

5.7 PUBLIC SERVICES

This section contains a discussion of law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency medical services, public schools, libraries, and parks and recreation services provided on the west slope of El Dorado County. Where possible, the analysis focuses on desired service levels and ratios and how the General Plan could affect them. Environmental impacts are determined based primarily on the need for new facilities, and how construction of these facilities could generate environmental impacts. This section considers any environmental impacts peculiar to the types of facilities to be developed. General impacts typically associated with development of structures are considered together with other general development impacts in the other sections of this EIR. The analysis section is based on consultation with public service providers to the extent feasible and on estimates of facilities required to serve future population under each alternative.

5.7.1 LAW ENFORCEMENT

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Regulatory/Planning Environment

El Dorado County Sheriff

The El Dorado County Sheriff's Office (EDSO) provides service to the unincorporated areas of the County with a staff of 383 people, including 185 sworn officers. EDSO operates four offices (El Dorado Hills, Georgetown, Placerville, and Pollock Pines) on the west slope, and one in the Lake Tahoe Basin as shown in Exhibit 5.7-1.

EDSO operates two county jail facilities, one each in Placerville and South Lake Tahoe. The Placerville Jail currently houses 160 inmates and has capacity for a total of 240 inmates. The South Lake Tahoe Jail currently houses 90 inmates and has capacity for 126 inmates. The South Lake Tahoe Jail is planned for expansion to allow for 52 additional inmates, with a future capacity of 178 inmates. (Friedl, pers. comm., 2002.) Although EDSO has offices and jail facilities in Placerville and South Lake Tahoe, these incorporated cities each have their own independent police forces and facilities.

A variety of special programs are operated by EDSO, including the Special Emergency Response Team (SERT), Crisis Negotiation Team, Boat Patrol (including the only kayak patrol in California), and an extensive neighborhood watch program partly composed of a senior citizen volunteer program called the Sheriff's Team of Active Retirees (STAR). The Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) program is fully active with four assigned officers.

In addition, EDSO coordinates a search and rescue team composed of more than 800 staff and volunteers with specialties in tracking, Nordic skiing, rock climbing, etc. (EDSO 2002).

EDSO's Office of Emergency Services is a member of the County's Disaster Council, which also includes the County Board of Supervisors, local fire districts, the County Department of Public Health, and County Environmental Management Department. The Disaster Council is the advisory body for the County's response strategy to major disasters, including acts of terrorism on targets within the county (Egbert, pers. comm., 2003).

Level-of-Service Standards

Level of service may be measured by the ratio of sheriff's deputies to residents. EDSO attempts to maintain a minimum of one deputy per 1,000 residents in the unincorporated area (EDSO 2002). Currently 383 staff members, including 185 sworn deputies, are employed by EDSO. The existing staffing ratio provides a higher level of service with approximately 1.4 deputies per 1,000 residents (Egbert, pers. comm., 2003).

Secondary Response

Two agencies provide secondary response for EDSO. The City Police Departments provide secondary response to incidents that occur near the city limits. The California Highway Patrol provides secondary response to all other areas outside the city of Placerville (EDSO 2002). EDSO provides secondary response to crime incidents within the cities of Placerville and South Lake Tahoe.

Crime Statistics

As shown in Table 5.7-1, the number of incidents for each of the major crime types in El Dorado County has fluctuated over the years. Generally, the total number of crime incidents has shown a relatively stable trend (neither increasing nor decreasing) from 1990 to 2002. The number of crime incidents showed a peak between 1993 and 1995 and a decrease from 1998 to 2001.

Overall, given that population increased in the county between 1990 and 2002, the number of crimes per resident in the county has generally decreased. In 1990 there were 31 major crime incidents per 1,000 residents, peaking at 33 incidents per 1,000 in 1994 and dropping to as low as 17 incidents per 1,000 in 1999. In 2002 the rate was 22 incidents per 1,000 residents.

Exhibit 5.7-1 (11x17)

2nd page of 5.7-1 (11x17)

Table 5.7-1														
Number of Major-Crime Incidents in El Dorado County (1990-2002)														
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Average
Homicide	11	9	6	2	5	4	2	3	5	3	4	2	4	5
Rape	15	24	23	23	14	25	23	28	30	23	18	24	22	22
Robbery	14	21	17	25	17	26	20	14	15	8	9	18	22	17
Assault	665	736	641	686	874	854	725	795	726	661	656	720	791	733
Larceny	1,196	1,227	1,255	1,240	1,423	1,559	1,366	1,110	987	782	1,008	1,025	1,115	1,176
Burglary	1,041	1,135	1,210	1,363	1,342	1,086	734	920	744	528	562	666	933	943
Auto Theft	23	15	26	29	23	20	10	11	11	6	10	3	12	15
Total Major Crime Incidents	2,965	3,167	3,178	3,368	3,698	3,574	2,880	2,881	2,518	2,011	2,267	2,458	2,899	2,900
Population	96,123	100,000	104,100	107,700	110,400	111,700	113,600	115,700	118,000	120,200	123,080	127,400	129,400	113,646
Major-Crime Incidents per 1,000 People	31	32	31	31	33	32	25	25	21	17	18	19	22	26
Source: Egbert, pers. comm., 2003; DOF 2002a, 2002b														

Response Times

EDSO compiles data on the number of calls and the average response time for each of its Sheriff's Office zones, as shown in Exhibit 5.7-1. Table 5.7-2 contains the data for 2001 and 2002. Response time is the amount of time that elapses between the time the call is made and the time the first officer responds to the call. As shown, the number of calls and the average response times in most zones are similar for 2001 and 2002 and response times are similar across all zones. EDSO does not have an established countywide goal for response time for either rural or urban areas, because the ideal response time varies by priority and by the area of the call (Friedl, pers. comm., 2002). However, data on average response times for the past year are used to determine the budget for EDSO and may affect the number of officers in the following years (Egbert, pers. comm., 2003).

Zone (see Exhibit 5.7-1)	Number of Calls		Average Response Time (minutes)	
	2001	2002	2001	2002
1	2,625	2,680	18:01	18:09
2	3,839	3,798	19:36	18:17
3	815	827	18:30	17:31
4	759	767	18:17	17:45
5	945	1,039	11:47	17:10
Total	8,983	9,111	17:56	17:58

Source: Egbert, pers. comm., 2003

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Thresholds of Significance

The General Plan would result in a significant impact if development would result in the need for new and/or expanded law enforcement facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.

Impact
5.7-1

Potential Land Use Incompatibility Associated with Development and Expansion of Law Enforcement Facilities. The projected growth in population under each of the equal-weight alternatives would generate the need for new and/or expanded law enforcement facilities. The greatest number of law enforcement facilities would be required under the 1996

General Plan Alternative, followed by the Environmentally Constrained, Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus,” and No Project alternatives. New facilities would be developed in response to population growth as funding allows. Law enforcement facilities are allowed under all General Plan designations under the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives, and under all but Natural Resource, Industrial, Research and Development, and Open Space designations under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives; new County facilities could also be built on lands with compatible land use designations in Placerville and South Lake Tahoe. Development of new and expanded law enforcement facilities would require discretionary approval. The development of law enforcement facilities could potentially result in adverse physical effects on the environment. These potential environmental impacts are generally addressed by proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures described in other sections of Chapter 5 of this EIR. Apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR, operation of law enforcement facilities could result in potential incompatibility with adjacent land uses, which is not fully addressed by General Plan policies. This impact is considered **significant**. Impact significance before and after mitigation is shown in the table below.

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation*							
	Alt. #1 (No Project)		Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus”)		Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)		Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)	
	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout
5.7-1: Potential Land Use Incompatibility Associated with Development and Expansion of Law Enforcement Facilities	S ₄	S ₄	S ₃	S ₃	S ₂	S ₂	S ₁	S ₁

Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation*							
	Alt. #1 (No Project)		Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus")		Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)		Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)	
	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout
5.7-1(a), Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b); and 5.7-1(b), Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d)	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
* Notes: LS = Less than Significant; N/A= Not Applicable; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable. Significant impacts are ranked against each other by alternative for the 2025 scenario and the buildout scenario, from 1 (Worst Impact) to 4 (Least Impact). Where the impact under two different alternatives during the same time frame would be roughly equal in severity, the numerical ranking is the same.								

No Project Alternative (Alternative #1)

Relevant Goals/Policies—No Project Alternative

The relevant policies included in the 1996 General Plan that are applicable to the No Project Alternative are Policies 5.1.2.1 through 5.1.2.4, and 5.1.3.1 and 5.1.3.2.

No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Under the No Project Alternative, the number of residents would increase by 53,610 by 2025. While the County is currently developing a countywide facility master plan, or capital improvement plan, EDSO does not have a facility master plan that evaluates its future facility needs. However, EDSO has indicated that the population growth expected under this alternative would require a new building in the El Dorado Hills/Cameron Park area, as well as the replacement of the existing Placerville facility with a larger facility. Furthermore, EDSO has indicated that an additional inmate housing unit (a “pod”) would need to be added to the Placerville jail, and additional patrol cars and other equipment would be required. Staffing increases by 172 positions would also be required, from the existing 383 positions to an estimated 555 positions by 2025, as shown in Table 5.7-3 (Egbert, pers. comm., 2003).

Land uses would be somewhat dispersed under this alternative, but this type of development would not be expected to be a significant problem because sheriffs’ services are highly mobile once they are staffed. Policy 5.1.2.4 states that the level of service may differ based on whether the area is rural or urban. Policies 5.1.3.1 and 5.1.3.2 would emphasize development and funding of the capital improvement plan in the more urbanized portions of the county.

Table 5.7-3 Existing and Estimated Future El Dorado County Sheriff's Office Staffing Levels							
General Plan Alternative	Existing Staffing	2025			Buildout		
		Population Increase from existing (% increase)	Staffing (% increase from existing) ¹	Additional Facility Needs	Population Increase from Existing (% increase)	Staffing (% increase from existing) ¹	Additional Facility Needs (quantity)
No Project	383	53,610 (45%)	555 (45%)	1 new building 1 jail pod 1 building replacement	73,829 (62%)	620 (62%)	1 new building 1 jail pod 1 building replacement Expansion as needed
Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus"	383	64,601 (54%)	590 (54%)	1 new building 1 jail pod 1 building replacement	104,137 (87%)	716 (87%)	1 new building 1 jail pod 1 building replacement Expansion as needed
Environmentally Constrained	383	80,730 (68%)	643 (68%)	2 new buildings 1 jail pod 1 building replacement	137,688 (115%)	823 (115%)	2 new buildings 1 jail pod 1 building replacement Expansion as needed
1996 General Plan	383	81,241 (68%)	643 (68%)	2 new buildings 1 new jail 1 jail pod 1 building replacement	196,692 (163%)	1,007 (163%)	2 new buildings 1 new jail 1 jail pod 1 building replacement Expansion as needed

¹ Based on existing ratio of EDSO staffing to population.
Source: Egbert, pers. comm., 2003

Policies 5.1.2.1 through 5.1.2.3 require new development to contribute its fair share to the cost of police services. These policies would ensure that law enforcement facilities are planned and built in accordance with the need generated by development of discretionary and most ministerial developments. They would also ensure that the funding mechanisms would exist to construct necessary facilities but would not fund new personnel. Given these policies, new law enforcement facilities would be expected to be constructed in order to ensure that the adequate level of service would be maintained for the new developments. Existing response times are roughly comparable in both urban and rural portions of the County. With appropriate increases in staffing and development of the facilities described above, there is no reason to expect that these response times would be degraded.

Development of new and expanded EDSO facilities needed to serve the future population growth is allowed on all lands with any General Plan designations under the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives. This could result in land use incompatibilities near sensitive land uses such as residences. Impacts could result from use of sirens and from other operational noise; possible visual impacts (e.g., use of razor wire fencing); safety issues (e.g., escape of prisoner, accidental discharge of weapon); traffic patterns (e.g., in/out traffic 24 hours a day, 7 days a week); and lighting. Development of new and expanded law enforcement facilities would be subject to discretionary review.

The new jail pod likely would be constructed at the existing jail in Placerville on land designated by the City as Public Facilities. The development of law enforcement facilities could potentially result in adverse physical effects on the environment. These potential environmental impacts are generally addressed by proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures described in other sections of Chapter 5 of this EIR. As described above, apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR, operation of law enforcement facilities could result in potential incompatibility with adjacent land uses, which is not fully addressed by General Plan policies. This impact is considered significant.

No Project Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Under the No Project Alternative, 73,829 new residents could be added to the county's existing population at buildout. Staffing increases could also be required from the existing 383 positions to an estimated 620 positions. Facilities noted for 2025 could be needed (and would be assumed to be already constructed); because the size of the facilities would be determined based on the number of staff needed to serve the given population size, further additions to facilities could be required by buildout. As discussed above, new and expanded EDSO facilities are projected to result in significant impacts apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR. This impact is considered significant.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (Alternative #2)

Relevant Goals/Policies—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative

The relevant policies that are applicable to the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative are Policies LU-3n, LU-7a, PS-1a, PS-1c, PS-1e, PS-1g, PS-7a, and PS-7b.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative, 64,601 new residents would be added to the county’s existing population. EDSO has indicated that this population growth may require new facilities in the El Dorado Hills/Cameron Park area, the Georgetown Divide area, and south county, as well as the replacement of the existing Placerville facility with a larger facility. Because the size of the facilities would be determined based on the number of staff needed to serve the given population size, other additions to facilities may be required by buildout. Under this alternative, the additional pod would also need to be added to the Placerville jail, and additional patrol cars and other equipment would be required. Staffing increases would also be required, from the existing 383 positions to an estimated 590 positions by 2025.

Policy PS-1c would require the County to develop a capital improvement plan or long-range facility plans for EDSO based on consistency with the General Plan. Policies PS-7a and PS-7b would help maintain adequate levels of service by establishing response-time standards and maintaining adequate officer-to-resident ratios. Policy PS-1a would place emphasis on capacity in the more urbanized portions of the county, but also emphasizes health and safety over capacity. Policies LU-7a, PS-1e, and PS-1g would require confirmation of adequate public services and consistency with capital improvement plans and other service-related plans before project approval for discretionary projects. While this does not address ministerial actions, Policies PS-7a and PS-7b more generally would address demands created by ministerial actions. These policies would provide that law enforcement facilities are planned and built in accordance with the need generated by new land uses. They would also ensure that the new discretionary development would not occur before necessary facilities are available. EDSO would increase personnel and build new or expanded facilities based on increases in the number of calls, which would be generated by both discretionary and ministerial developments. Given these policies and the existing EDSO planning process, adequate levels of service would be maintained in the county, and new and expanded facilities would be developed.

