writ was issued], limited multifamily projects) may proceed.
- < Commercial development and other nonresidential development may be approved provided that it is consistent with the land use designations of the 1996 General Plan and with the land use designations and policies of the January 11, 1994, "Public Review Draft General Plan," and it would not significantly impair the County's ability to adopt and implement a new General Plan.
- < Remodels and minor modifications may proceed.
- < Projects exempt from CEQA may proceed.
- < Projects approved by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and/or consistent with TRPA regulations may proceed.
- < Capital improvement projects serving existing or approved development may proceed.

Land use decisions in the County have been governed by these principles since the Writ was issued in July 1999 and will continue to be until the County adopts a new general plan in compliance with the Writ and the Writ is discharged.

MEASURE Y

Before the 1996 General Plan was rescinded pursuant to the Writ, county voters approved Measure Y on November 3, 1998. Measure Y, known as the “Control Traffic Congestion Initiative,” added the following five new policies to the Circulation Element of the 1996 General Plan:

- < Before giving approval of any kind to a residential development project of five or more units or parcels of land, the County shall make a finding that the project complies with the policies added by this initiative. If this finding cannot be made, then the County shall not approve the project, or give final approval to a tentative subdivision map, until all these policy findings can be made in order to protect the public’s health and safety as provided by state law to assure that safe and adequate roads are in place as such development occurs. (Policy 3.2.1.5)
- < Developer-paid traffic impact fees shall fully pay for building all necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development upon any highways, arterial roads, and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county. (Policy 3.2.2.4)
- < County tax revenues shall not be used in any way to pay for building road capacity improvements to offset traffic impacts from new development projects. Exceptions are allowed if county voters first give their approval. (Policy 3.2.2.5)
- < Traffic from residential development projects of five or more units or parcels of land shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service “F” (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange, or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county. (Policy 3.5.1.6.1)
- < The County shall not add any additional segments of Highway 50, or any other roads, to the County’s list of roads that are allowed to operate at Level of Service “F” (gridlock) without first getting the voters’ approval. (Policy 3.5.1.6.2)

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS AND SUBDIVISION MAPS

Under the El Dorado Hills Investors DA (“El Dorado Hills Specific Plan,” also known as “Serrano”), 6,162 dwelling units were approved before the 1996 General Plan was adopted.

The DA vested certain rights to develop the project and restricted the County's ability to modify those approvals. In the 3 years between adoption of the General Plan and the court decision ordering that the General Plan be set aside, the Board of Supervisors approved five more DAs—Carson Creek, Promontory, Marble Valley, Valley View, and Bass Lake Hills. All of these projects, with the exception of Marble Valley, have Specific Plans. These projects shown in Exhibit 3-3 permitted a total of over 11,000 dwelling units to be built over the life of the DAs. Anticipated buildout of the DAs will result in the following:

- < Bass Lake Hills (DAs expire in 2016): 1,025 units ²
- < Carson Creek (DA expires in 2018): 1,470 units ³
- < Marble Valley (DA expires in 2018): 398 units
- < Promontory (DA expires in 2018): 1,097 units
- < Serrano (DA expires in 2009): 4,481 units ⁴
- < Valley View (DA expires in 2019): 2,837 units

These DAs allow the landowners to develop subject to the density and intensity of land uses contemplated in the General Plan and Specific Plan in effect at the time the DA was signed. In other words, development under the DAs has a protected (“vested”) right to proceed. Many of these DAs contain conditions designed to reduce the environmental impacts of the permitted development. For example, the Valley View DA contains Condition T-16, which imposes concurrency requirements similar to those imposed by Measure Y. However, the DAs generally prohibit the application of new regulations to the extent those regulations would preclude development at the vested density or intensity.

In addition to DAs, the County also approved a number of tentative subdivision maps and other permits prior to the time the Writ was issued in 1999. A total of 3,257 units were approved through parcel maps, tentative subdivision maps, or other permits and had not expired at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this project was issued.

CURRENT GENERAL PLAN PROCESS

Following entry of the Writ in July 1999, County staff initiated modifications to the General Plan EIR in response to the Writ. In early 2001, the Board of Supervisors identified the

² Decreased from 1,458 dwelling units in Specific Plan based on executed DAs.

³ Decreased from 1,700 dwelling units in Specific Plan as a result of a Settlement Agreement.

⁴ Decreased from 6,162 dwelling units in Specific Plan based on infrastructure financing and actual map approval.

Exhibit 3-3
Specific Plans and Subdivision Maps Subject to DAs
B&W
letter

completion of the General Plan process as its highest priority. At this time it was also determined that the EIR should analyze something different from the 1996 General Plan as the preferred alternative. This new plan alternative was labeled the “2001 Project Description Alternative.”

On August 6, 2001, the County issued a CEQA NOP (Appendix A) commencing the EIR process. A total of 51 comment letters were received on the NOP (Appendix A)

Preliminary analysis commenced. On March 5, 2002, the County released a report that forecast the potential level of development in 2025 and at buildout (EPS 2002a, 2002b) for the 2001 Project Description Alternative, the No Project Alternative, and the 1996 General Plan Alternative (Appendix B-1). Preliminary traffic analysis demonstrated that the differences in terms of traffic impacts between the 2001 Project Description Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative were minimal. This was important, because traffic impacts on county roads and highways are a primary area of community concern. The Board had anticipated that the 2001 Project Description Alternative would result in substantially less development than the 1996 General Plan, which turned out not to be the case. Therefore, the Board directed that the EIR consider the four equal-weight alternatives analyzed in this document.

In addition to the 1996 General Plan and No Project Alternative, Planning Department staff developed two alternatives that addressed concerns raised by the public in comments on the Notice of Preparation. One is the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, or a constraints-based plan that identified physical and environmental limitations on development and located potential areas for growth in the areas with the fewest limitations. The details of this alternative are discussed below under that alternative.

The other alternative developed for full, equal-weight analysis is the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative. This alternative is based on the premise that U.S. 50 will not be widened to more than six through lanes, and that the ability of the County’s road system to carry the expected traffic would constrain growth and dictate the location, density, and intensity of land use designations throughout the county. The provisions of Measure Y, The Control Traffic Congestion Initiative, played an important role in setting the parameters for development of this alternative. Taking into account existing approved development commitments (development agreements and approved tentative maps), the County performed traffic modeling for the No Project Alternative to provide a baseline for road capacity. This showed that, without any additional development, U.S. 50 and several other major roads would exceed the LOS standards of Measure Y (i.e., that portions of U.S. 50 would operate at LOS F). Because Measure Y exempts, to some degree, the development of four or fewer parcels, staff then identified those lands that would have been able to develop under the 1996

General Plan, but modified the land use designations to limit the number of lots that could be created to a maximum of four. Further restrictions to preclude additional, subsequent subdivision of land are included in policy language of this alternative.

On July 16, 2002, the Board of Supervisors directed that the 2001 Project Description Alternative no longer be identified as the “preferred” alternative, but rather as one of several “comparative” alternatives because of the fact that it yielded similar traffic modeling results to the 1996 General Plan alternative. Additionally, the Board directed that the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives be elevated to “equal-weight” alternatives in the EIR and be fully analyzed for environmental impacts along with the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives. Subsequently, land use forecast reports for the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives were prepared (Appendices B-2 and B-3). A comprehensive description of the land use forecast methodology, assumptions, and results is presented in Chapter 4, Land Use Forecasts and Development Estimates, of this EIR.

Throughout August 2002, 10 public workshops were held by various County committees and commissions, including the Trails Committee of the Parks and Recreation Commission, the Parks and Recreation Commission, the Cultural Resources Preservation Commission, the Agricultural Commission, the River Management Advisory Committee, the Plant and Wildlife Technical Advisory Committee, and the Planning Commission. In addition, 60 written comments were received on the General Plan preliminary policy language, along with 61 requests to modify the land use designations on 340 individual parcels (Appendix A).⁵

3.3 PROJECT COMPONENTS AND CHARACTERISTICS

3.3.1 OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

The project is adoption of a General Plan for the County with a planning horizon of 2025. The General Plan is the blueprint for the community’s future. It provides visions, principles, goals and policies, and various diagrams (in particular the land use and circulation diagrams) to guide the County’s decisions about growth through 2025. Four fully developed plan alternatives are under consideration: No Project, Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus,” Environmentally Constrained, and 1996 General Plan. Each of these alternatives is described in greater detail later in this section. In addition, there are eight comparative alternatives.

⁵ Many of these requests were the same as those received during the public hearing for the 1996 General Plan and had already been incorporated into the 1996 General Plan.

Each of the equal-weight alternatives of the draft General Plan includes the seven state-mandated elements (land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety). Five optional elements (public services and utilities, agriculture and forestry, parks and recreation, economic development, and Tahoe) are included in the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives. The Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives include all of these optional elements except the Tahoe Element; in these alternatives, Tahoe-related policies and information are incorporated directly into other General Plan elements.

Each of the four equal-weight alternatives is evaluated at an equal level of detail in this EIR, to enable the Board of Supervisors to select any one land use map and/or set of goals and policies, a hybrid of land use plans and/or goals and policies from one or more alternatives, or a combination of features from one or more alternatives. These alternatives were chosen to cover a comprehensive range of reasonable possibilities and to be used to craft the final land use plan out of components of each alternative.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The overarching objective of a General Plan is to guide a jurisdiction’s growth over a long-term planning horizon, in a manner consistent with the community’s vision of its long-term physical form and development. The General Plan is intended to reflect the community’s expressions of quality of life and community values; satisfy the mandates of state law; and serve as the basis for community decision-making regarding the designations of land uses and the allocation of resources.

Specific objectives of the proposed General Plan, applicable to all project alternatives, include:

- < Maintenance of the county’s natural beauty and environmental quality (wildlife and vegetation, air and water quality, cultural resources, and rural character).
- < A strong economy sustaining each community, supported by agriculture, resource extraction, tourism, research and development, and services.
- < Development occurring in distinct communities, separated by open space and resource areas.
- < Availability of sufficient public services and utilities concurrent with development to meet the needs of county residents and businesses.
- < A safe, efficient, and effective transportation system.

- < A jobs/housing balance, particularly the provision of housing that is affordable to those working in El Dorado County.
- < Sufficient park and recreation facilities throughout the county.

ORGANIZATION OF THE GENERAL PLAN

Each of the Draft General Plan alternatives is organized into an Introduction chapter and various “elements.” The Introduction chapter provides background on the General Plan process. It includes the vision statements for the General Plan. Key planning issues are identified and described. Each of the elements includes an introduction and a list of goals and policies. In addition, in the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives, an implementation program is identified as part of the text. This is designed to assist the County in establishing priorities and a time frame for follow-up to the adoption of the General Plan.

Following the introduction are the seven state-mandated elements (several have been combined as allowed by state law) and the optional elements: Land Use; Circulation; Housing; Public Services and Utilities; Health Safety, and Noise; Conservation and Open Space; Agriculture and Forestry; Parks and Recreation; and Economic Development. The optional elements are treated just like mandated elements in that they must be internally consistent, have implementation programs, etc.

In addition, in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternative, there is a Tahoe Element. Because of the unique issues in the Lake Tahoe Basin and the unique regulatory framework, the County decided to handle Lake Tahoe Basin issues separately in the previous General Plan. The Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives eliminate the separate Tahoe Element, establish TRPA’s land use designations as the applicable designations in the Lake Tahoe Basin portion of the county, and where appropriate incorporate basin-specific policies throughout the other General Plan elements. A brief overview of each element follows.