Policy LU-3n would promote the siting of public facilities in areas under any land use designation with the exceptions of Natural Resource, Industrial, Research and Development, and Open Space; development of law enforcement facilities may not be appropriate in some of these land use designations because of the potential for nuisances associated with agricultural activities and for disturbance to wildlife and habitats. However, there are no obvious incompatibilities with Industrial and Research and Development uses. Further, new and expanded EDSO facilities may still result in significant impacts related to land use incompatibility near sensitive land uses, as described under the No Project Alternative. This impact is considered significant.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

As discussed above, the policies would ensure that law enforcement facilities are planned and built in accordance with the need generated by new land uses, as shown in Table 5.7-3. Also as discussed above, new and expanded EDSO facilities could still result in significant impacts related to land use incompatibility. This impact is considered significant.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Alternative #3)

Relevant Goals/Policies—Environmentally Constrained Alternative

For the relevant policies of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, please refer to the policies listed above under Relevant Goals/Policies—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative. Policy LU-3n for the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative is renumbered as Policy LU-3o for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, additional staffing and facilities would be required by 2025, as shown in Table 5.7-3. Development of new and expanded EDSO facilities needed to serve future population growth would be allowed under all land use designations, except Natural Resource, Industrial, Research and Development, and Open Space designations. Please refer to Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, additional staffing and facilities could be required by buildout, as shown in Table 5.7-3. Please refer to Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

1996 General Plan Alternative (Alternative #4)

Relevant Goals/Policies—1996 General Plan Alternative

For the relevant policies of the 1996 General Plan Alternative, please refer to the policies listed above under Relevant Goals/Policies—No Project Alternative.

1996 General Plan Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, additional staffing and facilities would be required by buildout, as shown in Table 5.7-3. Please refer to No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

1996 General Plan Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Please refer to 1996 General Plan Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-1—No Project Alternative

The County shall implement both of the following measures:

- < Mitigation Measure 5.7-1(a): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b)
- < Mitigation Measure 5.7-1(b): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d)

These potential mitigation measures are described below.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-1(a): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b)

The County shall implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b) described in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-1(b): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d)

The County shall implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d) described in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing.

These mitigation measures would limit potential land use incompatibilities by limiting the range of appropriate land uses within which law enforcement facilities could be developed and

would subject such projects to a review of land use compatibility by the County and any subsequent siting and design conditions. As a result, with implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-1—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level for the same reasons as described under the No Project Alternative.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-1—Environmentally Constrained Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-1—1996 General Plan Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

5.7.2 FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Physical Environment

Fire Hazards

There are generally two types of fires in El Dorado County: wildland fires and structural fires.

Wildland Fires

Wildland fire is a major hazard in California. Wildland fires are started by natural processes or by human activities, both intentional and unintentional. The long, hot, and dry summers in El Dorado County, combined with poor road access, inadequate clearance, flammable vegetation, and steep topography, result in severe wildfire conditions every year. Wildland fires in the county have caused major resource damage that required large investments in burn suppression and rehabilitation. These fires burn structures and natural vegetation on

developed and undeveloped lands and include timber, brush, woodland, and grass fires. Wildland fires also endanger human lives and wildlife. While wildland fire may (at times) be a natural phenomenon that is considered a part of the county's ecosystem, wildland fires can put life, structures (e.g., homes, schools, businesses), air quality, recreation areas, water quality, wildlife habitat and ecosystem health, and timber at risk. Safety hazards associated with wildland fires are discussed in Section 5.8, Human Health and Safety. The discussion here focuses on sufficiency of facilities.

Structural Fires

Structural fires occur in developed areas and include structural, chemical, and vehicle fires. Structural fire may be started by accidents or by arson. As with wildland fire, structural fire also poses a major threat to human life and property. The flammability of many building materials and the contents of the buildings result in the potential for fire to rapidly destroy buildings and spread to adjacent areas. A study of residential structural fires done by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) reveals that a fire reaches a critical state within an elapsed time of 4 to 10 minutes. Once a fire reaches this critical point, it spreads with extreme intensity, compounding losses and the effort needed to control and eliminate the fire (EDHFD 2002).

Medical Emergency

Medical emergency is a condition or situation in which an individual has a need for immediate medical attention, or where the potential for such need is perceived (County Code Chapter 8.74). Causes of medical emergencies include potentially fatal medical conditions, such as heart attacks, or traumatic situations, such as automobile accidents. Large-scale and atypical situations, such as hazardous material spills, dam failures, and wildland fires, are also causes of medical emergencies.

Regulatory/Planning Environment

California Occupational Safety and Health Regulations

The California Occupational Safety & Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) requires the presence of a minimum of four firefighters before the use of respirators, which are required for entry into an enclosed space filled with harmful dusts, fogs, fumes, mists, gases, smokes, sprays, or vapors. As such, a minimum of four firefighters are required in order to respond to most fire incidents. For fire protection districts with fewer than four paid firefighters on duty at all times, volunteer firefighters may be required in order to comply with the California Occupational Safety and Health Regulations.

County Regulations

Fire District Improvement Fee

Chapter 13.20 of the County Code establishes the Fire District Improvement Fee, which is paid by developers at the issuance of building permits for all new discretionary and ministerial projects. The fee is used to finance public improvements and equipment for fire protection purposes. Each building permit applicant in the County pays a fair share of the total cost of improvements and equipment needed to serve the development proposed.

County Emergency Medical Service and Medical Transportation Ordinance

The purpose of the County Emergency Medical Service and Medical Transportation Ordinance, also known as the Ambulance Ordinance, is to ensure a consistent level of service that meets the minimum acceptable standards established by the State of California. This ordinance sets the standards and/or definitions for emergency medical services and medical transport, personnel and training requirements, equipment and supply requirements, response times, communication requirements, and medical transportation service requirements. The ordinance requires the availability of ambulance service 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Agencies

Fire protection services in El Dorado County are provided by 13 separate fire districts, one city fire department, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). On the west slope there are 10 fire protection districts. CDF and the fire districts also provide emergency medical services (EMS) to the west slope. EMS services from the fire districts are provided through a subcontract with the El Dorado County Regional Prehospital Emergency Services Operational Authority.

U.S. Forest Service

USFS is responsible for fire prevention and suppression in the Eldorado National Forest and those privately owned lands within the forest boundaries. USFS currently operates from eight facilities that serve the county in the Pioneer (Amador County), Grizzly Flats, Sly Park, Pollock Pines, Kyburz, Crystal Basin, and Georgetown areas. The station at Sly Park is being expanded to accommodate new staff and equipment. USFS' fire protection unit currently has 105 full-time staff, in addition to approximately 200 seasonal staff. Future staffing, equipment, and facility needs are planned every 2 years based on the National Fire Management Analysis

System, which models the optimum level of staffing, equipment, and facilities. The National Fire Management Analysis System predicts future demand using recent fire incident data. Currently, the 1985 to 1995 data are being used to project needs by 2005. As the frequency and magnitude of fire increases in the Eldorado National Forest, additional staffing, equipment, and facilities would be added based on available federal funding (Patton, pers. comm., 2003).

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

CDF is responsible for fire protection in the State Responsible Areas (SRAs). However, CDF is also required by law to respond to and abate uncontrolled fire that threatens to destroy life, property, or natural resources outside the SRA. As such, CDF extensively trains and equips its personnel to suppress wildland, structural, and vehicle fires. CDF attempts to have 95% of all wildland fires in the SRA controlled at 10 acres or less.

The Amador-El Dorado Administrative Unit of CDF provides fire protection and emergency medical services to the 413,000 acres of SRA land in the county. CDF operates from five fire stations in the county, located near the communities of Camino, El Dorado, Pilot Hill, Garden Valley, and River Pines. Currently, CDF has no plans for staffing, equipment, or facility increases, which are determined in consideration of the capital outlay budget set by the state (Smith, pers. comm., 2003).

Local Fire Protection Districts

In addition to CDF and USFS, 13 local fire protection districts serve the county. The service areas of these local fire protection districts are shown in Exhibit 5.7-2. The fire protection districts that serve rural areas are staffed primarily by volunteer firefighters. There are mutual aid agreements between most of the agencies to ensure that adequate manpower and equipment can be provided when a fire occurs. The fire protection districts are responsible for responding to structural fires and wildland fires, as well as providing emergency medical services within their assigned areas. Response times for the local fire protection districts can range from 1 minute in urbanized zones to more than 20 minutes in rugged mountain areas.

Each fire protection district is assigned an Insurance Service Organization (ISO) rating to determine insurance costs. The rating reflects fire suppression response time based on a schedule of 10 public protection classifications. Classifications range from Class 1, which is the highest level of protection and usually affords properties the lowest insurance premium, to Class 10, which is the lowest level of protection and which usually leads to higher insurance premiums. The ISO ratings in El Dorado County range from 5 to 9. Each fire protection

district may have a number of different ISO ratings for different areas within their jurisdiction. Table 5.7-4 provides the ISO rating, number of stations, and population served for each fire district on the west slope.

Each of the fire protection districts may also set minimum staffing and response-time goals. While the NFPA sets recommended minimum response-time standards for paid firefighters and volunteer firefighters, individual fire protection districts may choose to set their own response-time goals based on the particular available resources and service demands of each fire protection districts. Table 5.7-4 shows the response-time goals of the fire protection districts in the county. Because fire protection districts are required to comply with Cal/OSHA's regulations that establish the minimum number of responding firefighters, many fire protection districts also set goals for paid staffing. Other fire protection districts rely heavily on volunteer firefighters for compliance.

Cameron Park Fire Department

The Cameron Park Fire Department serves an 8-square-mile area with a population of 18,800. The fire department has two stations and employs 18 firefighters who are assisted by 15 volunteer firefighters. While the department currently has no expansion plans, relocation of an existing fire station is being considered (Silva, pers. comm., 2002).

Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District

The Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District covers an area of 93 square miles with an approximate population of 30,000. The district has five stations, six paid firefighters, and 30 volunteer firefighters (Cunningham, pers. comm., 2002).

El Dorado County Fire Protection District

The El Dorado County Fire Protection District, with 70 paid firefighters on staff and 110 volunteer firefighters, serves the communities of Placerville, Shingle Springs, Pleasant Valley, Camino, Coloma, Lotus, Gold Hill, Pollock Pines, Kyburz, Strawberry, Pilot Hill, and Cool. Approximately 61,000 people live in the 248-square-mile service area. The district operates out of 18 stations that protect a primarily rural area (Fire Information Network 2002).

Exhibit 5.7-2

FOLD OUT

B & W

Exhibit 5.7-2

page 2

Table 5.7-4 Existing Fire Protection District Ratings, Resources, and Goals						
District	ISO Rating	Response-Time Goal	Stations	Paid Firefighters	Population Served	Existing Staffing Ratio
Cameron Park FD	5	8 minutes 90% of time	2	18	18,000	1.00 firefighter per 1,000 residents
Diamond Springs/ El Dorado FPD	5; 8 (Rural)	Community Region: 8 minutes 80% of time Rural Center or Rural Region: 15-45 minutes	5	16	30,000	0.53 firefighter per 1,000 residents
El Dorado County FPD	5-9	Urban Areas: 8 minutes 90% of time Rural Areas: 20 minutes 90% of time	18	70	61,160	1.16 firefighters per 1,000 residents
El Dorado Hills FD	4; 8 (Rural)	6 minutes 90% of time	3	40	28,000	1.43 firefighters per 1,000 residents
Garden Valley FPD	5 & 8	Community Region: 8 minutes to 80% of population Rural Center or Rural Region: 15-45 minutes (Default Standard)	3	2	8,000	0.25 firefighter per 1,000 residents
Georgetown FPD	5-9	Unknown	5	9	8,000	1.13 firefighter per 1,000 residents
Latrobe FPD	6; 9 (Rural)	Community Region: 8 minutes to 80% of population Rural Center or Rural Region: 15-45 minutes (Default Standard)	2	2	950	1.11 firefighters per 1,000 residents
Mosquito FPD	5 (hydrant area) & 8 (non-hydrant area)	Community Region: 8 minutes to 80% of population Rural Center or Rural Region: 15-45 minutes (Default Standard)	1	2	1,500	1.33 firefighters per 1,000 residents
Pioneer FPD	6-10; majority of area 8	Community Region: 8 minutes to 80% of population Rural Center or Rural Region: 15-45 minutes (Default Standard)	6	4	16,000	0.25 firefighter per 1,000 residents
Rescue FPD	8; 4 with hydrants	Community Region: 8 minutes to 80% of population Rural Center or Rural Region: 15-45 minutes (Default Standard)	2	6	4,500	1.33 firefighters per 1,000 residents
FD = Fire Department; FPD = Fire Protection District Sources: Pers. comms. listed below for respective districts: Cameron Park FD: Johnson, 2002; Diamond Springs/El Dorado FPD: Christian, 2002; El Dorado County FPD: Wolshop, 2002, and Rodgers, 2002; El Dorado Hills FD: Caughy, 2002; Garden Valley FPD: Daigle, 2002; Georgetown FPD: Holmstrom, 2002; Latrobe FPD: Littlejohn, 2002; Mosquito FPD: Minor, 2002; Pioneer FPD: Winger, 2002; and Rescue FPD: Knoop, 2002.						

El Dorado Hills Fire Department

The El Dorado Hills Fire Department covers 33 square miles and serves a population of approximately 20,000. The department currently has three stations, 47 paid firefighters, and 45 volunteer firefighters, and is expecting to construct new facilities (Caughey, pers. comm., 2002).

Garden Valley Fire Protection District

The Garden Valley Fire Protection District serves a 60-square-mile area with 6,000–8,000 residents. It currently has four paid firefighters. There are 18 volunteer firefighters and three stations. The district is considering placing fire stations in higher risk areas (Daigle, pers. comm., 2002).

Georgetown Fire Protection District

The Georgetown Fire Protection District encompasses 96 square miles and serves a population of 7,500–8,000 people. The district has five stations, with no plans for new stations in its 5-year plan. The district has nine paid firefighters, three of whom are seasonal employees brought on from June through November. Thirty-five volunteers serve in the firefighting force (Holmstrom, pers. comm., 2002).

Lake Valley Fire Protection District

The Lake Valley Fire Protection District has three stations serving an area of approximately 50 square miles with a population of 49,000. Most of the district is located outside the west slope of the county. The district employs 21 firefighters, with 10 volunteer firefighters assisting. The district is currently remodeling a station and may expand another station (Fullerton, pers. comm., 2002).

Latrobe Fire Protection District

The Latrobe Fire Protection District serves a 36-square-mile area with a population of 950. The district has two stations, one full-time paid firefighter, and two part-time paid firefighters, along with 18 volunteers (Littlejohn, pers. comm., 2002).

Mosquito Fire Protection District

The Mosquito Fire Protection District covers a 13-square-mile area with a population of 1,400–1,500 residents. The district has one station, two paid firefighters, and 25 volunteer firefighters (Minor, pers. comm., 2002).

Pioneer Fire Protection District

The Pioneer Fire Protection District serves a 296-square-mile area with a population of 16,000. The district has six stations, one staffed with paid personnel, the other by volunteers. The district has four paid firefighters and 22 volunteers. The district is currently renovating one of the stations and is considering building another fire station in Grizzly Flats (Winger, pers. comm., 2002).

Rescue Fire Protection District

The Rescue Fire Protection District covers a 34-square-mile area with a population of 4,500. The district has two stations, six paid firefighters, and 25 paid-call firefighters. The district is planning to build a third station (Knoop, pers. comm., 2002).

County Emergency Medical Services Agency

The County's Emergency Medical Services Agency (EMSA), a division of the County's Public Health Department, coordinates and manages the county's emergency medical services system. EMSA is responsible for contracting with local fire districts and other entities for ambulance services, monitoring performance, enforcing standards if necessary, and acting in an impartial manner as an arbitrator in matters of citizen complaints. EMSA also coordinates with the County Office of Emergency Services to develop emergency response plans for large-scale or atypical disaster events, such as wildland fires, floods, earthquakes, severe winter storms, utility failures, and hazardous material spills. EMSA funding is provided by special taxes, benefit assessments, property taxes, and fees paid by individual recipients of ambulance services on a per-incident basis (Lee, pers. comm., 2003).

Emergency Medical Services System

The emergency medical service providers in El Dorado County compose a complex system linked by wireless communications, such as radio or wireless phones. Each of the emergency medical service providers plays a crucial role in the three phases of the system: first response, medical transportation, and emergency health care.

First Response

First response to medical emergencies in the west slope is provided by CDF and the fire protection districts, each of which has an assigned response area (EMS 2002). First response may also be provided by the County Sheriff's Office, County Environmental Management Department (Hazardous Waste), California Highway Patrol, and trained search-and-rescue crews. All of these personnel provide basic life support.

Medical Transportation

If necessary, trauma victims may be transported by ambulance services or emergency air transportation to the nearest or most appropriate health care facility.

Ambulance Services

CDF and some of the local fire protection districts in the county provide ambulance and paramedic services in El Dorado County (EMS 2002). Because these agencies also provide fire protection services, their facilities house equipment, such as ambulances and fire engines, and staffing for both fire protection and emergency medical services. Five districts provide ambulance services and paramedic services; three districts provide paramedic only services; and two districts provide neither.

Emergency Air Transportation

Emergency air transportation is provided by the Cal Star out of Auburn, Life Flight, Care Flight from Reno, and Med Flight in Stockton.

Emergency Health Care

The last phase of medical emergency response is emergency health care, which is provided by emergency rooms that are staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Medical emergency victims may be transferred to other emergency medical facilities following emergency treatment in the emergency room.

Emergency Medical Facilities

The primary emergency medical facilities serving the west slope are the main hospital of Marshall Medical and Mercy Hospital of Folsom. Marshall Medical is an independent, nonprofit hospital serving the west slope of El Dorado County. The main hospital campus is

located in Placerville, and numerous outpatient services are located in Placerville and Cameron Park. Marshall is a fully accredited, acute-care facility with eight beds in its emergency room. Marshall Medical provides basic emergency services 24 hours a day, and the Emergency Department is staffed by a physician board certified in emergency medicine and by nurses specifically trained in emergency care. The hospital is currently preparing a facilities master plan with an estimated planning horizon of 10 years. Based on existing patient load, expansion of the emergency room is expected, although the number of new beds in the emergency room has not been determined (Marshall Medical 2002; Funston, pers. comm., 2003).

Mercy Hospital of Folsom, which is located in Sacramento County, serves El Dorado Hills and other communities on the west slope near Sacramento County. Mercy Hospital of Folsom is a facility of Catholic Healthcare West, a nonprofit hospital system. Mercy Hospital of Folsom has a 24-hours-a-day full-service emergency room with seven beds. The hospital is currently expanding its emergency room to accommodate a total of 25 beds in the emergency room; the expansion is expected to be completed in 2006. Further expansion of the emergency room may occur after 2012, depending on the number of visits per year (Sams, pers. comm., 2003).

The nearest trauma centers are located in Sacramento County. UCDCM and Mercy San Juan Hospital both operate trauma centers that serve El Dorado County. Other medical services are provided by skilled nursing facilities, convalescent hospitals, and other health care services provided for the elderly.

Response-Time Goals

In accordance with federal and state regulations and guidelines, including those administered by the California Emergency Medical Services Authority, EMSA has established the following response-time goals for the west slope:

- < Urban: 10 minutes 90% of the time
- < Semirural: 20 minutes 90% of the time
- < Rural: 20 minutes 90% of the time
- < Wilderness: As soon as possible

The land use classifications used in the response-time goals are based on U.S. Census classifications of population density. Each of the contracted first-response entities must meet these standards, and EMSA regularly reviews the performances of the local fire protection districts as part of the contract procedures (Lee, pers. comm., 2003). As new developments increase the demand for emergency medical services in the county, the local fire districts and CDF may construct new facilities in new locations and procure additional ambulances to

comply with the response-time requirements. However, new development in rural and wilderness areas may not warrant the construction of new emergency medical facilities because of financial constraints associated with providing services in areas with low development density.

Response Capacity Planning

EMSA estimates future demand for emergency medical services based on the historic number of calls and the ability of the existing system to provide services and comply with the response-time goals. The Joint Power Authority, an entity comprising the 10 local fire protection districts, regularly updates its System Status Management Plan, which matches service demands with existing resources and determines whether additional staffing, equipment, or facilities are necessary to accommodate future demand for emergency medical services (Lee, pers. comm., 2003).

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Thresholds of Significance

The General Plan would result in a significant impact if development would result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection and emergency medical facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.

Impact
5.7-2

Potential Land Use Incompatibility Associated with Development and Expansion of Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services and Facilities.

The projected growth in population under the equal-weight alternatives would generate the need for new and physically altered fire protection and emergency medical facilities. The greatest number of new and/or expanded fire protection and emergency medical facilities would be required under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, followed by the Environmentally Constrained, Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus,” and No Project Alternatives. New facilities would be developed in response to population growth as funding allows. Fire protection and emergency medical facilities are allowed under all General Plan designations under the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives, and under all but Natural Resource, Industrial, Research and Development, and Open Space designations under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives. New and expanded fire protection and emergency medical facilities development would be subject to discretionary

approval. The development of fire protection and emergency medical facilities could potentially result in adverse physical effects on the environment. These potential environmental impacts are generally addressed by proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures described in other sections of Chapter 5 of this EIR. Apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR, operation of fire protection and emergency medical facilities could result in potential incompatibility with adjacent land uses, which is not fully addressed by General Plan policies. This impact is considered **significant**. Impact significance before and after mitigation is shown in the table below.

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation*							
	Alt. #1 (No Project)		Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus")		Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)		Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)	
	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout
5.7-2: Potential Land Use Incompatibility Associated with Development and Expansion of Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Facilities	S ₄	S ₄	S ₃	S ₃	S ₂	S ₂	S ₁	S ₁
Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation*							
	Alt. #1 (No Project)		Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus")		Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)		Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)	
	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout
5.7-2(a), Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b) and 5.7-2(b), Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d)	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
* Notes: LS = Less than Significant; N/A= Not Applicable; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable. Significant impacts are ranked against each other by alternative for the 2025 scenario and the buildout scenario, from 1 (Worst Impact) to 4 (Least Impact). Where the impact under two different alternatives during the same time frame would be roughly equal in severity, the numerical ranking is the same.								

Under all alternatives, new developments would occur throughout the county, and the numbers of structures and residents would increase within the service boundaries of every fire protection district on the west slope. Growth would generate additional incidents of both structural and wildland fires, and the need for fire protection services would increase in both urban and rural areas. Population growth would also generate additional calls for emergency medical services. If the existing emergency medical service system is not expanded in response to the increased service demand, then the system may not be able to achieve the

response-time standards established in the EMS Plan. For example, the existing primary-response ambulances, which would be responding to more calls and thus be unavailable for new calls more frequently, may not be able to respond to at least 90% of the calls within the required time limit. In order to meet the response-time goals of the fire protection and emergency medical agencies, additional staffing, equipment, and facilities would be required. Table 5.7-5 shows the estimated facility additions required for the maintenance of adequate levels of service throughout 2025, based on estimates and on responses received from fire protection districts and CDF.

Table 5.7-5 Future Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Facility Needs¹		
District	Additional Facility Needs by 2025	Additional Facility Needs by Buildout²
Cameron Park FD	Expansion of facility ¹	Expansion of facility ¹
Diamond Springs/ El Dorado FPD	Expansion of facilities (No Project Alternative: None; Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus," Environmentally Constrained, and 1996 General Plan Alternatives: quantity undetermined)	Expansion of facilities (No Project Alternative: None; Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus," Environmentally Constrained, and 1996 General Plan Alternatives: quantity undetermined)
El Dorado County FPD	Replacements of facilities; new facilities (quantity undetermined)	Replacements of facilities; new facilities (quantity undetermined)
El Dorado Hills FD	New facility ¹	New facility ¹
Garden Valley FPD	New facility ³	New facility ³
Georgetown FPD	New facility ¹	New facility ¹
Latrobe FPD	New facility ³	New facility ³
Marshall Medical	Expansion of facility ¹	Expansion of facility ¹
Mercy Hospital of Folsom	Expansion of facility ¹	Expansion of facility ¹
Mosquito FPD	New facility ³	New facility ³
Pioneer FPD	New facility ¹ Expansion of facility ¹	New facility ¹ Expansion of facility ¹
Rescue FPD	New facility ¹	New facility ¹
<p>¹ Unless otherwise noted, the extent of additional facility needs would be greatest under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, followed by the Environmentally Constrained, Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus," and No Project alternatives. The extent of new facilities and facility expansions would increase correspondingly with population growth in areas that would not be sufficiently served by existing facilities, as funding allows. In areas with existing fire stations, facility expansions are more likely to occur than the construction of new facilities.</p> <p>² The amount of additional facilities needed by buildout is compared to existing facilities; it may reflect the same facility needs that are shown in this table under "Additional Needs by 2025."</p> <p>³ Based on worst-case scenario that one or more new facilities would be required to serve population growth.</p> <p>FD = Fire Department; FPD = Fire Protection District</p> <p>Sources: Pers. comms. listed below for respective districts and hospital: Cameron Park FD: Silva 2003, Diamond Springs/El Dorado FPD: Christian 2002, El Dorado County FPD: Lacher 2003, El Dorado Hills FD: Russell 2003, Georgetown FPD: Todd 2002, Pioneer FPD: Lindgren 2003, Rescue FPD: Knoop 2003, Marshall Medical: Funston 2003, and Mercy Hospital of Folsom: Vicks 2003.</p>		

No Project Alternative (Alternative #1)

Relevant Goals/Policies—No Project Alternative

The relevant policies included in the 1996 General Plan that are applicable to the No Project Alternative are Policies 5.1.1.1 and 5.1.1.2, 5.1.2.1 through 5.1.2.4, 5.1.3.1 and 5.1.3.2, 5.7.2.1, and 6.2.3.1.

No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Under the No Project Alternative, Policies 5.1.1.1 and 5.1.1.2, 5.1.2.1 through 5.1.2.3, 5.7.2.1, and 6.2.3.1 would ensure that the County cooperates with the fire protection districts in developing level-of-service standards and capital improvement plans (e.g., facility master plans). These policies would also require new developments to contribute fair-share funding to fire protection districts in order to maintain an adequate level of service. Given these policies, it is expected that additional fire protection facilities would be constructed in the county by 2025.¹

New and expanded facilities would be developed in response to population growth as funding allows. Fire protection and emergency medical facilities are allowed under all General Plan designations under the No Project Alternative. Development of new and expanded fire protection and emergency medical facilities may require land use permits in some instances. The development of fire protection and emergency medical facilities could potentially result in adverse physical effects on the environment. These potential environmental impacts are generally addressed by proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures described in other sections of Chapter 5 of this EIR (e.g., schools, residences). Apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR, operation of fire protection and emergency medical facilities could result in potential incompatibility with adjacent land uses from siren noise at any hour of the day, traffic and access, and handling of hazardous materials, which are not fully addressed by General Plan policies. This impact is considered significant.

No Project Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Under the No Project Alternative, the numbers of structures and residents could increase within the service boundaries of every fire protection district on the west slope by buildout.

¹ Not all fire protection districts responded to data requests for this analysis. In the instances where data were not provided, facility needs were inferred based on similar circumstances in those districts where data was provided.

The policies would require the construction of additional fire protection and emergency medical facilities in the county in order to maintain an adequate level of service through the buildout of the county (please refer to No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above). Apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR, operation of fire protection and emergency medical facilities could result in potential incompatibility with adjacent land uses from siren noise, traffic and access, and handling of hazardous materials. This impact is considered significant.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (Alternative #2)

Relevant Goals/Policies—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative

The relevant policies that are applicable to the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative are Policies LU-3n, LU-7a, HS-1b and HS-1c, HS-2a through HS-2d, PS-1a through PS-1e, PS-1g, PS-7a, and PS-7c.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative, the numbers of structures and residents would increase within the service boundaries of every fire protection district on the west slope, as listed in Table 5.7-5.

Policies LU-7a, HS-2d, PS-1a through PS-1e, PS-7a, and PS-7c would ensure that the County would cooperate with the fire protection districts in developing level-of-service standards and capital improvement plans (e.g., facility master plans). These policies would also require new discretionary developments to contribute fair-share funding to fire protection districts in order to maintain an adequate level of service for fire protection and emergency medical services. While this does not address ministerial actions, Policy HS-2d requires application of fire protection standards for discretionary actions and building permits (ministerial actions), and Policies PS-7a and PS-7c more generally address demands created by ministerial actions. Given these policies, it is expected that additional and expanded fire protection and emergency medical facilities would be constructed in the county by 2025.