Land Use Element

The Land Use Element addresses the requirements of §65302(a) of the Government Code. The Land Use Element designates the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of land for all public and private purposes. This element contains the General Plan land use maps (Exhibits 3-4, 3-6, and 3-8) and the descriptions of the various designations of land contemplated countywide, which together allow countywide density and

intensity of development at full buildout to be determined and analyzed. Included in the text of the Land Use Element for the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives is a discussion of geographic setting, historic land use patterns, environmental setting, population projections, employment projections, the land use map and designations, and goals, objectives, and policies categorized as follows: urban and suburban development, rural development, Lake Tahoe Basin, visual quality, general and administrative provisions. As required by Government Code §65302, the Land Use Element considers flooding and timber production issues. These issues are also addressed in the Health, Safety and Noise Element (flooding) and the Agricultural and Forestry Element (timber production).

Transportation and Circulation Element

The Transportation and Circulation Element addresses the requirements of §65302(b) of the Government Code, except for “other local public utilities or facilities,” which are addressed in the Public Services and Utilities Element. This element provides the framework for decisions regarding the countywide transportation system. It includes the circulation diagrams (Exhibits 3-5, 3-7, and 3-9) showing all existing and planned regionally significant roadways. It establishes functional classifications and capacities for all roadways, and establishes minimum levels of service. Included in the text of this element for the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives is a discussion of the bikeway system and transit corridors. Goals and policies are categorized as follows: streets and highways, transit, transportation systems management, bicycle facilities, rail transportation, and air transportation. Policies comparable to those approved by the voters in Measure Y are included in this element.

Housing Element

The Housing Element addresses the requirements of §65583 of the Government Code. This element provides a housing needs assessment, quantified objectives, inventory of vacant land uses, governmental and nongovernmental constraints, and review of the previous Housing Element. Included in the text of this element are a discussion of the regulatory framework, background information, an overview of the Regional Housing Needs Plan, and a discussion of income levels. Goals, policies, and implementation programs are categorized as follows: affordable housing, conservation and rehabilitation, at-risk unit preservation, special needs, energy conservation, and equal opportunity. Also discussed are demographic characteristics, employment and income, physical housing characteristics, housing cost, and affordability. This element is the same for all four of the equal-weight alternatives.

Public Services and Utilities Element

The Public Services and Utilities Element addresses “other public utilities and facilities” required by Government Code §65302(b). This element addresses general public-service and utility delivery, water supply, wastewater collection and treatment, storm drainage and flood control, solid-waste processing and disposal, emergency law enforcement service, library and cultural facilities, school facilities, and utility service.

Health, Safety, and Noise Element

The Health, Safety, and Noise Element addresses noise as required by Government Code §65302(f) and safety as required by Government Code §65302(g). This element addresses emergency preparedness and planning, fire safety, seismic and geologic hazards, flood hazards, noise, hazardous materials, air quality, and airport safety.

Conservation and Open Space Element

The Conservation and Open Space Element addresses the requirements of §65302(d) and §65560 of the Government Code. This element addresses geologic resources (soils and mineral resources), water resources (water quality), biological resources (vegetation, fish, and wildlife habitat), cultural resources, and open space.

Agriculture and Forestry Element

The Agriculture and Forestry Element focuses on protection of the County’s agricultural and timber resources.

Parks and Recreation Element

The Parks and Recreation Element examines park and recreation opportunities provided both publicly and privately in the county, provides a foundation for comprehensive parks and trail master plans, and establishes a framework for detailed recreation facility design and operations policy.

Economic Development Element

The Economic Development Element examines the county’s economic base and establishes a policy framework for the economic future.

Tahoe Element

As discussed above, policies specific to the Lake Tahoe Basin are set forth in a separate element under the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives. In the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives, these policies are incorporated throughout the other General Plan elements.

3.3.2 EQUAL-WEIGHT ALTERNATIVES

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to allow for informed decision-making and meaningful public participation (State CEQA Guidelines [Guidelines] §15126(d)(5)). The EIR must describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project or its location that would feasibly attain most of the project’s basic objectives, but would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of the project.

The EIR must include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison among the alternatives (Guidelines §15126(d)(3)). This becomes the factual basis for reaching conclusions about the feasibility of various alternatives.

The following 12 alternatives have been identified by the County for examination and analysis in this EIR:

- < Equal-Weight Alternative #1: No Project (Writ Constrained)
- < Equal-Weight Alternative #2: Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus”
- < Equal-Weight Alternative #3: Environmentally Constrained
- < Equal-Weight Alternative #4: 1996 General Plan
- < Comparative Alternative #5: 2001 Project Description
- < Comparative Alternative #6: Roadway Constrained six-Lane
- < Comparative Alternative #7: Roadway Constrained eight-Lane
- < Comparative Alternative #8: Modified Development Agreements
- < Comparative Alternative #9: Modified El Dorado Hills Development South of U.S. 50
- < Comparative Alternative #10: New White Rock Road Connection
- < Comparative Alternative #11: Transit Emphasis
- < Comparative Alternative #12: Compact Development

As indicated by the naming conventions, the first four of these alternatives have been identified for equal-weight analysis in Chapter 5, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this EIR.

This level of detail for all alternatives is not required by CEQA, but was determined by the County to be appropriate in order to provide the Board of Supervisors with a full range of options for decision-making, to fully address public concerns, and to disclose sufficient information. The remaining eight alternatives are described and examined at a comparative, but lesser level of detail in Chapter 6, Alternatives Analysis, in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines §15126(d). Each of the equal-weight alternatives is described in detail below, beginning with a discussion of factors common to each alternative, and then key factors that differ between them. The full text of each of the equal-weight alternatives is available in the General Plan documents.

Factors Common to Each Equal-Weight Alternative

There are several factors common to all of the equal-weight alternatives. Policy-based commonalities are described below.

Use of the Community Region, Rural Center, and Rural Region Planning Area Concepts

The land use maps for all of the alternatives designate a greater concentration of higher density residential uses and commercial lands in Community Regions and Rural Centers.

Community Regions are centered on existing larger communities that provide the greatest levels of services and infrastructure that already support population centers. The location and boundaries of Community Regions are based on a variety of factors: the extent of existing development; the availability of infrastructure; the location of transportation corridors, topographic features, and other physical constraints; spheres of influence of cities and service providers; and the ability to provide and maintain appropriate transitions at Community Region boundaries.

Rural Centers are smaller community “hubs” that provide limited services. They are comprised of smaller concentrations of higher density residential and commercial lands located throughout the rural areas of the county. Rural Centers are typically centered on historic town sites. The primary purpose of Rural Centers is to provide a focus of activity for and services to those living in, working in, and visiting the county’s Rural Regions.

The remainder of the County that does not fall within Community Regions and Rural Centers are considered “rural regions.” The majority of lands in El Dorado County are designated as Rural Regions, which are those areas outside of the Community Regions and Rural Centers not suitable for high-intensity land uses (i.e., Multifamily Residential, High-Density

Residential, Medium-Density Residential, Commercial, Research and Development, and Industrial uses).

The Rural Regions are dominated by Natural Resource lands, although there are many areas of rural residential land (i.e., Low-Density Residential and Rural Lands), much of which is undeveloped. The Rural Regions are very important for resource-based land uses (i.e., agricultural and timber production and mineral resource extraction) and protection of natural resources and open space. Although much of the land in the Rural Regions is managed by the U.S. Forest Service (in the Eldorado National Forest, Tahoe National Forest, and the Tahoe Basin Management Unit), many thousands of acres are still under the County's jurisdiction. Therefore, it is important for the County to provide rural development standards that facilitate resource-based activities and conserve important natural resources. While residential uses are allowed in the Rural Regions, the primary focus for these areas is conservation and utilization of the natural resources.

Although all four of the equal-weight alternatives use these planning area concepts, the quantity and size of these planning areas are different across alternatives; these distinctions are described under Extent of Community Regions, Rural Centers, and Rural Regions below. As a result of these mapping differences and other factors, the distribution patterns for projected future growth differ for each alternative.

Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F

Under each of the alternatives, the roadway segments shown in Table 3-1 are allowed to operate at LOS F and cannot exceed the volume to capacity (V/C) ratios listed in the table.

Nonautomobile Transportation

All of the equal-weight alternatives have an equal emphasis on the nature and extent of nonautomobile transportation modes. These modes include transit, bicycle transportation, rail transportation, and aviation. Comparative Alternative #11 (Transit Emphasis) goes beyond this base assumption in emphasizing the use of transit (see discussion in Chapter 6, Analysis of Comparative Alternatives, of this EIR).

Measure Y—The “Control Traffic Congestion” Initiative

As described above, in 1998 El Dorado County voters adopted Measure Y, which added five new policies to the Circulation Element of the 1996 General Plan. All of the equal-weight alternatives include these policies.

Table 3-1 Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F		
Roadway	Segment	Maximum V/C Ratio
Cambridge Road	Country Club Drive to Oxford Road	1.07
Cameron Park Drive	Robin Lane to Coach Lane	1.11
Missouri Flat Road	U.S. 50 to Mother Lode Drive	1.12
	Mother Lode Drive to China Garden Road	1.20
Pleasant Valley Road	El Dorado Road to SR 49 (S)	1.28
U.S. 50	Canal Street to junction of SR 49	1.25
	Junction of SR 49 to Coloma Street	1.59
	Coloma Street to Bedford Avenue	1.61
	Bedford Avenue to Begin freeway	1.73
	Begin freeway to Washington Overhead	1.16
	Ice House Road to Echo Summit	1.16
SR 49	Pacific/Sacramento Streets to new four-lane section in Diamond Springs	1.31
	U.S. 50 to SR 193 (N)	1.32
	SR 193 to Placer County line	1.51
Source: El Dorado County 1996		

Residential Development Allowed by Right

All of the equal-weight alternatives allow residential construction on vacant legal parcels “by right.” This includes construction of a primary residence as well as a second unit, as allowed under state law.

The factual, legal, and methodological assumptions described below are also common to each alternative.

2025 Planning Horizon and Buildout

The impacts of each of the four equal-weight alternatives were analyzed under two scenarios: the impacts expected in 2025 and the impacts expected at full buildout. The planning horizon for each of the alternatives is 2025. The EIR analyzed the reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts that would occur through the year 2025 using each alternative’s projected growth during that time period. The projected amount and distribution of growth expected in each alternative by 2025 was developed for the County by the firm of Economic and Planning Systems (EPS) using economic forecasting.

In addition, the EIR analyzes the potential environmental impacts that each of the equal-weight alternatives would have if every parcel in the county were developed to the maximum density and intensity allowed by the land use map and policies associated with that alternative. This analysis is called the “buildout” analysis. The buildout analysis does not consider any particular time frame, because the date that any of the alternatives might be fully built out is unknown. According to the forecasting done by EPS, none of the alternatives would come close to approaching full buildout within the next 20 years. Indeed, it is not expected that any of the alternatives would reach this theoretical “full buildout,” because many parcels would develop at lower densities than allowed because of physical, geographic, economic, and other constraints. However, this additional analysis provides an analysis of the worst-case scenario under each of the alternatives.

Existing Residential Commitments

All of the equal-weight alternatives assume construction of the following as “existing commitments”: (1) residential and commercial development allowed under the DAs adopted before Judge Bond’s 1999 ruling on the 1996 General Plan; and (2) tentative maps approved before Judge Bond’s ruling that had not expired at the time the NOP was released in August 2001. In total, existing residential commitments represent approximately 14,565 new dwelling units that have been approved for development in El Dorado County. These existing commitments include only previous discretionary approval and do not include construction that can occur under ministerial permits on other property throughout the county.

Fair Share Housing Allocation

All of the equal-weight alternatives include policies in support of affordable housing; they also include sufficient vacant land with appropriate land use designations that meet the state-mandated County fair-share housing obligations through 2008. The fair-share housing obligations for the unincorporated County for the period 2001–2008 are:

- < 2,829 units very low income
- < 1,890 units low income
- < 2,100 units moderate income
- < 3,175 units above moderate income

Business Park Development

All of the equal-weight alternatives retain the existing land use designations for the El Dorado Hills Business Park and assume full development of the business park. This is based on

assumptions regarding regional market conditions, issuance of bonds, the longstanding nature of the project, historical development of the project, and the fact that it is not affected by the Writ. Comparative Alternative #9 (Modified El Dorado Hills Development South of U.S. 50) examines modifications to land use policies governing development in the area of El Dorado Hills south of U.S. 50, where the business park is located.

Shingle Springs Rancheria Hotel/Casino

All of the equal-weight alternatives assume that the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians will build and operate a hotel and casino at the Shingle Springs Rancheria. The authority of the project sponsors to proceed with the project is in dispute and this dispute remains unresolved (see footnote #1 in Chapter 1). To ensure that this EIR presents a conservative assessment of cumulative conditions, the analysis for each of the four equal-weight alternatives assumes that the hotel and casino will be operating before 2025.

Based on published information, the hotel and casino complex would consist of a mixture of uses located on 43.9± acres in the southwest corner of the rancheria. A schematic site plan for the hotel and casino has been developed. A 250-room, five-level hotel would be constructed on a portion of the development connected to the casino complex. The casino complex would consist of a mix of uses including food and beverage facilities, banking and administration facilities, gaming commission offices, child care/family fun room, retail, and the main gaming hall. The development would employ approximately 1,500 employees. The breakdown of proposed uses with associated square footage, which total 381,250 square feet, for the proposed hotel and casino complex is provided below.

- < Gaming Floor Area—82,800
- < Banking—6,300
- < Toilets—6,600
- < Gaming Support—8,400
- < Retail—4,000
- < Day Care/Family Fun—14,000
- < Food and Beverage—43,300
- < Administration/Support Services—15,000
- < Employee Rooms—9,000
- < Office—13,000
- < Miscellaneous and Circulation—36,100
- < Hotel (250 rooms)—142,750

In addition to the hotel and casino complex, the development would also include parking for 3,000 cars in a parking structure and in surface parking. The five-level parking structure would be located within the casino structure, while surface parking would be located to the south and southwest of the casino.

It is assumed that the main access to the casino site would be a new interchange on U.S. 50 currently under consideration by the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The new interchange would be located south of the existing rancheria. The access road from the new interchange would be four lanes. All of the equal-weight alternatives assume that this interchange and access road would be constructed.

Factors That Differ Among the Equal-Weight Alternative

Key factors that differ between the four equal-weight alternatives are described below.

Population, Housing, and Job Growth

Based on the unique factors among the four equal-weight alternatives described below, projected population, housing, and job growth varies across alternatives as shown in Table 3-2 (note that detailed information on the land use forecasts is presented in Chapter 4, Land Use Forecasts and Development Estimates).

Types and Extent of Land Use Designations

Although most of the land use designations remain the same throughout each of the equal-weight alternatives, there are some significant differences between them. The No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives use the same land use maps and designations; however, the No Project Alternative is subject to restrictions found in the Writ. The Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative uses the same land use designation categories as the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives, with the exception of the Rural Residential designation, which was changed to Rural Lands to emphasize that residential use is not the primary use within that designation. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative uses the same designation categories and nomenclature as the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus,” Alternative, except that it includes an Agricultural land use designation (20-acre minimum parcel size), which is unique to this alternative and emphasizes the importance of agriculture through the establishment of a new base land use designation rather than the use of an overlay district.

Table 3-2 Comparison of West Slope Population, Housing, and Job Growth by Alternative					
	Existing Conditions ¹	Alt. #1 (No Project)	Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus")	Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)	Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)
Population					
Population—2025 ²	121,000 persons	174,610 (53,610) ³	185,601 (64,601) ³	201,730 (80,730) ³	202,241 (81,241) ³
Population—Buildout ^{2,4}		194,829 (73,829) ³	225,137 (104,137) ³	258,688 (137,688) ³	317,692 (196,692) ³
Housing					
Housing Units—2025 ⁴	44,708 units	66,142 (21,434) ³	70,547 (25,839) ³	76,998 (32,290) ³	77,199 (32,491) ³
Housing Units—Buildout ²		74,228 (29,520) ³	86,360 (41,652) ³	99,786 (55,078) ³	123,400 (78,692) ³
Jobs					
Jobs—2025 ³	30,434 jobs	66,622 (36,188) ³	64,889 (34,455) ³	73,145 (42,711) ³	72,630 (42,196) ³
Jobs—Buildout ⁴		114,794 (84,360) ³	117,122 (86,688) ³	98,143 (67,709) ³	117,122 (86,688) ³
¹ Based on 1999 base-year information used for the EPS development forecasts. A small portion of the projected increases in population, housing, and jobs is accounted for in development that has occurred in the county since 1999. ² Assumes 2.63 persons per household and a 5% vacancy rate in housing units. ³ Parenthetical numbers represent net increase from existing conditions. ⁴ Buildout numbers include 2025 projections.					
Sources: EPS 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2002d					

Please refer to Table 3-3 for a comparison of land use designations and allowable densities for the four equal-weight alternatives. It should also be noted that although most of the land use designation definitions are the same across alternatives, there are minor distinctions in the details of these designations. These are described in the text of each of the alternative General Plan policy sets. A summary of the differences among the four equal-weight alternatives is contained in Volume 3, Appendix H.

The residential density ranges remain the same for all of the alternatives. Maximum nonresidential floor-area ratios (FAR), defined as the ratio between building size and lot size, are established for the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained alternatives, but were not included in the 1996 General Plan, and therefore are not a part of the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives. The maximum research and development

FAR is 0.3 for the Roadway Constrained 6-lane “Plus” Alternative and 0.2 for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, but otherwise the FAR designations for these two alternatives are the same.

Table 3-3 Land Use Designation Densities and Floor-Area Ratios				
Land Use Designation	Alt. #1 (No Project)	Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus”)	Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)	Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)
Multifamily Residential (MFR)	5-24 du/ac	5-24 du/ac	5-24 du/ac	5-24 du/ac
High-Density Residential (HDR)	1-5 du/ac	1-5 du/ac	1-5 du/ac	1-5 du/ac
Medium-Density Residential (MDR)	1 ac/du min.	1 ac/du min.	1 ac/du min.	1 ac/du min.
Low-Density Residential (LDR)	5 ac/du min.	5 ac/du min.	5 ac/du min.	5 ac/du min.
Rural Residential (RR)	10 ac/du min.	N/A	N/A	10 ac/du min.
Rural Lands (RL)	N/A	10 ac/du min.	10 ac/du min.	N/A
Agricultural (A)	N/A	N/A	20 ac/du min.	N/A
Natural Resource (NR)	40 or 160 ac/du min.	40 or 160 ac/du min.	40 or 160 ac/du min.	40 or 160 ac/du min.
Commercial (C)	0.25	0.3–1.0 FAR	0.3–1.0 FAR	0.25
Research & Development (RD)	0.25	0.3 FAR	0.2 FAR	0.25
Industrial (I)	0.25	0.5–1.0 FAR	0.5–1.0 FAR	0.25
Tourist Recreational (TR)	N/A	0.2–0.5 FAR	0.2–0.5 FAR	N/A
Open Space (OS)	N/A	0.05 FAR	0.05 FAR	N/A
Public Facilities (PF)	N/A	0.2–0.5 FAR	0.2–0.5 FAR	N/A
Adopted Plan (AP)	Varies	Varies	Varies	Varies
ac/du = acres per dwelling unit du/ac = dwelling units per acre N/A = not applicable Source: El Dorado County Planning Department 2002				

Although the naming conventions and definitions of land use designations are similar across alternatives, the amount of land to which each designation applies differs significantly for each alternative. Table 3-4 shows the area subject to each land use designation across project alternatives. In addition, the No Project and Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” alternatives are subject to additional restrictions on subdivisions that would prevent many properties from developing to the maximum densities authorized by the land use designations. New subdivisions are prohibited under the No Project Alternative and are limited to four parcels or less under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative.

Although the total numbers of dwelling units for each of the equal-weight alternatives paint an important picture of the growth projections, an equally important factor is the distribution of the new development that is likely to occur under each alternative. In fact, the differences in development patterns are critical in understanding the differences between the alternatives.

The No Project Alternative, with its prohibition of residential subdivisions other than those approved before 1999, would limit infill possibilities within the existing Community Regions and Rural Centers. As demand for housing in the western end of the county is absorbed by the prior commitments of approved tentative maps and DAs, greater pressure would be put on those existing rural parcels that are within or close to the market areas where the demand is highest. A similar effect, although lesser, would occur under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative because future subdivision of land is limited to a maximum of four parcels or dwelling units, based on the land use designation. This would limit the ability to maximize infill potential and the use of existing infrastructure, and would put additional pressure on the Rural Regions to accommodate the anticipated demand for housing in the county.

No such development restrictions exist under the Environmentally Constrained and 1996 General Plan alternatives, so lands identified for residential development would be able to develop to their maximum permitted density. The primary differences between these two alternatives are the sizes of the Community Regions, permitted densities within them, and overall Rural Region densities. In general, densities under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative are lower throughout the Rural Regions than under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, and the sizes of the Community Regions and Rural Centers are smaller. The total area of the Community Regions would be larger under the 1996 General Plan Alternative than under either the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative or the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The Community Regions for the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative were reduced in size only as a result of changes in land use designations needed to cap potential subdivisions at four parcels. The boundaries of the Community Regions for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative were reduced to maintain separation between the communities and reduce dispersed development into existing rural areas.

**Table 3-4
Extent of Land Use Designations (in acres) ¹**

Land Use Designation	Alt. #1 (No Project) ²	Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus") ³	Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)	Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)
Multi-Family Residential (MFR)	1,427	1,281	1,281	1,427
High-Density Residential (HDR)	16,227	8,274	10,916	16,227
Medium-Density Residential (MDR)	30,516	12,623	11,440	30,516
Low-Density Residential (LDR)	79,381	72,319	50,767	79,381
Subtotal: Residential	127,551 (11.5%)	94,497 (8.5%)	74,404 (6.7%)	127,551 (11.5%)
Commercial (C)	3,320	2,718	2,187	3,320
Research & Development (R&D)	1,000	962	854	1,000
Industrial (I)	2,364	2,292	1,773	2,364
Subtotal: Commercial & Industrial	6,684 (0.6%)	5,972 (0.5%)	4,814 (0.4%)	6,684 (0.6%)
Rural Residential (RR)	184,678	N/A	N/A	184,678
Rural Lands (RL)	N/A	129,034	103,124	N/A
Agricultural (A)	N/A	N/A	59,363	N/A
Natural Resource (NR)	722,562	806,931	795,744	722,562
Tourist Recreational (TR)	3,427	5,583	4,359	3,427
Open Space (OS)	39,258	38,929	39,145	39,258
Subtotal: Rural, Open Space, & Resource	949,925 (85.6%)	980,477 (88.3%)	1,001,735 (90.2%)	949,925 (85.6%)
Public Facilities (PF)	2,183	2,179	2,099	2,183
Adopted Plan (AP)	23,760	18,890*	19,027*	23,760
Unassigned (Roads)	N/A	8,088	8,024	N/A
Subtotal: Other	25,943 (2.3%)	29,157 (2.6%)	29,150 (2.6%)	25,943 (2.3%)
Total ¹	1,110,103	1,110,103	1,110,103	1,110,103

¹ Excludes Lake Tahoe and Folsom Reservoir.

² Residential uses cannot be developed to maximum densities because of subdivision restrictions in the Writ.