New and expanded facilities would be developed in response to population growth as funding allows. Fire protection and emergency medical facilities are allowed under all but Natural Resource, Industrial, Research and Development, and Open Space designations under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative. The development of fire protection and emergency medical facilities could potentially result in adverse physical effects on the environment. These potential environmental impacts are generally addressed by proposed

General Plan policies and mitigation measures described in other sections of Chapter 5 of this EIR. Apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR, operation of fire protection and emergency medical facilities could result in potential incompatibility with adjacent land uses (e.g., schools, residences) from siren noise, traffic and access, and handling of hazardous materials, which are not fully addressed by General Plan policies. This impact is considered significant.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

As discussed above, buildout of the county under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative could require the construction of additional fire protection and emergency medical facilities, as shown in Table 5.7-5. As discussed above, this impact is considered significant.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Alternative #3)

Relevant Goals/Policies—Environmentally Constrained Alternative

For the relevant policies of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, please refer to the policies listed above under Relevant Goals/Policies—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative. Policy LU-3n in the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative is renumbered as Policy LU-3o in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Please refer to Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. Fire protection and emergency medical facilities are allowed under all but Natural Resource, Industrial, Research and Development, and Open Space designations under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR, operation of fire protection and emergency medical facilities could result in potential land use incompatibility with adjacent land uses from siren noise, traffic and access, and handling of hazardous materials, which are not fully addressed by General Plan policies. This impact is considered significant.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Please refer to Environmentally Constrained Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

1996 General Plan Alternative (Alternative #4)

Relevant Goals/Policies—1996 General Plan Alternative

For the relevant policies of the 1996 General Plan Alternative, please refer to the policies listed above under Relevant Goals/Policies—No Project Alternative.

1996 General Plan Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

As shown in Table 5.7-5, additional facilities would be required. Please refer to No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

1996 General Plan Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Please refer to 1996 General Plan Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-2—No Project Alternative

The County shall implement the following measures:

- < Mitigation Measure 5.7-2(a): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b)
- < Mitigation Measure 5.7-2(b): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d)

These potential mitigation measures are described below.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-2(a): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b)

The County shall implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b) described in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-2(b): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d)

The County shall implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d) described in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing.

These mitigation measures would limit potential land use incompatibilities by limiting the range of appropriate land uses within which fire protection and emergency medical facilities could be developed, and would subject such projects to a review of land use compatibility by

the County and any subsequent siting and design conditions. As a result, with implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-2—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level for the same reasons as described under the No Project Alternative.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-2—Environmentally Constrained Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-2—1996 General Plan Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

5.7.3 SCHOOLS AND CHILDCARE FACILITIES

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Physical Environment

School-age children are children between the ages of 5 and 18. In the United States, school-age children made up 18.87% of the total population in 2000. The state of California has a higher percentage of school-age children, with 19.97% in 2000. In El Dorado County, school-age children made up 20.38% of the population in 2000, an increase from 18.98% of the population in 1990. These numbers indicate that the county has a higher percentage of school-age children than either the state or the nation as a whole (U.S. Census 2002).

Currently there are 62 schools and related public education facilities, such as special-education schools and juvenile centers, in the county, accommodating 28,795 students during the 2000–2001 school year (Ed-Data 2003). Based on a county population of 156,299 persons in 2000, public-school students comprise 18.42% of the county population (U.S. Census 2002). Public-school facilities are shown in Exhibit 5.7-3.

Children under the age of 5 may be cared for at private homes at all times or in childcare facilities during the day. The percentage of children under the age of 5 in the United States in 2000 was 6.81%, lower than California's 7.34%. In El Dorado County, children under the age of 5 made up 5.72% of the population in 2000, a substantial decrease from 7.40% of the population in 1990. The absolute number of children under 5 years of age has decreased from 9,326 persons to 8,946. These numbers indicate that the percentage of children under the age of 5 in the county is below the state and national percentages, and that the number of childcare-age children is decreasing in the county (U.S. Census 2002).

Regulatory Environment

The focus of the regulatory discussion in this EIR is on funding mechanisms that enable the provision of school facilities.

State Regulations

Before passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, funding for the construction of new school facilities was mostly provided for at the local level through property tax levies. Proposition 13 severely restricted the ability of local districts to enact these levies; a funding shortfall for school facility construction ensued. Since 1978, numerous programs have been passed at the state level, resulting in a shift in the funding of school facility construction from largely local sources to a closer split between state and local funding. The two largest segments of funding for school facilities are state funding through voter-approved bond measures, which fund up to 50% of the cost of new construction, and fees paid by property developers to the local school districts where impacts result. Funding through state bond measures has always been highly competitive, and the pool of available dollars has never been sufficient to meet local needs. Further, state funding requires a local matching fund. Developer fee funding has had varying levels of success in providing local funding for school facilities, and at different times both legal and legislative action have capped the available funding of this source. Developer fees have typically funded less than 50% of the cost of new facilities. Other funding sources have included community facilities district funding (e.g., Mello-Roos funds), which require passage by a vote of two-thirds of the electors or (in new development areas with uninhabited land) two-thirds of the landowners, and local bond funding, which also requires a larger than 50% majority for passage.

Local bond funding was given a boost in 2000, when the percentage needed for passage of a school bond was reduced from two-thirds to 55% through the passage of State Proposition 39. Before 2000, local revenue bonds (primarily for school facility funding) passed 48% of the time.

EXHIBIT 5.7-3

FOLD OUT

B & W

2nd page of Exhibit 5.7-3 (11x17)

In the three general elections between November 2001 and November 2002 following passage of Proposition 39, 211 local school bond measures appeared on ballots in California, and 180 of these measures were passed, a success rate of 85% (Public Policy Institute of California 2003). This reduction in the voting requirement has made local funding of school facilities more achievable.

Perhaps the most important school funding program enacted since 1978 is the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, which is discussed below.

Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act (1998)

The Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act was signed into law with the passage of Senate Bill (SB) 50, which also put Proposition 1A on the ballot. Approval of Proposition 1A in 1998 made \$9.2 billion in bonds available to K-12 schools for new construction, modernization of older schools, funding for districts in hardship situations, and funding for classroom size reductions. SB 50 suspended the *Mira/Hart/Murrieta* court cases for 8 years and provides authority for school districts to collect three different levels of fees with established dollar amounts. These fees are not applicable to “grandfathered” developments that were contracted with or otherwise specifically permitted by school districts, cities, or counties before the approval of Proposition 1A in November 1998. Government Code §65995(e), as amended by SB 50, prohibits cities and counties from denying land use approvals on the basis that school facilities are inadequate. These provisions are in effect until 2006 and may be extended by the approval of subsequent state school facilities bonds (Bowie 2001). The latest bond measure, Proposition 47, was approved by the voters in November 2002. A future bond measure is currently being proposed for March 2004 (OPSC 2002). However, in 2006, if a state bond measure fails, the findings of the *Mira/Hart/Murrieta* court cases would be partially restored to the extent that a city or county could deny a land use development application but could not condition the project to pay fees above the fee set by the state.

Level One Fee

Government Code §65995 allows statutory fees, which, as of January 2002 could not exceed \$2.14 per square foot of residential construction for K-12 facilities and \$0.34 per square foot of commercial/industrial construction. The amount of these fees may be increased for inflation by the State Allocation Board (SAB) on a biannual basis. These statutory fees are referred to as “Level One Fees.” Before Level One Fee requirements are adopted, schools districts must prepare fee justification studies, which must make findings of the following (Bowie 2001):

1. Identify the purpose of the fee;
2. Identify the use to which the fee is to be put;
3. Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed; and
4. Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development on which the fee is imposed.

Level Two and Level Three Fees

Government Code §65995 also allows school districts to impose fee requirements in addition to Level One Fees. These alternative fees, referred to as “Level Two Fee” and “Level Three Fee,” are applicable solely to residential developments under specific circumstances. Specifically, a school district may impose these alternative fees if it meets at least two of the following four requirements:

1. Imposed a Multi-Track Year-Round Education (MTYRE) Schedule:
 - a. For a unified or elementary school district, at least 30% of the K-6 enrollment in the school district (or high school attendance area) must be on MTYRE schedule, and
 - b. For a high school district, at least 30% of the high school enrollment must be on MTYRE schedule or at least 40% of K-12 enrollment must be on MTYRE schedule (within the district or high school attendance area for which the district is applying for funding);
2. Within the last 4 years, placed on the ballot a local bond measure that received at least 50% plus 1 of the votes;
3. Issued debt or incurred obligation for capital outlay equal to a specified percentage of its local bond capacity; and
4. Located at least 20% of classrooms in relocatable structures.

Furthermore, school districts must prepare school facilities needs analyses on an annual basis before imposing Level Two and Level Three Fees.

Level Two Fees, the amount of which is intended to represent approximately 50% of a school district's school facility costs, apply when the SAB is apportioning state funding. The SAB would match the remaining 50% if state funds are available.

Level Three Fees are implemented if the SAB determines that the State School Facilities Program has run out of bond funding. Level Three fees can pay for up to 100% of the cost of the school facility or mitigation, minus local dedicated school funding (Bowie 2001).

Planning Environment

Public School Districts

There are 15 school districts in the county. Fourteen of these school districts are located on the west slope, including one high school district, one K-12 school district, and 12 small- to moderate-sized K-8 school districts that “feed” into the El Dorado Union High School District (CDE 2002). The service areas of these school districts are shown in Exhibit 5.7-3. The countywide public school enrollment has fluctuated over the last 9 school years from a low of 27,683 students in the 1993-1994 school year to a high of 29,104 students in the 2001-2002 school year (CDE 2002). The 2001-2002 enrollment and school capacity data for the west slope are shown in Table 5.7-6.

Table 5.7-6 School District Enrollment and Capacity on the West Slope (2001-2002)			
District	2001-2002 Enrollment	Traditional Capacity¹	Percentage of Traditional Capacity
El Dorado Union High School	6,612	4,394	150.5%
Black Oak Mine Unified (K-12)	2,012	2,120	94.9%
Buckeye Union Elementary	4,100	4,546	90.2%
Camino Union Elementary	592	390	151.8%
Gold Oak Union Elementary	756	860	87.9%
Gold Trail Union Elementary	645	759	85.0%
Indian Diggings Elementary	38	27	140.7%
Latrobe Elementary	192	NA	NA
Mother Lode Union Elementary	1,663	1,924	86.4%
Pioneer Union Elementary	589	685	86.0%
Placerville Union Elementary	1,345	1,368	98.3%
Pollock Pines Elementary	935	1,064	87.9%
Rescue Union Elementary	3,346	2,874	116.4%
Silver Fork Elementary	17	NA	NA
¹ Traditional capacity is based on permanent structures and does not include portable classrooms. Additional capacity provided by MTYRE is considered traditional capacity in this analysis. ² Based on school districts with available information on capacity. NA = data not available. Sources: California Department of Education DataQuest, September 5, 2002; Corley and Schwarzbach 1994a-h; Williams & Associates 2002a-c.			

In addition to the school districts, the County Office of Education operates a program for home schooling, a daycare program, a vocational high school, a school associated with the juvenile hall, and special education programs (EDCOE 2002). The total enrollment in these programs during the 2001-2002 school year was 773 students (CDE 2002). The average classroom size for the public schools was 26.5 students during the 2000-2001 school year (Ed-Data 2003).

El Dorado Union High School District

Currently students from the elementary school districts on the west slope, aside from Gold Oak Union School District, feed into the El Dorado Union High School District. The school district operates four comprehensive high schools, one continuation high school, a daycare program, and an adult education program. Construction of one of the comprehensive high schools, Union Mine High School, was completed in 1999 with some of the funding coming from a local bond that was approved in June 1997 (EDCCC 2002). Enrollment in the school district has increased every year over the last 9 school years, from 5,217 students in the 1993-1994 school year to 6,612 students in the 2001-2002 school year (CDE 2002). Enrollment growth is expected to continue based on the increase of residential development in the county. The existing enrollment exceeds the school district's traditional classroom capacity by 2,218 students. The school district completed a school facilities needs assessment in February 2002, and currently imposes Level Two Fees on all residential development within the school district in order to fund the construction of a new school (EDUHSD 2002). Two additional high schools are currently planned. The district has also established a community facilities district in the El Dorado Hills area and has access to unused bond funding (Walker, pers. comm., 2003).

Black Oak Mine Unified School District (K-12)

This school district, serving the Georgetown Divide region, had an enrollment of 2,012 students during the 2001-2002 school year. The number of students has steadily declined since the 1993-1994 school year, when the district had an enrollment of 2,238 students (CDE 2002). The school district currently operates one daycare school, four K-8 schools, one high school, and one continuation high school. The Black Oak Mine Unified School District adopted its Facilities Master Plan in April 1994. The Facilities Master Plan projects that 1,119 students may be added to the school district between approximately 2005 and 2025, predicated in part on the assumption that the Auburn Dam would be built, which would accelerate the growth within the school district. The Auburn Dam is not a currently approved federal project; nevertheless, growth in the district has been predicted. This growth would result in a need for one new elementary school, one new middle school, and the expansion of

the existing high school. Several potential school sites have been identified, including the Garden Valley park, a site at Greenwood, and a site in Pilot Hill Ranch (BOMSD 1994). The traditional classroom capacity of the school district is 2,120 students; as such, the school district is currently operating within its capacity, as shown in Table 5.7-6.

Buckeye Union Elementary School District

The Buckeye Union Elementary School District serves the rapidly growing communities of El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, and Shingle Springs with four elementary schools and two middle schools. Two of the elementary schools currently operate on the MTYRE schedule because enrollment at these schools exceeds the schools' traditional-schedule capacity. Rolling Hills Middle School also operates on the MTYRE schedule. The new Oak Meadow Elementary School, which will operate on the MTYRE schedule, will open in June 2003.

The enrollment in the school district has steadily increased, with an increase of 163% between the 1993-1994 school year and the 2001-2002 school year. During the 2001-2002 school year the district had an enrollment of 4,100 students (CDE 2002), which is below the district's MTYRE classroom capacity of 4,546 students. The Facilities Master Plan, prepared for the Buckeye Union Elementary School District, projected that enrollment within the district would grow to 6,718 students by 2011, an increase of 2,660 students over the 2001-2002 enrollment. Additional school capacity for 1,522 students will need to be constructed by 2011. Potential school sites are located within areas designated for development within the Serrano, El Dorado Hills, Marble Valley, Valley View, and Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan Areas. The school district currently imposes Level Two development fees (Williams & Associates 2002c).

Camino Union School District

The Camino Union School District, serving the community of Camino, has an enrollment of 592 K-8 students, all of whom attend Camino School. The enrollment in the school district has fluctuated over the last 9 school years from a low of 554 students in the 1999-2000 school year to a high of 592 students in the 2001-2002 school year (CDE 2002). Camino School has a traditional classroom capacity for 390 students (Corley and Schwarzbach 1994a). Camino School is currently operating above capacity, and the district uses relocatable classrooms. The school district has purchased 12 acres of land adjacent to Camino School for the purpose of constructing a new middle school. However, no new school is currently being planned (Schamberg, pers. comm., 2003).