³ Residential uses cannot be developed to maximum densities because of subdivision restrictions in Policy 1D.

* Under the approach proposed with the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained alternatives, Lake Tahoe acreage would be added into this category, and other entries in other categories for these alternatives would decrease accordingly.

Source: El Dorado County Planning Department 2002

The Environmentally Constrained Alternative also restricts the types of residential densities; for example, Low-Density Residential is not an allowed land use type within Community Regions. This should encourage development with higher densities to locate where services and infrastructure are available.

A comparison of the different land use designations by market area helps to illustrate some of these differences (Table 3-5 and Exhibit 4-1). The designations for the 1996 General Plan Alternative also apply to the No Project Alternative, although densities in the No Project Alternative are restricted by the Writ. For example, in Market Area 3 (Diamond Springs), the acreages are approximately 800 in the Environmentally Constrained, 1,100 in the 1996 General Plan, and 300 in the Roadway Constrained alternatives, respectively. Market Area 2 (Cameron Park/Shingle Springs/Rescue) contains 2,000 acres of HDR under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative, 2,500 acres under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, and almost 4,000 acres under the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

Under both the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives, the amount of land designated Medium-Density Residential (MDR) is greatly reduced from the amount so designated under the 1996 General Plan Alternative. In most areas, the amount designated MDR is less under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative than under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative. However, this is not always the case because of the necessity to designate some larger, undeveloped parcels in or near Community Regions that were designated Rural Lands or Natural Resources to maintain the limit of four new parcels under the latter alternative. Examples of the distribution are Market Area 3, with approximately 1,600 acres of MDR under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives and more than 4,000 acres under the 1996 General Plan Alternative; Market Area 6 (Pollock Pines) with 1,400, 1,000, and 2,500 acres under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus,” Environmentally Constrained, and 1996 General Plan alternatives, respectively; Market Area 7 (Pleasant Valley) with 1,400, 300, and 2,700 acres, respectively; and Market Area 10 (Cool/Pilot Hill) with 500, 1,000, and 4,000 acres, respectively.

In most market areas, the amount of land designated Low-Density Residential is generally less under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and especially under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative than under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, with corresponding increases in Rural Residential/Rural Lands and Natural Resources. This is especially true for Market Area 1, Market Area 5 (Coloma/Gold Hill), and Market Area 11 (Georgetown/Garden Valley). One exception is Market Area 3, where a large area of land designated HDR and MDR—surrounding the existing town sites of Diamond Springs and El Dorado—was reduced

Table 3-5 Land Use Comparison by Market Area (acres) ^{1,2}															
Land Use Designation	Alternative	Market Area #1 El Dorado Hills	Market Area #2 Cameron Park/ Shingle Springs/Rescue	Market Area #3 Diamond Springs	Market Area #4 Placerville/Camino	Market Area #5 Coloma/Gold Hill	Market Area #6 Pollock Pines	Market Area #7 Pleasant Valley	Market Area #8 Lathrobe	Market Area #9 Somerset	Market Area #10 Coal/Pilot Hill	Market Area #11 Georgetown/Garden Valley	Market Area #12 Lake Tahoe Basin ³	Market Area #13 American River	Market Area #14 Mosquito
AP	EC	8,882	907	-	3,357	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100,381	1,731	-
	RC	8,769	907	-	3,358	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100,383	-	-
	96	5,249 ⁴	909	-	3,737	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,263	-	-
I	EC	8	145	694	439	-	9	-	182	-	-	161	-	-	-
	RC	8	340	667	440	-	9	93	279	-	-	149	-	-	-
	96	8	346	705	444	-	9	93	279	-	-	149	48	-	-
RD	EC	854	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	RC	896	66			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	96	1,133	66			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
C	EC	147	617	450	274	39	142	30	-	63	125	231	-	21	2
	RC	217	664	494	290	40	168	97	8	118	203	289	26	41	15
	96	233	935	555	376	42	246	105	9	141	224	333	83	59	15
MFR	EC	107	436	419	34	-	176	-	-	-	70	50	-	-	-
	RC	183	442	534	25	-	147	16	-	-	70	50	-	-	-
	96	366	531	560	25	-	153	16	-	-	70	55	42	-	-
HDR	EC	2,706	2,551	824	419	17	976	1	-	18	249	9	-	565	-
	RC	1,576	2,063	276	249	15	969	91	3	42	139	21	14	546	-
	96	4,758 ⁴	3,987	1,137	495	59	1,783	137	38	38	328	69	3,885	881	-

Land Use Designation	Alternative	Market Area #1 El Dorado Hills	Market Area #2 Cameron Park/ ShingleSprings/ Rescue	Market Area #3 Diamond Springs	Market Area #4 Placerville/Camino	Market Area #5 Coloma/Gold Hill	Market Area #6 Pollock Pines	Market Area #7 Pleasant Valley	Market Area #8 Latrobe	Market Area #9 Somerset	Market Area #10 Coal/Pilot Hill	Market Area #11 Georgetown/Garden Valley	Market Area #12 Lake Tahoe Basin ³	Market Area #13 American River	Market Area #14 Mosquito
MDR	EC	643	1,972	1,582	2,288	134	999	341	-	91	1,027	1,541	2	528	78
	RC	805	2,526	1,603	1,806	238	1,404	1,365	12	33	518	1,193	6	587	83
	96	1,182	3,705	4,035	3,244	971	2,533	2,738	27	513	4,046	2,767	386	1,259	2,349
LDR	EC	4,258	14,580	4,401	3,528	3,718	1,599	5,466	903	923	7,084	4,209	-	-	-
	RC	5,202	14,414	5,419	4,524	7,958	3,011	8,566	893	2,770	5,873	9,297	42	943	2,067
	96	9,503	15,957	3,771	5,016	8,889	3,354	8,356	890	2,374	7,363	15,264	88	620	-
RR/RL	EC	3,991	10,257	7,149	3,819	11,356	3,785	10,854	9,546	12,432	4,592	22,577	-	197	2,361
	RC	3,036	10,652	7,462	3,927	6,323	3,405	8,854	8,493	6,945	9,945	21,065	24	1,199	976
	96	2,247	12,551	14,292	3,889	7,759	2,409	9,475	28,837	8,328	17,826	26,101	108	1,979	911
NR	EC	1,901	4,276	9,436	3,747	2,858	16,893	22,381	12,723	17,237	13,079	92,389	6,839	494,522	12,410
	RC	3,143	5,344	10,009	3,710	2,985	15,299	19,838	24,120	14,763	13,421	87,109	6,730	492,472	11,602
	96	-	-	1,869	1,955	353	14,234	18,375	3,637	13,181	707	74,558	88,611	493,110	11,604
OS	EC	3,403	1,939	1,498	899	1,911	221	831	1,375	2,367	14,794	4,540	-	51	91
	RC	3,235	1,859	1,483	624	1,788	195	831	1,375	2,449	14,440	4,573	-	58	-
	96	3,264	1,453	1,483	624	1,788	612	831	1,495	2,575	14,444	4,612	5,030	58	-
A ⁴	EC	-	1,428	2,716	6,498	5,636	1,573	3,097	10,456	15,451	4,216	7,951	-	322	-
	RC	-	-	966	6,308	6,140	1,513	3,249	-	21,474	-	9,489	-	372	-
	96	-	-	966	6,296	5,834	1,525	3,264	-	21,462	-	9,442	-	372	-

in density in comparison to the 1996 General Plan Alternative. That market area was found to have a large oversupply of available land for housing based on market demand.

The acreage of Rural Residential (RR in the No Project Alternative and the 1996 General Plan Alternative), Rural Lands (RL in the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives) and Natural Resources (NR) is generally greater under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives than under the 1996 General Plan Alternative. For example, there is no land designated NR under the 1996 General Plan Alternative in Market Areas 1 and 2, but several thousand acres have been so designated in both market areas under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives. In Market Area 5, the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative has 6,300 acres of land designated RL, while the Environmentally Constrained Alternative has more than 11,300 acres and the 1996 General Plan Alternative has 7,800 acres. On the other hand, in Market Area 8 (Latrobe), there are almost 29,000 acres of land designated RR under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, and only 8,500 and 9,500 acres under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives, respectively. This is balanced, however, by the 10,500 acres of land designated Agricultural and 12,700 acres of land designated NR under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, compared with only 3,600 acres of land designated NR under the 1996 General Plan Alternative. Market Area 10 is another example of the large differences in land use types between the alternatives, with 13,000 acres of land designated NR under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives and only 700 acres under the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

In general, densities under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives are lower throughout the Rural Regions than under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, and the sizes of the Community Regions and Rural Centers are smaller. However, sufficient land is available within the Community Regions under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative to accommodate the expected demand as demonstrated by the growth projections in the report prepared by EPS. More population growth would likely result from adoption of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative than from adoption of the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative, because of the constraints on new subdivision activities (beyond the creation of a maximum of four new parcels from existing parcels, where consistent with the basin land use designation). However, more of the development would be dispersed throughout the Rural Regions of the county under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative than under the Environmentally Constrained or the 1996 General Plan alternatives.

Types and Extent of General Plan Overlay Designations

The project alternatives use various land use overlay designations to further define areas subject to special planning considerations and associated land use restrictions. All of the alternatives include Ecological Preserve (-EP) and Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay designations, and all but the Environmentally Constrained Alternative (which contains a separate Agricultural Lands designation) include an Agricultural District (-A) overlay. The Environmentally Constrained Alternative includes a new Important Biological Corridor (-IBC) overlay. The Nonjurisdictional Lands (-NJ), Planned Community (-PC), and Platted Lands (-PL) overlays are eliminated in the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives for the reasons described below. Table 3-6 provides the area within each land use overlay designation across project alternatives.

Land Use Designation	Alt. #1 (No Project)	Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus”)	Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)	Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)
Ecological Preserve (-EP)	6,583	6,583	6,774	6,583
Mineral Resource (-MR)	23,515	24,160	24,434	23,515
Agricultural District (-A)	49,460	49,771	N/A ²	49,460
Important Biological Corridor (-IBC)	N/A ³	N/A ³	70,210	N/A ³
Nonjurisdictional Lands (-NJ)	555,949	N/A ⁴	N/A ⁴	555,949
Planned Community (-PC)	3,114	N/A ⁴	N/A ⁴	3,114
Platted Lands (-PL)	28,971	N/A ⁴	N/A ⁴	28,971
¹ Excludes Lake Tahoe and Folsom Reservoir. ² The Agricultural District overlay is not included in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative because the Agricultural Lands designation was established, totaling 59,363 acres. ³ The Important Biological Corridor overlay is included only in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. ⁴ These overlay designations do not apply to all alternatives.				
Source: El Dorado County Planning Department 2002				

< Ecological Preserve (-EP). The Ecological Preserve overlay identifies lands in public or private ownership that have the potential to be established or have been established as preserves for special-status plant and/or animal species (currently, only the five areas of the Pine Hill Preserve). For publicly owned lands, the base land use designation is Open Space (OS). The base land use designation for privately owned lands varies.

- < Mineral Resource (-MR). The Mineral Resource overlay identifies areas that are designated Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ 2xx) on the State Classification Reports. These overlay areas do not necessarily coincide with areas currently used for mineral resource extraction and in many cases are applied to areas that have never been subject to such activity. Appropriate application of this overlay is detailed in the policy section of each alternative.

Additional General Plan overlay designations apply to the alternatives as follows:

- < Agricultural District (-A). The Agricultural District overlay is used to identify core areas containing the majority of the county's federally designated prime, state-designated unique or important, or County-designated locally important soils (collectively referred to as "choice agriculture soils"). This overlay is included in the No Project, Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus," and 1996 General Plan alternatives; it is not included in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, which instead establishes a base land use designation of Agricultural Lands. This is intended to provide equal or greater protection for agricultural resources in the county as did the Agricultural District overlay. Lands designated Agricultural Lands were identified by mapping those parcels that were 20 acres or larger and met one or more of the following criteria: contained more than 50% of choice agricultural soils; were currently under agricultural production; or were within the Agricultural Districts identified on the 1996 General Plan Land Use Map. Additionally, lands that were enrolled in the Williamson Act were also included.
- < Important Biological Corridor (-IBC). This overlay is included only in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. The Important Biological Corridor overlay designation is used to identify core areas important for wildlife forage, cover, and migration and areas of relatively intact native vegetation in more urbanized areas of the county. This overlay designation is designed to provide continuous corridors of vegetation and habitat and connectivity between areas of more extensive natural vegetation or greater environmental protection. Based on aerial photographs; Geographic Information Systems (GIS) maps and data from The California Department of Fish and Game regarding special-status species, deer migration corridors, and plant community associations; and existing development patterns and parcel sizes, the -IBC overlay identifies areas within the county that contain one or more important biological features and corridors that provide connections between existing expanses of important habitat and open space. The overlay creates north south linkages between river corridors, and a crossing of U.S. 50. The important

resources identified include riparian zones, rare-plant and animal habitat, and contiguous areas of oak canopy.

- < Nonjurisdictional Lands Overlay (-NJ). The Nonjurisdictional Lands overlay is used to identify the incorporated cities of Placerville and South Lake Tahoe, the Shingle Springs Rancheria, and other lands under federal and state ownership. The County does not have jurisdiction over local land use planning in these areas. After using this overlay since adoption of the 1996 General Plan, County staff members have found that it has not provided significant value as a land use tool; they have also found that it is changing on a regular basis as a result of land exchanges between other government entities and private property owners, which have made the land use maps outdated. When information regarding jurisdictional issues is relevant, the County has other, more accurate and up-to-date means of identifying those lands, and has found that the -NJ overlay serves no real purpose in the General Plan. It was, therefore, not used in the development of the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives and applies to only the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives.
- < Planned Community Overlay (-PC). The Planned Community overlay is used to identify the area subject to the Master Circulation and Financing Plan, established in 1998 for the Missouri Flat Planned Community. This overlay is included only in the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives.⁶
- < Platted Lands Overlay (-PL). The Platted Lands overlay identifies isolated areas of contiguous, existing smaller parcels or established commercial land uses in the Rural Regions. These parcels have assigned land use designations that are inappropriate given surrounding areas (e.g., 1-acre residential parcels surrounded by 160-acre Natural Resource parcels). The intent is to prevent the extension of similar land use patterns into undeveloped areas having substantially larger parcel sizes. The land use maps for the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives takes a different approach, by simply designating those smaller parcels with the same land use designation as the surrounding larger parcels. A policy is included in the Land Use Element that provides guidance how to treat such parcels in the update of the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, this overlay is included in only the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives.

⁶ The 1996 General Plan, when originally adopted, contained three other areas identified with a base designation of Planned Community (Carson Creek, Promontory, and Pilot Hill Ranch). However, since adoption, specific plans were adopted for three of those, which are now identified with a base designation of Adopted Plan (AP). The owner of the third Planned Community project site (Pilot Hill Ranch) withdrew the application for development.

Extent of Community Regions, Rural Centers, and Rural Regions

The land use maps for each of the equal-weight alternatives identify three types of regions within the county, with different types of land uses appropriate for each region: (1) Community Regions; (2) Rural Centers; and (3) Rural Regions. All lands not classified as Community Regions and Rural Centers are considered Rural Regions. Table 3-7 provides the extent of Community Regions and Rural Centers across the four equal-weight project alternatives.

Table 3-7 Extent of Community Regions and Rural Centers (in acres) ¹				
Land Use Region	Alt. #1 (No Project)	Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus")	Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)	Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)
Community Region	70,699	50,678	49,723	70,699
Rural Center	8,469	8,390	6,124	8,469
Rural Region	1,030,935	1,051,035	1,054,256	1,030,935
Total	1,110,103	1,110,103	1,110,103	1,110,103
¹ Excludes Lake Tahoe and Folsom Reservoir.				
Source: El Dorado County Planning Department 2002				

As shown in Table 3-8, the Community Regions and Rural Centers vary among the alternatives. Although the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives have the same number and sizes of Community Regions and Rural Centers, development within them under the No Project Alternative is constrained because of the Writ. Such regions are reduced by more than 20,000 acres under both the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives, partly because the Lake Tahoe Basin is redesignated Adopted Plan, but also as a means of reducing densities and intensities of use, and promoting more infill in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

For the most part, the El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, and Placerville Community Regions remain the same under all four equal-weight alternatives. The size of the other west-slope Community Regions are reduced under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives to correspond to reductions in densities associated with different land use designations. Additionally, Camino, Pollock Pines, and Georgetown are designated as Rural Centers rather than Community Regions under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

**Table 3-8
Locations of Community Regions and Rural Centers, by Alternative**

Name	Alts. #1 and #4 (No Project and 1996 General Plan)	Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus")	Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)
Community Regions			
Cameron Park	X	X	X
Camino/Pollock Pines	X	X	
Camp Richardson	X		
Diamond Springs/El Dorado	X	X	X
El Dorado Hills	X	X	X
Georgetown	X	X	
Meeks Bay	X		
Meyers	X		
Placerville	X	X	X
Shingle Springs	X	X	X
South Lake Tahoe	X		
Tahoma	X		
Rural Centers			
Camino			X
Camino Heights		X	
Chrome Ridge	X	X	
Coloma	X	X	X
Cool	X	X	X
Fairplay	X	X	X
Garden Valley	X	X	X
Georgetown			X
Greenwood	X	X	X
Grey's Corner	X	X	
Grizzly Flat	X	X	X
Kelsey	X	X	
Kyburz	X	X	X
Latrobe	X	X	
Little Norway	X	X	

**Table 3-8
Locations of Community Regions and Rural Centers, by Alternative**

Name	Alts. #1 and #4 (No Project and 1996 General Plan)	Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus")	Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)
Lotus	X	X	X
Mosquito	X	X	X
Mt. Ralston	X	X	
Mt. Aukum	X	X	X
Nashville	X	X	
Oak Hill	X	X	X
Omo Ranch		X	
Phillips	X	X	X
Pilot Hill	X	X	X
Pleasant Valley	X	X	X
Pollock Pines			X
Quintette	X	X	
Rescue	X	X	X
Somerset	X	X	
Strawberry	X	X	X

Rural Centers are much the same under the No Project, Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus,” and 1996 General Plan alternatives. However, because of the reduction in size of the Camino/Pollock Pines Community Region under the Roadway Constrained Alternative, one new Rural Center, Camino Heights, was created along with the designation of Omo Ranch as a new Rural Center. The number of Rural Centers was reduced by about one-third under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Policy Differences Among the Equal-Weight Alternatives

Key differences between the four equal-weight alternatives emerge throughout this project description. Appendix H contains a more detailed comparison of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. In summary, the key differences include:

< format (principles, objectives, and implementation);

- < Lake Tahoe regulations (County regulations overlaid on TRPA regulations versus deferral to TRPA regulations);
- < Community Regions and Rural Centers (geographic extent);
- < land use designations (differences in base categories and overlays between alternatives);
- < extent of subdivision allowed;
- < level of detail contained in the policies versus implementation measures;
- < development on ridgelines;
- < treatment of off-premises signs;
- < number of lanes on U.S. 50;
- < concurrency and timing of demand for public services and utilities, particularly traffic improvements;
- < traffic LOS thresholds;
- < restrictions on development in fire hazard areas;
- < noise standards;
- < various development controls (e.g., gated communities, grading in rainy season, disturbance of steep slopes); and
- < ratios for wetlands restoration and protection of other biological resources.

Roadway Improvements

Summaries of roadway improvements under the No Project, Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus,” Environmentally Constrained, and 1996 General Plan alternatives are presented in Tables 3-9, 3-10, 3-11, and 3-12, respectively.

3.3.3 DESCRIPTION OF EQUAL-WEIGHT ALTERNATIVES

The following general description of the four equal-weight alternatives focuses on characteristics related to land use, and transportation and circulation. Information specific to the land use forecasts is presented in Chapter 4, Land Use Forecasts and Development Estimates.

EQUAL-WEIGHT ALTERNATIVE #1: NO PROJECT (WRIT CONSTRAINED)

The No Project (Writ Constrained) Alternative would allow development to proceed under the existing 1996 General Plan (see description of the 1996 General Plan Alternative below), but subject to constraints imposed by the Writ. This alternative reflects the conditions under which the County has been operating for the 4 years since the Writ was issued on July 19, 1999.

This alternative looks at the growth that is reasonably foreseeable to occur if the County does not adopt a General Plan and the Writ remains in effect indefinitely. It is different from the “Existing Conditions” scenario, which would assume no further growth or development at all. The “Existing Conditions” scenario is presented in the baseline for the impact analysis in the EIR. Each alternative is analyzed in comparison to existing conditions. However, in light of the 20-year planning horizon, market demand, and the existence of the DAs and other development commitments, it is also important to analyze the impacts on development that would be likely to occur if a General Plan were not adopted. The No Project (Writ Constrained) Alternative provides this analysis.

The Writ directs that land use decisions in the county be administered as follows:

- < No discretionary residential housing development (e.g., tentative subdivision maps, rezones, planned developments) may be approved except pursuant to DAs or vesting tentative maps approved before the court decision.
- < Ministerial actions (e.g., approval of residential building permits, grading permits, final subdivision maps [where tentative maps were approved before the Writ was issued], limited multifamily projects) may proceed.
- < Commercial development and other nonresidential development may be approved provided that it is consistent with the land use designations of the 1996 General Plan and with the land use designations and policies of the January 11, 1994, “Public Review Draft General Plan” and would not significantly impair the County’s ability to adopt and implement a new General Plan.
- < Remodels and minor modifications may proceed.
- < Projects exempt from CEQA may proceed.
- < Projects approved by TRPA and/or consistent with TRPA regulations may proceed.
- < Capital improvement projects serving existing growth may proceed.

With respect to residential development, all of the equal-weight alternatives, including the No Project Alternative, assume development of existing commitments (DAs and approved/unexpired tentative maps); that component of growth (14,565 dwelling units) would be identical for each alternative. With respect to other growth expected under this alternative, however (referred to as “remaining capacity”), only ministerial projects could proceed.

Under this alternative, ministerial growth undergoes no General Plan policy consistency analysis. Ministerial growth, by definition, is not subject to any other discretionary review and typically does not require environmental analysis under CEQA. Under this alternative, the remaining capacity expected to be developed through 2025 is 6,869 dwelling units, for a total of 21,434 new units. At buildout, this alternative would allow up to 8,086 additional dwelling units (after 2025) for a total of 29,520 new units. As with the other equal-weight alternatives, the analysis assumes 44,708 existing units. Because no further subdividing is allowed under this alternative, residential growth would primarily take the form of single-family homes on individual existing parcels throughout the county (up to four units can be developed on land designated for multifamily housing under the terms of the Writ, based on a CEQA categorical exemption).

This alternative would have the lowest amount of projected growth at both 2025 and buildout. Given the distribution of that growth, however, this alternative would generally exacerbate dispersed development, result in little multifamily housing, and increase impacts on rural and remote areas. As demand for housing in the lower west slope of the county near U.S. 50 begins to exceed supply in that area, it is expected that development pressure in remote areas of the county would increase. At some point, reasonable growth potential would be exhausted and development would increasingly be pushed outside the county to satisfy demand.