Gold Oak Union School District

The Gold Oak Union School District operates one K-5 school and one 6-8 school that together served 756 students during the 2001-2002 school year. Enrollment in the district has steadily declined over the last 9 school years, from a high of 1,079 students in 1993-1994 to a low of 756 students in 2001-2002. The enrollment is projected to decline through 2011-2012 even with the addition of up to 60 students generated by projected new residential development. The existing classroom capacity is for 860 students. As such, existing capacity is sufficient for future enrollment, and no developer's impact fees are collected for this school district (Williams & Associates 2002).

Gold Trail Union School District

The Gold Trail Union School District operates one K-3 school and one 4-8 school and served 645 students during the 2001-2002 school year. Enrollment at the school district has steadily declined over the last 9 school years from a high of 723 students in the 1993-1994 school year to a low of 645 students in 2001-2002 (CDE 2002). The decline is generally attributed to a large influx of new retirement-age residents without children. The traditional classroom capacity of the school district is for 720 students. As such, the school district is currently operating below capacity. Voters approved a bond measure in November 2002 for the renovation of the school; however, no new classrooms would be constructed (Piffero, pers. comm., 2003).

Indian Diggings School District

Indian Diggings School, with two classrooms, is the only school in this elementary school district. The school district had an enrollment of 38 students in the 2001-2002 school year (CDE 2002) and expects a slow, gradual increase in student enrollment. The school district does not currently use relocatable classrooms. The district is currently operating above its traditional classroom capacity of 27 students (Corley and Schwarzbach 1994b).

Latrobe Elementary School District

The Latrobe Elementary School District operates one K-3 school and one 4-8 school. The enrollment in the school district has increased within the last 9 school years, with 192 students attending the schools in 2001-2002 (CDE 2002). The school district currently imposes Level One development fees (Pinotti, pers. comm., 2003).

Mother Lode Union Elementary School District

The school district operates three schools that served 1,663 students in the K-8 grades during the 2001-2002 school year. The enrollment has declined within the last 9 school years, with a low of 1,638 students during the 2000-2001 school year (CDE 2002). A fee justification study prepared for the school district in 1994 had projected that enrollment would be 2,267 K-8 students during the 2001-2002 school year, increasing to 2,508 students by 2003-2004, rather than declining. The existing traditional classroom capacity is for 1,924 students; as such, the school district is currently operating within its capacity (Corley and Schwarzbach 1994c). Based on an anticipated increase in school enrollment, the school district currently imposes Level One development fees (Hewitt, pers. comm., 2003).

Pioneer Union Elementary School District

The Pioneer Union Elementary School District operates three schools and served 526 K-8 students during the 2001-2002 school year. The Developer Fee Justification Report prepared for the district in May 2002 concluded that projected enrollment through 2011-2012 would decrease to 518 students. The school district has traditional classroom capacity for 685 students. As such, existing and future enrollment would not be expected to exceed the school district's capacity, and the school district is not eligible to impose developer's impact fees (Williams & Associates 2002a).

Placerville Union School District

Three schools are operated by the Placerville Union School District to serve K-8 students in the Placerville area. A fee justification study prepared for the school district in 1994 projected that enrollment would increase steadily to 2,577 students by 2003-2004 (Corley and Schwarzbach 1994d). However, the enrollment in the school district has been declining over the last 9 school years, and during the 2001-2002 school year the enrollment was 1,345 students (CDE 2002). The school district has traditional classroom capacity for 1,368 students. As such, the school district is currently operating within its capacity.

Pollock Pines Elementary School District

The Pollock Pines Elementary School District operates three schools serving the K-8 student population. The traditional classroom capacity is currently 1,064 students (Jackson, pers. comm., 2002). A fee justification study prepared for the school district in 1994 projected that enrollment would increase steadily to 1,689 students by 2003-2004 (Corley and Schwarzbach 1994e). The school enrollment in the district has declined over the last 9 school years, with an

enrollment of 935 students during the 2001–2002 school year (CDE 2002). The school district currently operates within its capacity.

Rescue Union School District

The Rescue Union School District operates four K-6 schools and one 7-8 school. The traditional classroom capacity of the school district is for 2,874 students. A fee justification study prepared for the school district in 1994 projected that enrollment would increase steadily to 5,398 students by 2003–2004 (Corley and Schwarzbach 1994c). The school district is currently operating over its capacity, with an enrollment of 3,346 students during the 2001-2002 school year (CDE 2002). A new middle school will be completed in July 2003. The school district currently exacts Level Two development fees and has established a community facilities district. The district also has access to funding from a local bond passed in 1998 (Benning, pers. comm., 2003).

Silver Fork School District

The Silver Fork School District operates one school, which has one classroom. The enrollment at this elementary school district has varied between 10 students and 38 students over the last 9 school years. The 2001–2002 school year had an enrollment of 17 students (CDE 2002).

Higher Education

Three institutions of higher learning are located in the county: a branch of Cosumnes River College, Lake Tahoe Community College, and a branch of Chapman University. Chapman University is a private, 4-year college located in Southern California that operates a campus in Diamond Springs.

California's community colleges are considered a part of the state's public school system. The El Dorado Center branch is a part of the Cosumnes River College, which is a 2-year community college serving all but one of the school districts in El Dorado County. Construction of the first permanent structures for the El Dorado Center has been completed, and classes operating in the permanent buildings opened in 1994 (LRCCD 2000). The El Dorado Center is planning the construction of a new instructional/library space, new student and faculty support facilities, and roadway access and parking improvements. The funding sources would be local and/or state bond funds, and the El Dorado Center is not authorized to collect developer's fees (Kirklin, pers. comm., 2002). No other facilities are contemplated and this issue is not addressed further in this EIR.

Private Schools

Private-school enrollment in El Dorado County accounts for approximately 4.7% of the total K-12 enrollment in the county. The percentage of students enrolled in private schools in the county has remained stable in recent years, according to the California Department of Education. Enrollment in private schools ranges from one student being taught in a home to enrollment of more than 100 students. No records are kept regarding the capacity of private schools, and because they are not public-service facilities, they are not addressed further in this EIR.

Childcare Facilities

Childcare services are generally provided by two main types of providers: licensed public and private care providers and unlicensed providers, which includes parents, relatives, and friends. Four types of licensed care providers are available in the county: family day care, childcare centers, exempt care, and school-age childcare. Some of these providers are publicly funded by agencies such as the California Department of Education. The County Superintendent's Office administers two publicly funded childcare programs. Participation in these programs is voluntary, and the eligibility of families to participate is based on income level. Private residential care facilities for six or more children are licensed by the California Department of Social Services. Because these facilities are generally small, are part of homes and generally private, or are part of development projects, they are not considered further in this EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Thresholds of Significance

The General Plan would result in a significant impact if development would result in the need for new or physically altered public school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives. Government Code §65995(e) precludes the use of a threshold related to inadequate capacity.

Impact
5.7-3

Potential Land Use Incompatibility Associated with Development and Expansion of Public School Facilities. The projected growth in population resulting from development under the General Plan would generate the need for new and physically altered school facilities. The greatest number of new and physically altered public school facilities would be required under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, followed by the Environmentally Constrained, Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus," and No Project alternatives. New facilities

would be developed in response to population growth as funding allows. Public school facilities are allowed under all General Plan land use designations under the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives, and under all but the Natural Resources, Industrial, Research and Development, and Open Space designations under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives. The development of public school facilities could potentially result in adverse physical effects on the environment. These potential environmental impacts are generally addressed by proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures described in other sections of Chapter 5 of this EIR, as well as policies specific to this issue under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives. Apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR, operation of public school facilities could result in potential incompatibility with adjacent land uses from noise, traffic and access, and other issues, which are not fully addressed by General Plan policies. This impact is considered **significant**. Impact significance before and after mitigation is shown in the table below.

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation*							
	Alt. #1 (No Project)		Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus”)		Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)		Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)	
	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout
5.7-3: Potential Land Use Incompatibility Associated with Development and Expansion of Public School Facilities	S ₄	S ₄	S ₃	S ₃	S ₂	S ₂	S ₁	S ₁
Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation*							
	Alt. #1 (No Project)		Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus”)		Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)		Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)	
	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout
5.7-3(a), Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b);and 5.7-3(b), Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d)	SU ₄	SU ₄	SU ₃	SU ₃	SU ₂	SU ₂	SU ₁	SU ₁
* Notes: LS = Less than Significant; N/A= Not Applicable; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable. Significant impacts are ranked against each other by alternative for the 2025 scenario and the buildout scenario, from 1 (Worst Impact) to 4 (Least Impact). Where the impact under two different alternatives during the same time frame would be roughly equal in severity, the numerical ranking is the same.								

According to the County Office of Education, students are currently generated at an average of 0.338 student per household countywide (including Lake Tahoe). Of these, approximately 44% are grades K-5, 24% are grades 6-8, and 32% are high school students.

The California Department of Education, School Facilities Planning Division, published the *Guide to School Site Analysis and Development, 2000 Edition* (CDE 2000), in which guidelines for school facility/campus size are provided. The guidelines are complex and show a wide range of facility size needs depending on programs that local districts want to fill. This EIR uses a conservative estimate of facility needs by assuming relatively large campuses. Based on a range of needs, an elementary school of 500 students would require a site of 9.5 acres, or approximately 825 square feet (sf) per student. A middle school housing 700 students would require a 12.9-acre site, or approximately 800 sf per student. A high school with an enrollment of 1,500 students would require a 40.8-acre site, or 1,185 sf per student. School site sizes and square feet per student are variable, but these totals represent reasonable ranges based on the data in the DOE guide.

By taking the average square footage per student by grade level and using the County's current student generation data, a figure for total school facility need per household can be calculated. Based on these data, each new dwelling would generate an average need for 312 sf of school facilities (including classrooms, play areas, parking, and internal roads). If this is applied to each new dwelling unit, a "worst-case" development total for school facilities is provided (i.e., assuming that each new student would generate a demand for new facilities and the facilities would be provided). In practice, as described above, there would be capacity remaining at some schools; other schools would choose portables rather than new facilities depending on total enrollment, funding sources, etc.; and some schools would choose alternative programming to increase capacity (year-round schooling, multitrack sessions). By not considering these factors, a maximum-potential-construction scenario can be determined and potential physical development impacts would be based on that total.

Table 5.7-7 shows the estimated acreage needed for expanded school facilities by market area, needed to serve the increase in public school enrollment. Because of boundary differences, the market area calculations could not be correlated with school districts. Further, as can be seen in the table, these calculations are illustrative but not necessarily reflective of what would be built and where. For instance, it is unlikely that school facilities of 1 to 3 acres in size would reflect actual construction, as schools are rarely that small. Nevertheless, this represents the worst-case scenario, as some of the school districts currently have excess capacity that can accommodate additional students, as shown in Table 5.7-6. However, it is clear that new schools would be needed, because many of the school districts are currently operating above their traditional classroom capacities.

Table 5.7-7 Additional School Facilities Needed ¹									
Market #	Market Area	School Facility Needs (acres)							
		No Project		Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus"		Environmentally Constrained		1996 General Plan	
		2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout
1	El Dorado Hills	94	95	106	108	120	135	116	147
2	Cameron Park/Shingle Springs/Rescue	22	31	28	43	43	85	41	112
3	Diamond Springs	4	7	6	14	17	39	23	85
4	Placerville	10	12	14	17	17	22	14	25
5	Coloma/Gold Hill	3	5	5	8	3	5	4	10
6	Pollock Pines	3	8	4	16	7	19	6	28
7	Pleasant Valley	3	8	4	13	3	7	5	17
8	Latrobe	3	3	5	6	5	6	6	11
9	Somerset	3	8	2	9	3	9	3	12
10	Cool/Pilot Hill	2	6	3	15	6	25	6	42
11	Georgetown/Garden Valley	2	14	3	24	5	24	6	39
13	American River	2	11	2	19	3	17	2	24
14	Mosquito	2	4	4	8	1	1	2	10
Total Additional School Facility Needs (1999 to 2025/Buildout)		153	212	186	300	233	394	234	562
<p>¹ See Table 4-6 for dwelling unit forecasts. Totals assume 312 square feet of school facility (including classrooms, play areas, parking, and internal roads) per new dwelling unit.</p> <p>Note: For this EIR, consideration was given to determining potential facility needs by market area and grade level. A further examination of this concluded that determining facility needs by grade level in each market level would suggest a greater level of precision in predicting the future (not only number of students, but their grade levels by market area) than is reasonable for a General Plan. Typically such analyses are conducted by school districts and are based on specific development proposals, local demographic trends, proposed housing sizes, etc. Thus, at the General Plan level it was determined that a better method would be to use an overall student generation rate for the County and equate this to classroom needs and the impacts of construction of these facilities.</p> <p>Source: EPS 2002, EDAW 2003</p>									

No Project Alternative (Alternative #1)

Relevant Goals/Policies—No Project Alternative

The relevant policies included in the 1996 General Plan that are applicable to the No Project Alternative are Policies 5.1.2.1 through 5.1.2.3, 5.8.1.1 through 5.8.1.6, 5.8.2.1, 5.8.2.2, 5.8.2.4 and 5.8.2.5.

No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

New residential developments would occur both in urban and rural portions of the west slope under the No Project Alternative, and population growth may occur in every school district. This population growth, depending on the age groups of the new residents and the birth rate, would generate varying numbers of new students within the school district boundaries. Because the school districts are required to allow enrollment in their school districts, the increase in school enrollment may exceed existing capacities at some of the school districts.

Policies 5.8.1.2, 5.8.1.3, and 5.8.2.5 would require the coordination of the school facility master plans with the County's Capital Improvement Plan and General Plan in order to anticipate long-term future growth and maintain adequate classroom sizes by expanding permanent facilities at existing school sites, leasing additional portable classrooms, or constructing new schools. However, the County does not have the authority to deny project approval based on school capacity deficiencies, due to Government Code §65995(e). For this reason, Policy 5.8.1.1 is no longer legally valid. Policies 5.1.2.1 through 5.1.2.3, 5.8.1.1, 5.8.1.4 through 5.8.1.6, 5.8.2.2, and 5.8.2.4 would require, to the extent allowed by statutes, new discretionary projects to provide funding, land, or other mitigation to school districts for the development of additional school facilities in order to maintain acceptable classroom sizes. Given these policies, the capacity at the school districts would be expanded where needed to meet the demand generated by new development. As such, new or expanded school facilities would be constructed under the No Project Alternative.