Nonresidential land designations under this alternative would have a capacity for up to 87,198 jobs at buildout. Nonresidential development forecasts through 2025 are based on expected market forces proportional to residential growth and indicate that development through 2025 would have a capacity for 36,188 new jobs. As with the other equal-weight alternatives the analysis assumes 30,434 existing jobs.

Land Use

As described above, this alternative assumes only development that would be allowed under the Writ; that is, it assumes development of all lands covered by an approved DA and all lands for which there is an approved tentative subdivision map. All other single-family residential parcels are assumed to be developed at no more than one unit per parcel. Lands designated for multifamily uses are assumed to be developed with four units per parcel, under a limited

exception provided in the Writ. No additional lot splits or new subdivisions are assumed. Nonresidential property is assumed to be developed based on market forces, proportional to housing growth.

The No Project Alternative land use map (Exhibit 3-4) is the same as the map for the 1996 General Plan and identifies 13 land use designations (Table 3-3). However, maximum use of many of the residential parcels according to the land use designations would not be permitted under the Writ. The Writ prohibits new subdivisions of residential parcels. The Community Regions and Rural Centers identified on the land use map allow for greater concentrations of higher density residential and commercial/industrial uses under No Project conditions than under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives, although the ability to develop the residential uses at maximum densities is significantly affected by Writ-imposed limitations. In addition, one effect of the Writ is to constrain non-residential growth that might be otherwise found to be consistent with the 1996 General Plan land use designations and policies. This is because of the additional findings required to show “Writ consistency.”

In addition to the land use designations, the No Project Alternative includes the six land use overlay designations: Agricultural District (-A), Ecological Preserve (-EP), Mineral Resource (-MR), Platted Lands (-PL), Nonjurisdictional Lands (-NJ), and Planned Community (-PC), which are identical to the 1996 General Plan.

Transportation and Circulation

The circulation map for this alternative is provided in Exhibit 3-5 and summarized in Table 3-9. The LOS standards for the No Project Alternative would be those adopted in the 1996 General Plan, which generally set LOS E as the countywide standard (Objective 3.5.1 and Policies 3.5.1.1–3.5.1.7, as modified by Measure Y). However, these policies subject certain roadways to higher or lower standards, based on traffic projections for the year 2015 that were conducted as part of the 1996 General Plan process. Policy 3.5.1.1 states, “... all road segments projected in the roadway plan at the year 2015 to be operating at LOS A, B, or C shall not be allowed to fall below LOS C and all road segments at LOS D shall not fall below LOS D.” Policy 3.5.1.6 allows some road segments to operate at LOS F.

Roadway improvements (Appendix D-3a) needed to accommodate the growth projected for this alternative through 2025 include expanding U.S. 50 to eight lanes (three mixed-flow lanes and one high-occupancy vehicle [HOV] lane in each direction) west of Cambridge Road and six lanes (two mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction) from Cambridge Road to Ponderosa Road. Road segments needing to be six lanes include portions of El Dorado Hills

EXHIBIT 3-4
GP LAND USE MAP
FOLD OUT
COLOR

EXHIBIT 3-4

GP LAND USE MAP

FOLD OUT

COLOR

PAGE 2

EXHIBIT 3-5
CIRCULATION DIAGRAM
FOLD OUT
COLOR

EXHIBIT 3-5

CIRCULATION DIAGRAM

FOLD OUT

COLOR

PAGE 2

**Table 3-9
No Project Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Summary**

Roadway	Segment	Existing Lanes	Lanes Required by 2025	Improvement Type
COUNTY ROADWAYS				
Bass Lake Road	U.S. 50 to Country Club Drive	2	4	Widen
	Country Club Drive to Bass Lake	2	4	Widen
New Bass Lake Road	Bass Lake to Green Valley Road	0	2	Construct new road ¹
Cameron Park Drive	Palmer Drive to Oxford Road	2	4	Widen
	Oxford Road to Green Valley Road	2	4	Widen
Country Club Drive Extension	Silva Valley Parkway to Bass Lake Road	0	2	Construct new road
El Dorado Hills Boulevard	U.S. 50 to Lassen Lane	5	6	Widen
	St Andrews Drive to Francisco Drive	2	4	Widen
Francisco Drive	El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road	2	4	Widen ¹
Green Valley Road	County Line to Francisco Drive	2	4	Widen
	Francisco Drive to Salmon Falls Road	2	4	Widen ¹
	Salmon Falls Road to Deer Valley Road (W)	2	4	Widen
	Greenstone Road to Missouri Flat Road	2	4	Widen
Latrobe Road	Investment Boulevard to Carson Creek	2	6	Widen
	Carson Creek to White Rock Road	2	6	Widen
	White Rock Road to U.S. 50	4	6	Widen
Missouri Flat Road	Headington Road to U.S. 50	2	6	Widen
	U.S. 50 to Mother Lode Drive	3	4	Widen
	China Garden Road to SR 49	2	4	Widen
Missouri Flat - Pleasant Valley Connector	Missouri Flat Road to Pleasant Valley Road	0	4	Construct new road
Mother Lode Drive	French Creek Road to Greenstone Road	2	4	Widen
Ponderosa Road	U.S. 50 to N Shingle Road	2	4	Widen
Saratoga Way	El Dorado Hills Boulevard to County Line	2	4	Widen and construct new road
Serrano Parkway	Current terminous to Bass Lake Road	0	2	Construct new road
Silva Valley Parkway	Harvard Way to Green Valley Road	2	4	Widen ¹
	Serrano Parkway to U.S. 50	0	4	Construct new road

**Table 3-9
No Project Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Summary**

Roadway	Segment	Existing Lanes	Lanes Required by 2025	Improvement Type
South Shingle Road	Durock Road to US 50	2	4	Widen
Sophia Parkway	Green Valley Road to County Line	0	4	Construct new road
White Rock Road	Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Parkway	2	6	Widen
	Manchester Drive to Latrobe Road	2	4	Widen
STATE HIGHWAYS				
SR 49	Crystal Boulevard to China Hill Road	2	2	Upgrade to arterial
	Pleasant Valley Road to Placerville City Limits	2	4	Widen and upgrade to divided highway
	Rattlesnake Bar Road to SR 193	2	4	Widen and upgrade to divided highway
U.S. 50	County Line to Cambridge Road - westbound	2	4	Widen (add one mixed-flow lane and one HOV lane)
	County Line to Cambridge Road - eastbound	2	4	Widen (add one mixed-flow lane and one HOV lane)
	Cambridge Road to Ponderosa Road - westbound	2	3	Widen (add one HOV lane)
	Cambridge Road to Ponderosa Road - eastbound	2	3	Widen (add one HOV lane)
	Sly Park Road to Fresh Pond	3	4	Widen and upgrade to divided highway
	El Dorado Hills Boulevard Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Silva Valley Parkway Interchange	NA	NA	Construct new interchange
	Bass Lake Road Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Cambridge Road Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Cameron Park Drive Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Ponderosa Road Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Missouri Flat Road Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Camino Interchange	NA	NA	Construct new interchange

¹ Improvement triggered by a requirement other than LOS.

Source: Fehr & Peers 2003

Boulevard, Green Valley Road, Latrobe Road, Missouri Flat Road, and White Rock Road. Numerous other road segments would need to be improved from two lanes to four lanes.

EQUAL-WEIGHT ALTERNATIVE #2: ROADWAY CONSTRAINED 6-LANE “PLUS”

The Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative is designed primarily to limit development to a level that can be reasonably accommodated on a defined roadway system that allows for only limited roadway expansion. This alternative holds U.S. 50 to a maximum of six through lanes between the Sacramento County line on the west and Ponderosa Road on the east.

This alternative assumes development of all lands for which there are approved DAs and tentative subdivision maps. All other residential lands are allowed to be developed with up to four lots per existing parcel where permitted by the base land use designation. For 2025 projections, nonresidential property is assumed to be developed based on market forces, proportional to housing growth. Land use forecasts and traffic analyses have been prepared for both the 2025 and buildout scenarios. An LOS policy that generally sets LOS D for rural areas and LOS E for Community Regions is used. As indicated, U.S. 50 is set at six lanes. The land use map and policy set for this alternative are described further below. By 2025, 25,839 new units and 34,455 new jobs are projected. At buildout, 41,652 new dwelling units (15,813 units constructed after 2025) and 86,688 new jobs (52,233 new jobs after 2025) could be accommodated.

Land Use

The primary focus of this alternative is to help maintain the county’s rural character by maintaining U.S. 50 at six lanes and minimizing other roadway development to the extent feasible. To do this, given existing commitments and the need to preserve a viable use for all parcels this alternative limits subdivisions to a maximum of four parcels for each existing parcel to the extent authorized by the applicable land use designation. The effect of this is somewhat similar to the No Project (Writ Constrained) Alternative in that the overall amount of growth is curtailed; as a result, growth is pushed out into rural areas, contributing to dispersed development.

One of the primary differences between the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative and the other equal-weight alternatives is in the definition of “concurrency” for purposes of roadway infrastructure. Policy TC-1i in the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative defines concurrency as “immediate.” In other words, mitigating traffic improvements must be constructed and operational before occupancy of development can occur. The other

alternatives rely more heavily on fee programs and recognize that with the use of a fee program for infrastructure funding, there will be a “lag” between the time when the improvement is actually needed and the time when the infrastructure is built.

Another fundamental difference between the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative and the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is the way in which cumulative (“latent”) demand is measured for purposes of sizing traffic improvements triggered by a particular project. Policy TC-1i of the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative specifies that cumulative demand is to be measured as existing traffic, plus traffic from the proposed project, plus traffic that would result from unbuilt ministerial development (including future subdivisions in the areas with DAs as well as ministerial development of existing vacant parcels). Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, cumulative demand is defined as existing traffic plus traffic from the proposed project only.

The land use map for this alternative is provided in Exhibit 3-6. Table 3-3 identifies the land use designations. This alternative assumes that construction of at least one single-family residence will be allowed on all vacant residential parcels, regardless of parcel size. All parcels identified as Multifamily Residential (MFR) will be allowed a maximum of four units. Residential parcels are all parcels not identified as Commercial (C), Industrial (I), Research and Development (RD), Public Facilities (PF), Tourist Recreation (TR), or Open Space (OS).

The Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative includes three land use overlay designations: Agricultural District (-A), Ecological Preserve (-EP), and Mineral Resource (-MR). The policies for this alternative include guidance for application of the land use overlays.

The Community Regions and Rural Centers under this alternative are substantially smaller than those identified on the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternative land use maps. This reduction is the result of assignment of new, lower density land use designations in areas previously identified for higher density uses.

Higher density residential uses (MFR, HDR, and MDR) would be permitted only within Community Regions and Rural Centers. The extent of the Community Regions and Rural Centers were reduced consistent with the reduction in area of higher density residential designations. There are some exceptions to the inclusion of lower density residential uses (e.g., Low Density Residential [LDR] lands) within Community Regions where larger parcels are surrounded by existing higher density development.

EXHIBIT 3-6

**GP LAND USE MAP
6-LANE "PLUS**

FOLD OUT

COLOR

EXHIBIT 3-6

**GP LAND USE MAP
6-LANE "PLUS"**

FOLD OUT

COLOR

PAGE 2

Transportation and Circulation

A circulation map for this alternative is provided in Exhibit 3-7 and summarized in Table 3-10. The LOS standards for the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative require no worse than LOS E for roads in the Community Regions and no worse than LOS D for roads in the rest of the county. Additionally, a policy similar to Policy 3.5.1.6 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative would allow identified road segments to operate at LOS F (see Table 3-1).

Roadway improvements for the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative address the goal of maintaining U.S. 50 at two mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction west of Ponderosa Road. Other road segments needing to be six lanes include portions of El Dorado Hills Boulevard, Latrobe Road, Missouri Flat Road, and White Rock Road. Numerous other road segments would need to be improved from two lanes to four lanes.

The restriction of U.S. 50 to six lanes (two mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction) would result in an inability to meet the established LOS standard for some roadway segments as this alternative builds out, even with the limits on development as contained in this alternative. Amendment of the table of roadway segments allowed to meet or exceed LOS F is therefore a premise of this alternative. This issue is explored further and appropriate mitigation is offered in Section 5.4, Traffic and Circulation, of this EIR.

EQUAL-WEIGHT ALTERNATIVE #3: ENVIRONMENTALLY CONSTRAINED

This alternative is designed to limit or prevent adverse environmental effects associated with future development throughout the county. This alternative considers constraints associated with land use, topographic limitations, and important resources.

Land use designations were based on a number of factors relating to existing development patterns, important natural resources, infrastructure, and service availability and topography. It was developed by identifying the built environment around existing communities, and establishing Community Region and Rural Center boundaries that encouraged infill within those areas. The rest of the county was reviewed for constraints to development, taking into consideration the existing rural development patterns. Agricultural and biological resource data were reviewed, including the locations of rare and endangered plant and animal habitat, choice agricultural soils, the locations of river canyons and other topographic constraints, and the extent of contiguous native vegetation. Additional considerations included high fire hazard areas, access and other infrastructure availability, areas currently managed for agricultural and timber production, opportunities for separation of communities, and the proximity to larger holdings of state/federal lands.

This alternative assumes development of all lands for which there are DAs and tentative subdivision maps. All other lands (both residential and nonresidential) have been reevaluated and some have been redesignated based on the environmental constraints. Community Regions and Rural Centers have been reduced in terms of both size and density. Rural Centers have also been reduced in terms of total number of units. An LOS policy that sets LOS D for rural areas and LOS E for Community Regions is used. The land use map and policy set for this alternative are described further below. By 2025, 32,290 new dwelling units and 42,711 new jobs are projected. At buildout, 55,078 new units (22,788 after 2025) and 67,709 new jobs (24,998 after 2025) could be accommodated.

Land Use

The land use map for this alternative is provided in Exhibit 3-8; Table 3-3 identifies the land use designations. The general approach for development under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative was to factor in natural resource and other constraints to guide where and how development should occur. It represents the most significant departure from the 1996 General Plan land use map.

The land use patterns for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative and land use designations presented on the land use map are based on existing development patterns, existing expanses of largely undeveloped areas, important habitats, and a desire to maintain contiguous and connected expanses of native vegetation. These considerations and other environmental limitations, such as wildfire hazard, are also addressed in the policy set for this alternative.

In general, the land use pattern of this alternative focuses on reduced densities in the county's Rural Regions and more size-restricted Community Regions and Rural Centers. This alternative recognizes that there may be services (e.g., potable public water) outside of some of the Community Regions, but it does not provide for expansive growth outside of those regions in order to ensure greater separation of communities and protection of existing undeveloped or sparsely developed expanses of land.

One significant difference between this alternative and the other three is the inclusion of a new "Agricultural" land use designation (Table 3-3). An integral part of this alternative is the maintenance of agricultural lands and allowance of environmentally compatible management of other large expanses of undeveloped lands, whether such lands are one parcel or an assemblage of many parcels. The types of land use patterns shown on the land use map for this alternative would allow for protection of agricultural pursuits, including cattle grazing, large expanses of intact undeveloped or sparsely developed land, natural resources such as

EXHIBIT 3-7

**CIRCULATION DIAGRAM
6-LANE**

FOLD OUT

COLOR

EXHIBIT 3-7

**CIRCULATION DIAGRAM
6-LANE**

FOLD OUT

COLOR

PAGE 2

**Table 3-10
Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Summary**

Roadway	Segment	Existing Lanes	Lanes Required by 2025	Improvement Type
COUNTY ROADWAYS				
Bass Lake Road	U.S. 50 to Country Club Drive	2	4	Widen
New Bass Lake Road	Bass Lake to Green Valley Road	0	2	Construct new road ¹
Cameron Park Drive	Palmer Drive to Oxford Road	2	4	Widen
Country Club Drive Extension	Silva Valley Parkway to Bass Lake Road	0	2	Construct new road
El Dorado Hills Boulevard	U.S. 50 to Lassen Lane	5	6	Widen
	St Andrews Drive to Francisco Drive	2	4	Widen ¹
Francisco Drive	El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road	2	4	Widen ¹
Green Valley Road	County Line to Francisco Drive	2	4	Widen
	Francisco Drive to Salmon Falls Road	2	4	Widen ¹
	Salmon Falls Road to Deer Valley Road (W)	2	4	Widen
Latrobe Road	Investment Blvd to Carson Creek	2	6	Widen
	Carson Creek to White Rock Road	2	6	Widen
	White Rock Road to U.S. 50	4	6	Widen
Missouri Flat Road	Headington Road to U.S. 50	2	6	Widen
	U.S. 50 to Mother Lode Drive	3	4	Widen
	China Garden Road to SR 49	2	4	Widen
Missouri Flat - Pleasant Valley Connector	Missouri Flat Road to Pleasant Valley Road	0	4	Construct new road
Ponderosa Road	U.S. 50 to N Shingle Road	2	4	Widen
Saratoga Way	El Dorado Hills Boulevard to County line	2	4	Widen and construct new road
Serrano Parkway	Current terminous to Bass Lake Road	0	2	Construct new road
Silva Valley Parkway	Harvard Way to Green Valley Road	2	4	Widen ¹
	Serrano Parkway to U.S. 50	0	4	Construct new road
Sophia Parkway	Green Valley Road to County line	0	4	Construct new road

Table 3-10 Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Summary				
Roadway	Segment	Existing Lanes	Lanes Required by 2025	Improvement Type
South Shingle Road	Durock Road to U.S. 50	2	4	Widen ¹
White Rock Road	Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Parkway	2	6	Widen
	Manchester Drive to Latrobe Road	2	4	Widen
STATE HIGHWAYS				
U.S. 50	County Line to Ponderosa Road - westbound	2	3	Widen (add one HOV lane)
	County Line to Ponderosa Road - eastbound	2	3	Widen (add one HOV lane)
	El Dorado Hills Boulevard Interchange			Reconstruct interchange
	Silva Valley Parkway Interchange			Construct new interchange
	Bass Lake Road Interchange			Reconstruct interchange
	Cambridge Road Interchange			Reconstruct interchange
	Cameron Park Drive Interchange			Reconstruct interchange
	Ponderosa Road Interchange			Reconstruct interchange
	Missouri Flat Road Interchange			Reconstruct interchange
	Camino Interchange			Construct new interchange
¹ Improvement triggered by a requirement other than LOS.				
Source: Fehr & Peers 2003				

timberland and mineral deposits, and special-status species and important habitats. Reduced residential densities in Rural Regions could also lead to fewer losses associated with catastrophic wildfire and could provide for extensive wildlife migration corridors.

Another significant difference in this alternative is the requirement for mixed-use development. Policies contained in the Land Use Element for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative require new commercial development to include residential uses in some commercial development. The General Plan includes an implementation program to develop standards for mixed-use requirements.

EXHIBIT 3-8

**GP LAND USE MAP
EC ALT**

FOLD OUT

COLOR

EXHIBIT 3-8

**GP LAND USE MAP
EC ALT**

FOLD OUT

COLOR

PAGE 2

In addition to the land use designations, the Environmentally Constrained Alternative includes three land use overlay designations: Important Biological Corridor (-IBC), which provides greater environmental protection to biologically important areas; Ecological Preserve (-EP); and Mineral Resource (-MR). The policies for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative include guidance for application of the land use overlays.

Transportation and Circulation

The circulation map for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is provided in Exhibit 3-9 and summarized in Table 3-11. The LOS standards for this alternative would require no worse than LOS E for roads in the Community Regions and no worse than LOS D for roads in the rest of the county. This alternative assumes that road segments allowed to operate at LOS F would be the same as those listed in Policy 3.5.1.6 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative. These segments are described in Section 5.4, Traffic and Circulation, of this EIR.

Roadway improvements needed for this alternative include expanding U.S. 50 to three mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction west of Cameron Park Drive and two mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction from Cameron Park Drive to Ponderosa Road. Road segments needing to be six lanes include portions of El Dorado Hills Boulevard, Latrobe Road, and White Rock Road. Numerous other road segments would need to be improved from two lanes to four lanes.

EQUAL-WEIGHT ALTERNATIVE #4: 1996 GENERAL PLAN

This alternative looks at growth under the 1996 General Plan as follows:

- < The General Plan policies include all amendments adopted before the Writ was issued.
- < The original horizon year of 2015 is extended 10 years into the future (to 2025) to allow for consistent environmental analysis.
- < The originally adopted 1996 Land Use exhibit is modified to reflect adopted land use amendments since that time, plus other corrections identified by the Planning Commission and Board in the intervening period since adoption.
- < The originally adopted Circulation exhibit includes minor modifications to planned roadways to reflect the change in horizon year.
- < The Housing Element from the 1996 General Plan is replaced with the 2003 draft (as it is for all of the equal-weight alternatives) because under separate state statutes, the County's Housing Element must be updated before the end of the year, whether or not a General Plan is adopted.

Remaining capacity through 2025 under this alternative is 17,926 dwelling units. This alternative, generally, allows more growth in more areas, resulting in less of a distinction between rural and developed areas. In general, this alternative has fewer protections for sensitive resources, less regulation for impact avoidance and design control, and does not impose a precise requirement for concurrency between infrastructure/services and development to be served except with respect to roadway infrastructure. Because subdivisions are allowed under this alternative, land use patterns at 2025 may be somewhat less scattered than under the No Project or Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative, but the total amount of development countywide would be greater than under the No Project Alternative or any of the other alternatives.

Like the other equal-weight alternatives, this alternative assumes development of all lands for which there are approved DAs and tentative subdivision maps. The LOS policies from the 1996 General Plan as amended by Measure Y are used. U.S. 50 is planned to be a minimum of eight lanes per the 1996 Circulation Elemental, though additional lanes would be required to mitigate impacts on LOS under the buildout scenario. By 2025, 32,491 new dwelling units and 42,196 new jobs are projected. At buildout, 78,692 new units (46,201 after 2025) and 86,688 new jobs (44,492 after 2025) could be accommodated.

Land Use

This alternative shares the same land use map (Exhibit 3-4) and land use designations (Table 3-3) as the No Project Alternative, but development would not be restricted by the Writ. The Community Regions and Rural Centers identified on the land use map for the 1996 General Plan Alternative allow for the greatest level of higher density residential and commercial/industrial expansion. This alternative would allow for a greater amount of new residential growth than any of the other equal-weight alternatives, with the differences most pronounced at buildout.

Transportation and Circulation

The circulation map for this alternative is provided in Exhibit 3-10 and summarized in Table 3-12. The LOS standards for the 1996 General Plan Alternative are those adopted in 1996, generally setting a maximum LOS E as the countywide standard, but setting a higher standard of LOS C or D for certain roads with less projected traffic, and allowing certain other roads to operate at LOS F. (Objective 3.5.1 and Policies 3.5.1.1–3.5.1.7, as modified by Measure Y.) These policies are summarized above in the discussion of the No Project Alternative and are also described in Section 5.4, Traffic and Circulation, of this EIR.