The increase in school enrollment would require either additional portable classrooms or new or expanded school facilities. Based on demand by market area, this would be the case in Market Area #1 (El Dorado Hills) and Market Area #2 (Cameron Park/Shingle Springs/Rescue), which are both served by the Buckeye Union Elementary and El Dorado Union High School Districts. Based on consultation with school districts on the west slope, six school districts have expressed the need to construct new schools by 2025. Other school districts have indicated that the expansion of existing facilities or new portable classrooms may be needed by 2025. However, the total number of new or expanded facilities needed by the school districts

cannot be determined because of demographic changes, such as the average number of students per household, that may occur by 2025 (Thomas, Kirklin, Hewitt, and Jackson, pers. comms., 2002; Williams, Walker, Flanigan, Gary, Pinotti, Benning, Piffero, and Schamberg, pers. comms., 2003).

New and expanded facilities would be developed in response to the increase in school enrollment generated by population growth. Under this alternative, approximately 153 acres of new public school facilities could be needed on the west slope by 2025. Because the County does not have the direct authority for determining the construction and siting of public schools, new public school facilities may be constructed in all General Plan land use designations under all four equal-weight alternatives. Public schools can be constructed in any land use designation despite General Plan inconsistencies. The development of school facilities could potentially result in adverse physical effects on the environment. These potential environmental impacts are generally addressed by proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures described in other sections of Chapter 5 of this EIR. Apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR, operation of public school facilities could result in potential incompatibility with adjacent land uses from noise and traffic and access, which are not fully addressed by General Plan policies. This impact is considered significant.

No Project Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

By buildout, population growth in the county would generate additional school enrollment at the local school districts. As shown in Table 5.7-7, approximately 212 acres of additional school facilities could be required by buildout. As discussed above, some of the school districts anticipate that additional school facilities would be required to accommodate additional students. As discussed above, new and expanded school facilities are not anticipated to result in significant land use incompatibility impacts apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR. This impact is considered significant.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (Alternative #2)

Relevant Goals/Policies—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative

The relevant policies that are applicable to the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative are Policies LU-3n, LU-7a, PS-1c through PS-1e, PS-1g, and PS-9a through PS-9c.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

New residential developments would occur in the west slope under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative, and school enrollment increases in the local school districts may exceed existing capacities at some of the school districts.

Policies LU-7a, PS-1c, PS-9b, and PS-9c would require the coordination of the school facility master plans with the County’s Capital Improvement Plan and General Plan in order to anticipate long-term future growth and maintain adequate classroom sizes by expanding permanent facilities at existing school sites, lease additional portable classrooms, or construct new schools. Policies LU-7a, PS-1d, PS-1e, and PS-9a would require new discretionary projects to provide funding, land, or other mitigation for the development of additional school facilities in order to maintain acceptable classroom sizes to the extent allowed by law. Given these policies, the capacity at the school districts can be expected to expand to meet the demand generated by new development. As such, new or expanded school facilities would be constructed under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative. As shown in Table 5.7-7, up to 186 acres of school facilities may be required by 2025, in the same general locations as under the No Project Alternative. Several school districts have confirmed that additional or expanded school facilities would be required to accommodate the additional students. Policy LU-3n would promote the siting of schools in any land use designation areas with the exceptions of Natural Resource, Industrial, Research and Development, and Open Space designations; development of school facilities is generally not appropriate in these land use designations because of the potential for nuisances associated with industrial and agricultural activities and for disturbance to wildlife and habitats. Policy PS-9c would encourage the siting of schools in Community Regions and Rural Centers in order to reduce the impacts related to land use incompatibility. In spite of this, because school districts are not bound by these land use restrictions, they may choose to site facilities in any land use designation. New and expanded school facilities may still result in land use incompatibility impacts, such as from noise, traffic, and access in residential areas, apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR. This impact is considered significant.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Buildout under this alternative could require approximately 300 acres of new and expanded school facilities, as shown in Table 5.7-7. The construction and operations of these facilities could result in significant land use incompatibility impacts apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR. Please refer to Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above for discussion of applicable General Plan policies. This impact is considered significant.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Alternative #3)

Relevant Goals/Policies—Environmentally Constrained Alternative

For the relevant policies of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, please refer to the policies listed above under Relevant Goals/Policies—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative. Policy LU-3n in the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative is renumbered as LU-3o in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Policy LU-3o would promote the siting of schools in any land use designation areas with the exceptions of Natural Resource, Industrial, Research and Development, and Open Space designations; development of school facilities is generally not appropriate in these land use designations due to potential nuisances associated with industrial and agricultural activities and due to potential disturbance to wildlife and habitats. Policy PS-9c would encourage the siting of schools in Community Regions and Rural Centers in order to reduce the impacts related to land use incompatibility.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Development under this alternative could generate the need for approximately 233 acres for new and expanded school facilities in the same general locations (e.g., El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park/Shingle Springs/Rescue Market Areas) as under the No Project and Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternatives. This alternative additionally places relatively high demands on the Diamond Springs and Placerville Market Areas. Please refer to Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. Impacts related to land use incompatibility may result. This impact is considered significant.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Development under this alternative could generate the need for approximately 394 acres of new and expanded school facilities, as shown in Table 5.7-7. Please refer to Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. Impacts related to land use incompatibility could result. This impact is considered significant.

1996 General Plan Alternative (Alternative #4)

Relevant Goals/Policies—1996 General Plan Alternative

For the relevant policies of the 1996 General Plan Alternative, please refer to the policies listed above under Relevant Goals/Policies—No Project Alternative.

1996 General Plan Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Development under this alternative could generate the need for approximately 234 acres of new and expanded school facilities, as shown in Table 5.7-7, with the greatest demand in the El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, and Diamond Springs Market Areas. Please refer to No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

1996 General Plan Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Development under this alternative could generate the need for new and expanded school facilities, as shown in Table 5.7-7. Please refer to No Project Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-3—No Project Alternative

The County shall implement the following measures:

- < Mitigation Measure 5.7-3(a): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b)
- < Mitigation Measure 5.7-3(b): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d)

These potential mitigation measures are described below.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-3(a): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b)

The County shall implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b) described in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-3(b): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d)

The County shall implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d) as described in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing.

These mitigation measures could potentially limit potential land use incompatibilities by limiting the range of appropriate land uses within which school facilities could be developed. However, because school districts are not bound by land use restrictions and approve the location of facilities themselves, this policy may not be effective in eliminating land use incompatibility. Therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-3—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts would be reduced but not to a less-than-significant level for the same reasons as described under the No Project Alternative. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-3—Environmentally Constrained Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-3—1996 General Plan Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

5.7.4 PUBLIC LIBRARY

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Physical Environment

El Dorado County Library System

The County Library System is one of the departments of the County government. The mission of the County Library is to acquire, organize, and provide access to a wide variety of educational, informational, and recreational materials for children and adults in the county. The Library Commission makes recommendations concerning the budget and community needs and acts in an advisory capacity to the Board of Supervisors and to the County Librarian.

Library Facilities

The existing County Library System consists of six library buildings: a main library in Placerville, two large community branches in Cameron Park and South Lake Tahoe, two small branches in Georgetown and Pollock Pines, a shared library in El Dorado Hills at the high school, and a bookmobile. All but the South Lake Tahoe branch library are located on the west slope. Countywide, currently there are 54,800 sf of library space, expanding to 66,800 sf

after the completion of the new El Dorado Hills branch library. Currently, there are 42,800 sf of library space on the west slope. With the opening of the new El Dorado Hills branch library in 2004, the library system will have 52,400 sf of library space (Amos, pers. comm., 2002).

Main Library

The Main Library, located in Placerville, is the primary facility of the County Library System. The Main Library occupies 23,000 sf of a building in the Government Center in Placerville. Constructed in 1978, the Main Library was originally designed to hold 164,000 volumes. The book-holding capacity of the Main Library has since decreased with the addition of a computer lab, the reconfiguration of shelves to accommodate wider aisles in compliance with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA), and the addition of materials in a number of new formats, such as videos and books-on-tape.

As a result of the volume and variety of activities that occur in the Main Library, there is a reported need for additional space in the existing facility. The Main Library currently includes facilities for children's story hours, literacy offices and tutoring rooms, community meeting space/library programming space, staff conference room, storage space for rare and historic materials, and staff work space for branch, processing, computer, and information support.

Branch Libraries

Currently five branch libraries are located throughout the county to serve the various communities.

The Cameron Park Library is a 12,000-sf building that was built in 1994. The facility serves the Cameron Park community but is also used heavily by residents from El Dorado Hills. Currently no space deficiency problems have been reported (Amos, pers. comm., 2002).

The Georgetown branch library serves as the neighborhood library for the Georgetown, Cool, and Garden Valley communities, although many residents in Cool use the Auburn-Placer County Library instead. The current facility has served as a library since 1993, when the County Library System started leasing 1,200 sf in an existing commercial building. The County Library System estimated that this library should have at least 3,000 sf of space in order to adequately serve the residents of Georgetown. Currently there is not enough room to shelve all the library materials, especially those in nonbook formats such as videos and books-on-tape, and more space is needed for public Internet workstations, library programs, and the staff work area. The County Library System has proposed to purchase and renovate

the entire building. Potential funding sources include a grant from the Library Bond Act currently available from the state and a lease/purchase plan (Amos, pers. comm., 2002).

The branch library in Pollock Pines is located in a 40-year-old County-owned facility in a residential area on Pony Express Trail. This 1,200-sf building was built with community donations as a branch library. The El Dorado County Library System estimated that this library should have at least 3,000 sf of space and should be located in a commercial and retail area with plenty of parking and lighting. However, no expansion plans are currently under way for this library.

Built in the 1980s, the Oak Ridge Joint-Use Library is a facility that is shared with the El Dorado Union High School District to serve both the school and the El Dorado Hills community. However, because of the current library's location within the school campus and the growing demand for library services in the fast-growing El Dorado Hills community, a new library is currently being developed. The Serrano Project donated 4 acres to the County for government services. Construction funding sources that have been identified include the County's Community Enhancement Fund, Mello-Roos funds, and donations. A 15,000-sf facility in El Dorado Hills is being planned for opening in 2004 to replace the Oak Ridge Joint-Use Library.

There are no public library facilities in the south county area, which includes the communities of Somerset, Mt. Aukum, and Grizzly Flat. A new bookmobile operated by the County Library System began providing library services at Pioneer Park in summer 2002. Residents have inquired whether it might be possible to open a branch library in a former firehouse or public building, but no action has been taken. The County Library System has considered providing library service to this part of the county by forming a partnership with the local school district to increase the size of the school library and to provide public library services during after-school hours and on weekends.

Regulatory/Planning Environment

El Dorado County Library System

Planning Standards

While the County Library System does not currently have a facilities master plan, it uses a standard of 0.5 sf of library space per capita for planning purposes, not including space for computers, wider ADA-compliant aisles, and community meeting rooms. While this standard has not been adopted by any government agency, it is generally used by library service

providers to determine whether library space is adequate (Amos, pers. comm., 2002). Countywide, there are 54,800 sf of library space; this will expand to 66,800 sf after the completion of the new El Dorado Hills branch library. Based on U.S. Census population counts for 2000, the county's 156,299 residents would require 78,150 sf of library space. As such, the county has an existing deficit of library space to meet the standard generally used by the Library System.

Funding Sources

Library funding comes from two major sources: voter-approved library assessments and the County general fund. The county is divided into five library zones. The first zone was created in 1993 during the construction of the Cameron Park Library as a benefit assessment of \$25 per dwelling unit was approved. This was ratified by an advisory vote in 1994. The Cameron Park assessment has no sunset clause and has continued annually since its inception.

Three library zones received voter approval in November 1995 for a benefit assessment of \$12 per dwelling unit. South Lake Tahoe voters approved a fee of \$15 per dwelling unit in the same election. Also passed by the voters was a complementary measure that mandated an 80% match of the assessments in these four zones from the County general fund. The assessments and their corresponding "match" in these four zones would expire in 2005.

In March 2002, voters in El Dorado Hills approved an assessment of \$25 per parcel to fund operating costs of the proposed new library. This new assessment will take effect after construction of the library branch in El Dorado Hills is complete. A \$12-per-dwelling unit benefit assessment will continue until it is replaced by this parcel tax.

The State of California provides some funding (\$100,000–\$250,000) for library operations through the Public Library Fund, depending on the health of the state economy. The library also generates approximately \$125,000 through fines and fees.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Thresholds of Significance

The General Plan would result in a significant impact if development would result in the need for new and/or expanded library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant physical environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios.

**Impact
5.7-4**

Potential Land Use Incompatibility Associated with Development and Expansion of Library Facilities.

The projected growth in population resulting from development under the General Plan would generate the need for new and/or expanded library facilities. The greatest number of new and/or expanded library facilities would be required under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, followed by the Environmentally Constrained, Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus,” and No Project alternatives. New facilities would be developed in response to population growth as funding allows. Library facilities are allowed under all General Plan land use designations under all of the alternatives. The development of library facilities could potentially result in adverse physical effects on the environment. These potential environmental impacts are generally addressed by proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures described in other sections of Chapter 5 of this EIR. Apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR, operation of library facilities could result in potential incompatibility with adjacent land uses because of traffic access and other issues, which are not fully addressed by General Plan policies. This impact is considered **significant**. Impact significance before and after mitigation is shown in the table below.

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation*							
	Alt. #1 (No Project)		Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus”)		Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)		Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)	
	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout
5.7-4: Potential Land Use Incompatibility Associated with Development and Expansion of Library Facilities	S ₄	S ₄	S ₃	S ₃	S ₂	S ₂	S ₁	S ₁
Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation*							
	Alt. #1 (No Project)		Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus”)		Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)		Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)	
	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout
5.7-4(a), Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b) and 5.7-4(b), Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d)	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
* Notes: LS = Less than Significant; N/A= Not Applicable; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable. Significant impacts are ranked against each other by alternative for the 2025 scenario and the buildout scenario, from 1 (Worst Impact) to 4 (Least Impact). Where the impact under two different alternatives during the same time frame would be roughly equal in severity, the numerical ranking is the same.								

No Project Alternative (Alternative #1)

Relevant Goals/Policies—No Project Alternative

The relevant policies included in the 1996 General Plan that are applicable to the No Project Alternative are Policies 5.1.1.1 and 5.1.1.2, 5.1.2.2, and 5.9.1.1 and 5.9.1.2.

No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Under the No Project Alternative, new residential developments would occur throughout the west slope, and this population growth would generate a demand of 26,805 sf of new library space, as shown in Table 5.7-8. Including the current deficit of library space, the total deficit would increase to 38,155 sf of library space by 2025.