EXHIBIT 3-9

**CIRCULATION DIAGRAM
EC ALT**

FOLD OUT

COLOR

EXHIBIT 3-9

**CIRCULATION DIAGRAM
EC ALT**

FOLD OUT

COLOR

PAGE 2

**Table 3-11
Environmentally Constrained Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Summary**

Roadway	Segment	Existing Lanes	Lanes Required by 2025	Improvement Type
COUNTY ROADWAYS				
Bass Lake Road	U.S. 50 to Country Club Drive	2	4	Widen
	Country Club Drive to Bass Lake	2	4	Widen
New Bass Lake Road	Bass Lake to Green Valley Road	0	2	Construct new road ¹
Cameron Park Drive	Coach Lane to Palmer Drive	4	4	Upgrade to divided road
	Palmer Drive to Oxford Road	2	4	Widen
Country Club Drive Extension	Silva Valley Parkway to Bass Lake Road	0	2	Construct new road
El Dorado Hills Boulevard	U.S. 50 to Lassen Lane	5	6	Widen
	St Andrews Drive to Francisco Drive	2	4	Widen ¹
Francisco Drive	El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road	2	4	Widen ¹
Green Valley Road	County Line to Francisco Drive	2	4	Widen
	Francisco Drive to Salmon Falls Road	2	4	Widen
	Salmon Falls Road to Deer Valley Road (W)	2	4	Widen
Latrobe Road	Investment Blvd to Carson Creek	2	6	Widen
	Carson Creek to White Rock Road	2	6	Widen
	White Rock Road to U.S. 50	4	6	Widen
Missouri Flat Road	Headington Road to U.S. 50	2	4	Widen
	U.S. 50 to Mother Lode Drive	3	4	Widen
	China Garden Road to SR 49	2	4	Widen
Missouri Flat - Pleasant Valley Connector	Missouri Flat Road to Pleasant Valley Road	0	4	Construct new road
Ponderosa Road	U.S. 50 to N Shingle Road	2	4	Widen
Saratoga Way	El Dorado Hills Boulevard to County line	2	4	Widen and construct new road
Serrano Parkway	Current terminous to Bass Lake Road	0	2	Construct new road
Silva Valley Parkway	Harvard Way to Green Valley Road	2	4	Widen ¹
	Serrano Parkway to U.S. 50	0	4	Construct new road
Sophia Parkway	Green Valley Road to County line	0	4	Construct new road

**Table 3-11
Environmentally Constrained Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Summary**

Roadway	Segment	Existing Lanes	Lanes Required by 2025	Improvement Type
South Shingle Road	Durock Road to U.S. 50	2	4	Widen ¹
White Rock Road	Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Parkway	2	6	Widen
	Manchester Drive to Latrobe Road	2	4	Widen
STATE HIGHWAYS				
U.S. 50	County Line to Cameron Park Drive - westbound	2	4	Widen (add one mixed-flow lane and one HOV lane)
	County Line to Cameron Park Drive - eastbound	2	4	Widen (add one mixed-flow lane and one HOV lane)
	County Line to Ponderosa Road - westbound	2	3	Widen (add one HOV lane)
	County Line to Ponderosa Road - eastbound	2	3	Widen (add one HOV lane)
	Newtown Road to Carson Road (west)	4	4	Upgrade to freeway
	Sly Park Road to Fresh Pond	3	4	Widen and upgrade to divided highway
	El Dorado Hills Boulevard Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Silva Valley Parkway Interchange	NA	NA	Construct new interchange
	Bass Lake Road Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Cambridge Road Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Cameron Park Drive Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Ponderosa Road Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Missouri Flat Road Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
Camino Interchange	NA	NA	Construct new interchange	

¹ Improvement triggered by a requirement other than LOS.

Source: Fehr & Peers 2003

EXHIBIT 3-10

**CIRCULATION DIAGRAM
1996 GP**

FOLD OUT

COLOR

EXHIBIT 3-10

CIRCULATION DIAGRAM

1996 GP

COLOR

PAGE 2

**Table 3-12
1996 General Plan Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Summary**

Roadway	Segment	Existing Lanes	Lanes Required by 2025	Improvement Type
COUNTY ROADWAYS				
Bass Lake Road	U.S. 50 to Country Club Drive	2	6	Widen
	Country Club Drive to Bass Lake	2	4	Widen
New Bass Lake Road	Bass Lake to Green Valley Road	0	2	Construct new road ¹
Cameron Park Drive	Coach Lane to Palmer Drive	4	4	Upgrade to divided road
	Palmer Drive to Oxford Road	2	4	Widen
	Oxford Road to Green Valley Road	2	4	Widen
Country Club Drive Extension	Silva Valley Parkway to Bass Lake Road	0	2	Construct new road
El Dorado Hills Boulevard	U.S. 50 to Lassen Lane	5	6	Widen
	St. Andrews Drive to Francisco Drive	2	4	Widen
Francisco Drive	El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road	2	4	Widen ¹
Green Valley Road	County Line to Francisco Drive	2	4	Widen
	Francisco Drive to Salmon Falls Road	2	4	Widen ¹
	Salmon Falls Road to Deer Valley Road (W)	2	6	Widen
	Greenstone Road to Missouri Flat Road	2	4	Widen
Latrobe Road	Wetsel Oviatt to Investment Boulevard	2	4	Widen
	Investment Drive to Carson Creek	2	6	Widen
	Carson Creek to White Rock Road	2	6	Widen
	White Rock Road to U.S. 50	4	6	Widen
Missouri Flat Road	Headington Road to U.S. 50	2	6	Widen
	U.S. 50 to Mother Lode Drive	3	4	Widen
	China Garden Road to SR 49	2	4	Widen
Missouri Flat - Pleasant Valley Connector	Missouri Flat Road to Pleasant Valley Road	0	4	Construct new road
Mother Lode Drive	French Crk Road to Greenstone Road	2	4	Widen

**Table 3-12
1996 General Plan Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Summary**

Roadway	Segment	Existing Lanes	Lanes Required by 2025	Improvement Type
Ponderosa Road	U.S. 50 to N Shingle Road	2	6	Widen
Saratoga Way	El Dorado Hills Boulevard to County line	2	4	Widen and construct new road
Serrano Parkway	Current terminous to Bass Lake Road	0	2	Construct new road
Silva Valley Parkway	Harvard Way to Green Valley Road	2	4	Widen ¹
	Serrano Parkway to U.S. 50	0	4	Construct new road
Sophia Parkway	Green Valley Road to County line	0	4	Construct new road
South Shingle Road	Durock Road to U.S. 50	2	4	Widen
White Rock Road	Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Parkway	2	6	Widen
	Manchester Drive to Latrobe Road	2	4	Widen
STATE HIGHWAYS				
SR 49	Crystal Boulevard to China Hill Road	2	2	Upgrade to arterial
	Pleasant Valley Road to Placerville City Limits	2	4	Widen and upgrade to divided highway
	Marshall Road to Rattlesnake Bar Road	2	4	Widen and upgrade to divided highway
	Rattlesnake Bar Road to SR 193	2	4	Widen and upgrade to divided highway
SR 193	SR 49 to Greenwood Road	2	4	Widen and upgrade to divided highway
U.S. 50	County Line to Cameron Park Drive - westbound	2	4	Widen (add one mixed-flow lane and one HOV lane)
	County Line to Cameron Park Drive - eastbound	2	4	Widen (add one mixed-flow lane and one HOV lane)
	Cameron Park Drive to Ponderosa Road - westbound	2	3	Widen (add one HOV lane)
	Cameron Park Drive to Ponderosa Road - eastbound	2	3	Widen (add one HOV lane)
	Ponderosa Road to Shingle Springs Drive - westbound	2	3	Widen (add one auxiliary lane)
	Newtown Road to Carson Road (west)	4	4	Upgrade to freeway

**Table 3-12
1996 General Plan Alternative Proposed Roadway Improvements Summary**

Roadway	Segment	Existing Lanes	Lanes Required by 2025	Improvement Type
	Sly Park Road to Fresh Pond	3	4	Widen and upgrade to divided highway
	El Dorado Hills Boulevard Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Silva Valley Parkway Interchange	NA	NA	Construct new interchange
	Bass Lake Road Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Cambridge Road Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Cameron Park Drive Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Ponderosa Road Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Missouri Flat Road Interchange	NA	NA	Reconstruct interchange
	Camino Interchange	NA	NA	Construct new interchange
¹ Improvement triggered by a requirement other than LOS. Source: Fehr & Peers 2003				

Roadway improvements needed to accommodate the growth associated with this alternative include expanding U.S. 50 to three mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction west of Cameron Park Drive and two mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane in each direction from Cameron Park Drive to Ponderosa Road. Road segments needing to be six lanes include portions of Bass Lake Road, El Dorado Hills Boulevard, Green Valley Road, Latrobe Road, Missouri Flat Road, Ponderosa Road, and White Rock Road. Numerous other road segments would be improved from two lanes to four lanes. To the extent that roadway improvements shown on the circulation map for this alternative are not sufficient to satisfy traffic LOS policies, the EIR identifies additional necessary mitigation.

3.4 PROJECT APPROVALS AND SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS

A set of actions must be taken by the County to complete the General Plan process, including certification of the EIR, adoption of the General Plan, filing of a return to the Writ with the Superior Court, submittal of the Housing Element to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and other miscellaneous implementation actions. Each of these is described in more detail below.

SUBMITTAL OF HOUSING ELEMENT

Before the General Plan is approved, the draft Housing Element must be submitted to HCD for review. If HCD determines that the draft Housing Element does not substantially comply with the requirements of the Government Code, the County must either revise the element or adopt written findings explaining how the element complies with applicable requirements. After the General Plan is adopted, the County must submit a copy of the adopted Housing Element to HCD for certification.

CERTIFICATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Before taking action on the General Plan, the Board of Supervisors must certify that the EIR was completed in compliance with CEQA, that the Board reviewed and considered the information in the EIR before action was taken on the project, and that the EIR reflects the County's independent judgment and analysis.

ADOPTION OF THE GENERAL PLAN

The Board of Supervisors will adopt by resolution one of the analyzed General Plan alternatives, or may adopt a plan based on one of the alternatives amended to include one or more mitigation measures recommended in this EIR or one or more policies from other General Plan alternatives. Before adoption, the County is required to make specific findings of fact pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081 regarding the significant environmental impacts of the project, the feasibility of measures to mitigate those impacts, and, if appropriate, a statement of overriding considerations.

The County is also required to adopt a mitigation monitoring or reporting program, which will consist of the incorporation of adopted mitigation measures into the General Plan, the monitoring and implementation actions that are included in the General Plan, and the annual report on General Plan status required by the Government Code (see Government Code §65400(b)(1)). Immediately following adoption, a Notice of Determination will be filed with the County Clerk.

FINAL DISPOSITION OF GENERAL PLAN LITIGATION

As discussed earlier, the County is currently subject to a judgment and writ of mandate issued by the Sacramento Superior Court in the litigation challenging the 1996 General Plan. The Writ required the County to (1) rescind the resolutions certifying the EIR and adopting the 1996 General Plan in accordance with the terms of the Writ, and (2) approve a new general

plan in accordance with the directions of the Writ. Usual practice is for the party to respond to a writ of mandate by filing a “return” with the Court indicating that the party has complied with the terms of the Writ. The County did file an initial return indicating the rescission of the original resolutions. Similarly, a return will be filed once the County adopts a new general plan. The Writ set forth a specific procedure for doing so, and for determining the County’s compliance with the Writ. The court will hold a hearing and determine the County’s compliance with the Writ. The Writ would remain in effect until final action by the court.

OTHER IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

After the General Plan is approved and the lawsuit is closed, the Planning Department and other affected departments will seek funding for and take the steps required to implement the new General Plan. An important facet of this process will be a comprehensive update of the County’s Zoning Code, as well as the development of other regulations needed to implement the General Plan. As noted earlier, staff members will prepare an annual report on implementation of the General Plan, which is required to be filed with the State of California.