Table 5.7-8 Future Demand for Library Space on the West Slope (square feet)						
General Plan Alternative	Existing		2025		Buildout	
	Existing Capacity¹	Existing Demand	Additional Demand²	Total Deficit	Additional Demand²	Total Deficit
No Project	66,800	78,150	26,805	38,155	36,915	48,625
Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus”	66,800	78,150	32,301	43,651	52,069	63,419
Environmentally Constrained	66,800	78,150	40,365	51,715	68,844	80,194
1996 General Plan	66,800	78,150	40,621	51,971	98,346	109,696
¹ Includes new El Dorado Hills branch library. ² Based on 0.5 sf per capita standard (includes 2025 demand) Source: Amos, pers. comm., 2002						

Policies 5.1.1.1 and 5.1.1.2, 5.1.2.2, and 5.9.1.1 and 5.9.1.2 would ensure that the County would cooperate with the County Library System in developing level-of-service standards and capital improvement plans (e.g., facility master plans). Policy 5.9.1.1 would allow the County Library System to accommodate the additional demand for library services through a variety of means, including the construction of new facilities, the expansion and renovation of existing facilities, or the use of pre-existing building space through lease or purchase. Given these policies, it is expected that additional library space would be constructed, leased, or purchased in the county by 2025.

New and expanded facilities would be developed in response to the increase in demand for library services generated by population growth. The development of library facilities could potentially result in adverse physical effects on the environment. These potential environmental impacts are generally addressed by proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures described in other sections of Chapter 5 of this EIR. Apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR, operation of library facilities could result in potential incompatibility with adjacent land uses from traffic access, which is not fully addressed by General Plan policies. This impact is considered significant.

No Project Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Under the No Project Alternative, population growth could generate a demand for 36,915 sf of additional library space by county buildout, further increasing the deficit of library space (to 48,625 sf) and necessitating new or expanded library facilities. Please refer to No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (Alternative #2)

Relevant Goals/Policies—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative

The relevant policies that are applicable to the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative are Policies LU-3n, LU-7a, PS-1c through PS-1e, PS-1g, and PS-8a.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative, new residential developments would occur throughout the west slope, and this population growth would generate a demand of 32,301 sf of new library space, as shown in Table 5.7-8. The additional demand would further increase the deficit of library space to 43,651 sf, necessitating new or expanded library facilities.

Policies LU-7a, PS-1c through PS-1e, and PS-1g would ensure that the County would cooperate with the County Library System in developing level-of-service standards and capital improvement plans (e.g., facility master plans). These policies would also require new developments to contribute fair-share funding to the library system in order to develop enough library space if such fee programs would be established. Policy PS-8a would require the County Library System to provide library services throughout the county. The library system may use a variety of means, including the construction of new facilities, the expansion and renovation of existing facilities, the use of pre-existing building space through lease or

purchase, or the use of bookmobiles to provide the services. Given these policies, it is expected that additional library facilities would be constructed in the county by 2025. Policy LU-3n would promote the siting of libraries in any land use designation areas with the exceptions of Natural Resource, Industrial, Research and Development, and Open Space; development of library facilities is generally not appropriate in these land use designations because of the potential for nuisances associated with industrial and agricultural activities and for disturbance to wildlife and habitats. However, land use in compatibility impacts, such as traffic and access in residential areas, could still occur. This impact is considered significant.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Population growth is expected to generate a demand for new and expanded library space of 52,069 sf by county buildout, increasing the deficit to 63,419 sf as shown in Table 5.7-8. Please refer to No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Alternative #3)

Relevant Goals/Policies—Environmentally Constrained Alternative

For the relevant policies of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, please refer to the policies listed above under Relevant Goals/Policies—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative. Policy LU-3n in the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative is renumbered as LU-3o in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative. Policy LU-3o would promote the siting of schools in any land use designation areas with the exceptions of Natural Resource, Industrial, Research and Development, and Open Space; development of school facilities is generally not appropriate in these land use designations because of the potential for nuisances associated with industrial and agricultural activities and for disturbance to wildlife and habitats. Policy PS-8a would encourage the siting of libraries in Community Regions and Rural Centers in order to reduce the impacts related to land use incompatibility.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, population growth could generate a demand for 40,365 sf of new library space by 2025, increasing the deficit to 51,715 sf as shown in Table 5.7-8. As discussed above, this impact is considered significant.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, population growth could generate a demand for 68,844 sf of new library space by buildout, increasing the deficit to 80,194 sf as shown in Table 5.7-8. As discussed above, this impact is considered significant.

1996 General Plan Alternative (Alternative #4)

Relevant Goals/Policies—1996 General Plan Alternative

For the relevant policies of the 1996 General Plan Alternative, please refer to the policies listed above under Relevant Goals/Policies—No Project Alternative.

1996 General Plan Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, population growth could generate a demand for 40,621 sf of new library space by 2025, increasing the deficit to 51,971 sf as shown in Table 5.7-8. As discussed above, this impact is considered significant.

1996 General Plan Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, population growth could generate a demand for 98,346 sf of new library space by county buildout, increasing the deficit to 109,696 sf as shown in Table 5.7-8. As discussed above, this impact is considered significant.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-4—No Project Alternative

The County shall implement the following measures:

- < Mitigation Measure 5.7-4(a): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b)
- < Mitigation Measure 5.7-4(b): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d)

These potential mitigation measures are described below.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-4(a): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b)

The County shall implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b) described in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-4(b): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d)

The County shall implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d), as described in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing.

These mitigation measures would limit potential land use incompatibilities by limiting the range of appropriate land uses within which library facilities could be developed and would subject such projects to a review of land use compatibility by the County and any subsequent siting and design conditions. As a result, with implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-4—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level for the same reasons as described under the No Project Alternative.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-4—Environmentally Constrained Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-4—1996 General Plan Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

5.7.5 PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

The diverse natural characteristics of El Dorado County provide a wide range of recreational opportunities to residents and visitors alike. Many of the recreational resources located in the county have been developed by state and federal public agencies on public lands that are not directly subject to the County’s General Plan. Although these recreation resources are described briefly, the focus of this subsection is those recreation resources, specifically parks and open space, that are provided by the County and local service providers that are subject to the proposed General Plan. Developed parks and recreation facilities are shown in Exhibit 5.7-4.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Physical Environment

Parks and Recreation Service Providers

Countywide Parks and Recreation Management

The Airports, Parks, and Grounds Division (APGD) of the County General Services Department, established in 1986, is responsible for countywide parks and recreation planning. The primary responsibilities of the APGD as it relates to parks and recreation are to establish a regional trail system throughout the county; regulate and manage boating use of the South Fork American River; coordinate the development of a regional and community parks system; and to implement the countywide recreation plans. The APGD also administers and manages Bradford Park, Henningsen Lotus Park, and Pioneer Park, totaling 45.5 acres. Three additional County parks are proposed: Bass Lake Regional Park, Pollock Pines Park, and a park in South Lake Tahoe.

The County Parks and Recreation Commission serves as a policy advisory group on parks and recreation issues. The commission is a five-person body with one appointee from each of the five supervisorial districts. Working closely with the APGD, it is responsible for helping establish a regional park system and advises the Board of Supervisors on parks and recreation matters, as necessary. The commission also oversees development and maintenance of recreational resources within the county, and works closely with local service providers.

Local Parks and Recreation Service Providers

The responsibility of local park planning and development generally falls under the jurisdiction of local community service districts (CSDs), or other local parks and recreation districts, which serve distinct subareas of the county. The El Dorado Hills CSD, Cameron Park CSD, and Georgetown Divide Recreation District are all non-County public agencies that provide recreational opportunities and facilities within the county.

- < **El Dorado Hills CSD.** The El Dorado Hills CSD, formed in 1962 by Resolution #98-62, is the primary provider of park, recreation, and open-space services to the El Dorado Hills area. The district is governed by a five-member elected Board of Directors. The El Dorado Hills CSD adopted its Recreation Facilities Master Plan Update in 2000. The El Dorado Hills CSD maintains a standard of 5 acres of parkland

Exhibit 5.7-4

Parks

FOLD OUT

COLOR

Exhibit 5.7-4

Parks

FOLD OUT

COLOR

back of page

for every 1,000 persons within its district boundaries. Based on the Master Plan, the El Dorado Hills CSD administers 86.03 acres of developed park land serving a population of 19,388 residents within its service boundaries. At this population level, this CSD should have a total of 96.9 acres of developed parkland to meet district standards. The existing developed park area is approximately 11 acres less than the standard prescribes.

- < **Cameron Park CSD.** The Cameron Park CSD provides park and recreation services in the Cameron Park area. Based on a 1961 voter-approved ballot measure, the CSD was established by County Board of Supervisors Resolution #97-61. The Cameron Park CSD maintains a standard of 5 acres of parkland for every 1,000 persons within its district boundaries. Based on the district's Recreation Facilities Master Plan (2000), this CSD administers 56.2 acres of developed parkland serving a population of 16,564 residents within its service boundaries. At this population level, this CSD should have a total of 82.8 acres of developed parkland to meet district standards. The existing developed park area is approximately 27 acres less than the standard prescribes.
- < **Georgetown Divide Recreation District.** The purpose of the Georgetown Divide Recreation District (GDRD) is to provide recreational sites, facilities, and programs in the Georgetown Divide area. The GDRD boundaries cover about 412 square miles or nearly 23% of the entire area of El Dorado County, and are nearly coterminous with the Black Oak Mine Unified School District. Specific functions of the district are to acquire, develop, maintain, and operate parks, recreational facilities and programs, and preserve natural and historic resources. The GDRD was created by the voters of the district in November 1988. The GDRD does not have established parkland standards. Approximately 18.5 acres of developed parkland are administered by the GDRD.

Recreation on Federal Lands

Federal lands provide abundant recreation opportunities to county residents. Recreation on federal lands is provided primarily by the USFS and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

- < **U.S. Forest Service.** National Forest lands managed by the USFS, under the U.S. Department of Agriculture, include the Eldorado National Forest, Tahoe National Forest, and lands under the purview of the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit. The USFS provides developed facilities (e.g., campgrounds), owns land upon which private entities may operate recreational facilities (e.g., snowsports resorts), and allows for dispersed recreation (e.g., hiking, backpacking, fishing).
- < **Bureau of Land Management.** BLM, under the U.S. Department of the Interior, owns and manages a number of large tracts of forested lands in the American and Cosumnes

River canyons. The BLM manages its lands primarily for dispersed recreational opportunities, such as whitewater boating and hiking.

Recreation on State Lands

Lands under state agency jurisdiction also provide recreational opportunities to county residents. The California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) are the primary state recreation providers.

- < **California Department of Parks and Recreation.** DPR owns and/or manages a number of recreational areas in the county, including Folsom Lake State Recreation Area and Folsom Reservoir, Auburn State Recreation Area, Marshall Gold Discovery State Historic Park, Sugar Pine Point State Park, D.L. Bliss State Park, Emerald Bay State Park, Washoe Meadows State Park, and the Lake Valley State Recreation Area. Many of these State Park units are located in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Recreational areas managed by DPR typically provide developed facilities (e.g., campgrounds) and dispersed recreation opportunities (e.g., hiking, boating).
- < **California Tahoe Conservancy.** The CTC is an independent state agency within the Resources Agency of the State of California. It was established to develop and implement programs to improve water quality in Lake Tahoe, preserve the scenic beauty and recreational opportunities of the Lake Tahoe Basin, provide public access, preserve wildlife habitat areas, and manage and restore lands to protect the natural environment. The CTC's Public Access and Recreation Program aims to provide new access to the lake and other natural areas in the Lake Tahoe Basin; to expand access opportunities by providing parking and restroom facilities and other improvements at existing sites; to connect existing facilities with hiking, biking, and cross-country ski trails; and to provide visitor information services.

Other Recreation Providers

As an independent, public utility provider, the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) also provides recreation opportunities in the County. EID owns, operates, and maintains the Sly Park Recreation Area located at the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's Jenkinson Lake near Pollock Pines and operates the Silver Lake West Campground on Highway 88. Sly Park provides developed recreational opportunities (e.g., campgrounds, boat ramps) as well as dispersed recreational opportunities (e.g., hiking, biking, and equestrian trails) on approximately 2,000 acres. EID also owns lands surrounding Bass Lake and plans to develop a park facility at that location. Land surrounding the proposed Texas Hill Reservoir site near

Diamond Springs is also owned by EID and may be managed for recreational uses in the future.

The incorporated cities of South Lake Tahoe and Placerville also provide park planning and development services in the county. These cities finance, operate, and maintain park and recreation facilities within their respective city boundaries.

Recreation Advisory Committees

The River Management Advisory Committee (RMAC) and Trails Advisory Committee provide technical support and oversight on specific recreation issues to the County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission.

- < **River Management Advisory Committee.** The RMAC is a formal advisory body appointed by the County Board of Supervisors that provides a forum for the discussion of river use issues, ideas, and conflicts. The RMAC makes recommendations to both the County Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors on matters related to whitewater recreation and campground development along the South Fork American River. The RMAC consists of seven members (and two alternates) representing a broad base of interests concerning the river.

- < **Trails Advisory Committee.** The Trails Advisory Committee was established by the County Board of Supervisors in 1975 to prepare a Trails Master Plan for El Dorado County. The current role of this committee is to provide recommendations on the development of trails within the county and provide assistance in the interpretation and periodic update the Trails Master Plan.

Recreation Plans

The El Dorado County APGD is responsible for the implementation of the following adopted plans that guide the management of recreational resources in the county:

- < El Dorado County River Management Plan (2001)
- < Bikeway Master Plan (1979)
- < Hiking & Equestrian Trails Master Plan, El Dorado County (1989, amended 1990)

It is the intent of the County to adopt a Parks Master Plan and revise and update the Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan upon adoption of the General Plan.

Recreation on state and federal lands is governed by distinct recreation plans. Recreation activities on USFS lands are managed under the guidelines and policies established in the Eldorado National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. The State Parks within the county are operated under master plans developed for each park unit by DPR.

Parks and Recreation Facilities

El Dorado County is served by numerous parks and recreation areas. Table 5.7-9 provides a list of parks and recreation facilities under the jurisdiction of the County or local service providers; it does not include state and federal recreation resources. The table is organized by service provider and includes a description of the location and size of the facility. Exhibit 5.7-3 shows the spatial distribution of recreation facilities listed in Table 5.7-9.

Table 5.7-9 Park and Recreation Facilities in Western El Dorado County			
Map #	Site / Area	Location	Approx. Size (acres)
El Dorado Hills CSD			
1	Art Weisberg Park	Francisco Drive	4.27
2	Bertelsen Park	Arrowhead Drive	7.76
3	McCabe Field	Redwood Lane	3.00
4	St. Andrews Park	El Dorado Hills Boulevard	4.73
5	Ridgeview Park	Ridgeview Drive	4.35
6	Ridgeview Unit 7 Park	Powers Drive	0.60
7	Stephen Harris Tennis Court Park	Tam O'Shanter Drive	5.71
8	El Dorado Hills Community Park	El Dorado Hills Boulevard	39.50
9	Parkview Heights Park	Governors Drive	1.18
10	Waterford Park	NW of Marina/Lake Forest Park	1.15
11	Overlook Park	Green Valley Hills	1.18
12	Village Green	Serrano Parkway	10.00
13	Oak Knoll Park	Alyssum Circle	2.60
<i>Developed Parks (Subtotal)</i>			<i>86.03 acres</i>
--	St. Andrews Lot E (<i>Open Space</i>)	Riviera Circle	4.25
--	Governors/Crown Open Space (<i>Open Space</i>)	Governor and Crown Villages	18.22
--	Fairchild Open Space (<i>Open Space</i>)	Tam O'Shanter Drive	10.25
--	Reid White Memorial Park (<i>Nature Park</i>)	Governors Drive	1.9
--	New York Creek (<i>Nature Park</i>)	New York Creek	27.9
--	Wild Oaks Park (<i>Nature Park</i>)	El Dorado Hills Boulevard	8.2

**Table 5.7-9
Park and Recreation Facilities in Western El Dorado County**

Map #	Site / Area	Location	Approx. Size (acres)
--	Oak Ridge High School (<i>Joint Use</i>)	Harvard Way	10.0
--	William Brooks Elementary School (<i>Joint Use</i>)	Park Drive	10.3
--	Bass Lake Park (<i>Joint Use</i>)	Bass Lake Road	3.0
--	Marina/Lake Forest Park (<i>Unimproved</i>)	Francisco Drive	9.70
--	Windsor Point Park (<i>Unimproved</i>)	Francisco Drive	1.41
--	Fairchild Park (<i>Unimproved</i>)	Brackenwood Place	2.75
--	Governors West Park (<i>Unimproved</i>)	Hensley Circle	0.75
Cameron Park CSD			
14	Cameron Park Lake	Cambridge Road	6.4 (land)/ 45.0 (water)
15	Hacienda Park	Hacienda Drive	4.9
16	Gateway Park	Gateway Drive	7.8
17	Rasmussen Park	Mira Loma Drive	10
18	Royal Oaks Park	Country Club Drive	10.4
19	Christa McAuliffe Park	Merry Chase Drive	6
20	David West Park	South of U.S. Highway 50	2.1
21	Eastwood Park	South of Meder Road	2.6
22	Northview Park	North of Meder Road	6
<i>Developed Parks (Subtotal)</i>			56.2 acres
--	Knollwood Park (<i>Unimproved</i>)	Knollwood Drive	6.5
--	Bonanza Park (<i>Unimproved</i>)	South of Cameron Park Lake	13.6
--	Community Center (<i>Unimproved</i>)	Country Club Drive	4.1
--	Cameron Meadows (<i>Unimproved</i>)	East of Rasmussen Park	22
Georgetown Divide Recreation District			
23	Georgetown Park	Georgetown	1.5
24	Beam Field	Wentworth Springs Road	4
25	Garden Valley Park	Garden Valley	4
26	Bayley House Park	Pilot Hill	9
<i>Developed Parks (Subtotal)</i>			18.5 acres
--	Greenwood Regional Park Site (<i>Unimproved</i>)	Greenwood	210
El Dorado County			
27	Bradford Park	Shingle Springs	1.5

Table 5.7-9 Park and Recreation Facilities in Western El Dorado County			
Map #	Site / Area	Location	Approx. Size (acres)
28	Henningsen Lotus Park	Lotus	31
29	Pioneer Park	Somerset	13
<i>Developed Parks (Subtotal)</i>			<i>45.5 acres</i>
--	Bass Lake Regional Park (<i>Proposed</i>)	Bass Lake	--
--	Pollock Pines Park (<i>Proposed</i>)	Pollock Pines	--
--	South Lake Tahoe (<i>Proposed</i>)	South Lake Tahoe	--
El Dorado Irrigation District			
30	Sly Park Recreation Area	Pollock Pines	2,000
City of Placerville			
--	Town Hall	Main Street	1
--	City Park	Pacific Street	3.5
--	Rotary Park	Clark Street	4
--	Lions Park	Cedar Ravine	24
--	Lumsden Park	Wiltse Road	4
--	Gold Bug Park	Bedford Road	62
Source: El Dorado Hills CSD 2000; Cameron Park CSD 2000; Hyden, pers. comm., 2003; Berger, pers. comm., 2003; EDAW 2003			

Park resources in El Dorado County are generally defined as follows:

- < Regional Parks: 45+ acres. Facilities typically include sports fields, group picnic areas, open space areas, and trails.
- < Community Parks: 10-44 acres. Facilities typically include baseball diamonds, sports fields, playgrounds, picnic areas, and swimming.
- < Neighborhood Parks: 1-9 acres. Facilities typically include small playgrounds, small surfaced game areas, picnic tables, and benches.

Regulatory/Planning Environment

Quimby Act

The Quimby Act (California Government Code §66477) states that “the legislative body of a city or county may, by ordinance, require the dedication of land or impose a requirement of

the payment of fees in lieu thereof, or a combination of both, for park or recreational purposes as a condition to the approval of a tentative map or parcel map.

The County implements the Quimby Act through §16.12.090 of the County Code. The County Code sets standards for the acquisition of land for parks and recreational purposes, or payments of fees in lieu thereof, on any discretionary residential development project that is subject to land subdivision. A subdivision of 50 units or less can only be required to pay in-lieu fees; subdivisions of greater than 50 units may dedicate land, pay fees, or a combination of both. Non-residential subdivisions are conditioned so that Quimby fees would be paid if the property is developed with multifamily housing within 5 years of map recordation.

The County Code includes formulas to calculate the amount of parkland to be dedicated and/or in-lieu fees based on the number of proposed dwelling units and population density. The dedication of land, or the payment of fees, or both, shall not exceed the proportionate amount necessary to provide 3 acres for every 1,000 residents; if the existing park area already exceeds this standard, up to 5 acres may be required. If in-lieu fees are required, the fee is based on the fair market value of parkland area requirements. The amount of parkland or fees required to comply with this County ordinance is determined at the time of approval of the tentative map.

It should be noted that the Quimby Act only applies to the acquisition of new parkland; it does not apply to the physical development of new park facilities or associated operations and maintenance costs. Therefore, the Quimby Act effectively preserves open space needed to develop park and recreation facilities, but it does not ensure the development of the land or the provision of park and recreation services to county residents. In addition, the Quimby Act only applies to residential subdivisions. Other projects, such as ministerial residential development and commercial, could contribute to the demand for park and recreation facilities without providing land or funding for such facilities, but in many cases Quimby fees were paid at the time the residential lots were created.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of parks and open space in this EIR focuses on: (1) an evaluation of the need for new or expanded parks and open-space resources to meet projected population growth in order to maintain acceptable service ratios; and (2) whether the development of new parks and open-space resources would potentially lead to substantial adverse physical environmental impacts.

Thresholds of Significance

The General Plan would result in a significant impact if development would:

- < cause an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or
- < result in the construction or expansion of new parks and recreational facilities in order to meet established standards, which could result in an adverse physical impact on the environment.

Impact
5.7-5

Deterioration of Existing Park and Recreation Facilities and Need for New Facilities.

Projected new development would increase the demand for park and recreation facilities. The most parkland would be required under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, followed by the Environmentally Constrained, 1996 Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus,” and No Project Alternatives. Because it is not certain that adequate new park and recreation facilities would be developed concurrent with new development based on potential funding limitations, there may be a degradation in existing facilities. This impact is considered **significant**. Impact significance before and after mitigation is shown in the table below.

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation*							
	Alt. #1 (No Project)		Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus”)		Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)		Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)	
	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout
5.7-5: Deterioration of Existing Park and Recreation Facilities and Need for New Facilities	S ₃	S ₄	S ₂	S ₃	S ₁	S ₂	S ₁	S ₁
Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation*							
	Alt. #1 (No Project)		Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus”)		Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)		Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)	
	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout
5.7-5: Provide Funding Mechanisms for New Park Development	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
* Notes: LS = Less than Significant; N/A= Not Applicable; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable. Significant impacts are ranked against each other by alternative for the 2025 scenario and the buildout scenario, from 1 (Worst Impact) to 4 (Least Impact). Where the impact under two different alternatives during the same time frame would be roughly equal in severity, the numerical ranking is the same.								

The provision of adequate parkland to serve new population growth is an objective of all project alternatives. The definition of “adequate” parkland is based on countywide standards of 5 acre per 1,000 and projected levels of residential development. Table 5.7-10 shows the amount of parkland required to serve expected population growth in the county through 2025 and buildout, organized by project alternative. Other land uses, such as commercial development, can also contribute to the demand for park and recreation facilities.

Table 5.7-10 Parkland Needs (in acres)				
Alternative	2025		Buildout	
	Population Increase ¹	Additional Parkland Needed ²	Population Increase ¹	Additional Parkland Needed ²
No Project	53,610	268.1	73,829	369.1
Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus”	64,601	323.0	104,137	505.7
Environmentally Constrained	80,730	403.7	137,688	688.4
1996 General Plan	81,241	406.2	196,692	983.5
¹ Based on EPS land use forecasts.				
² Park ratios: 5 acres/1,000 population for the entire county. Based on CSD standards and county policy.				
Source: EPS 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2002d; EDAW 2003				

No Project Alternative (Alternative #1)

Relevant Goals/Policies—No Project Alternative

The relevant policies included in the 1996 General Plan that are applicable to the No Project alternative are Policies 5.1.2.2, 9.1.1.1 through 9.1.1.11, 9.2.2.1 through 9.2.2.7, and 9.2.3.1 through 9.2.3.5.

No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Implementation of the No Project Alternative is projected to result in the development of 21,434 new dwelling units and the addition of 53,610 residents through the planning horizon (2025). Based on the level and distribution of anticipated residential development, the amount of parkland needed to serve new growth to meet County standards would be approximately 268 acres through 2025.

It is not known whether the development of 268 acres of developed parkland is feasible under the No Project Alternative. Quimby Act requirements would ensure that adequate land is made available through dedication or in-lieu fees for new subdivisions. Under the No Project Alternative, roughly 68% of all new development is “existing commitments” (see Chapter 4 for a complete description of existing commitments in the context of the development forecasts). These existing commitments are typically subdivisions and/or specific plans, which would be required to provide parkland based on Quimby Act requirements. However, the remaining 32% of development would be single homes on existing parcels because Writ constraints do not allow subdivision of existing parcels. Because nondiscretionary residential development and commercial development are not subject to Quimby Act requirements, there would potentially be a shortfall of land dedications or fees available for the development of parks.

In addition, the provision of parkland under Quimby Act requirements does not ensure the development of parks to serve the population. Substantial funding is required to develop and also to operate and maintain parks. Limited funding is made available to local service providers (i.e., El Dorado Hills CSD, Cameron Park CSD, and the GDRD) through property tax revenue; these funds are typically used for operation and maintenance of parks, and are not always sufficient for these purposes. The development of park facilities generally is dependent on development fees on new residential development. Development fee programs are currently in place within the El Dorado Hills CSD and Cameron Park CSD; these CSDs rely on these fees for park development. If residential development slows in these areas, the revenue from fees and the construction of park facilities will likely slow. There is no development fee program for parks in the GDRD; therefore, it is highly unlikely that park development would keep pace with anticipated population growth. Other potential sources of revenue include local benefit assessments and bond financing; the latter would require voter approval.

The proposed policies under the No Project Alternative are designed to promote the development of a range of park and recreation facilities to serve residents in the county, including the adoption of a Capital Improvement Program (Policy 9.1.1.8), identification and securing of funding sources where possible (Policy 9.1.1.9), requiring new development projects to provide funding mechanisms for new park facilities (Policy 9.2.2.2), and requiring a study of the feasibility of adopting an impact fee schedule and a countywide benefit assessment district to fund park development requires (Policy 9.2.2.5). However, these policies do not ensure that adequate park facilities would be developed to meet county standards. The dedication of parkland through Quimby Act requirements may not be sufficient to meet county standards based on the substantial amount of infill development that is expected under the No Project Alternative, which is typically not subject to Quimby Act requirements. Even if adequate parkland were made available, it would be too speculative to assume that

development fees would be sufficient to develop adequate park facilities, and development fee programs for parks are not applicable to all parts of the county. Further, other sources of funding (e.g., bonds, local benefit assessments) are not guaranteed.

The potential inability to meet established park standards could result in the potential overuse of existing park facilities, which may lead to substantial physical deterioration of existing facilities. The lack of adequate funding for maintenance of park facilities coupled with increased use could further accelerate their deterioration. This impact is considered significant.

No Project Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Continuing population growth in the county through buildout would create a higher demand for park facilities to meet established standards. At buildout, a total of 369 acres of parkland would be required to serve potential new population growth. Because adequate parkland may not be available based on land dedication requirements and fee programs would not ensure the development of sufficient park facilities on a countywide basis, the physical deterioration of existing park facilities would likely continue through buildout. Further, as development occurs, the quantity of suitable parkland will become more limited. Because more parkland would be required and suitable parkland would be more scarce, impacts at buildout would be more severe than under 2025 conditions. This impact is considered significant.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (Alternative #2)

Relevant Goals/Policies—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative

The relevant policies that are applicable to the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative are Policies PR-1a, PR-1b, PR-4a through PR-4c, PR-5a, PR-5b, and Implementation Measures PR-A and PR-F.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Implementation of the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative is expected to result in the development of approximately 25,839 new dwelling units through the planning horizon (2025); this would result in a population increase of roughly 64,601 residents. In order to meet parkland standards for this level of projected growth, approximately 323 acres of developed parks would be required through 2025.

As under the other equal-weight alternatives, it is not clear whether available parkland and funding would be available to meet the necessary 323 acres of developed parkland under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative. Because there are no Writ constraints under this alternative, limited subdivision development would resume (up to four units per parcel), subject to Quimby Act requirements. Quimby Act requirements would provide the land needed for park development to serve new residential subdivisions through land dedication or in-lieu fees, which would help provide the necessary parkland needed to meet local CSD and County standards. The provision of parkland under the Quimby Act does not, however, ensure that funding would be available for the physical development of parks needed to serve anticipated growth.

The Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative contains policies and implementation measures that would aid the development of the appropriate amount of park and recreation facilities to serve the county. Under Implementation Measure PR-A, the County would develop and implement a Parks Master Plan and Capital Improvement Program. The County also recognizes the need for outside funding through Policy PR-5a, which states that new development projects will provide funding mechanisms (e.g., homeowners’ associations or benefit assessment districts) for the ongoing park needs in areas not served by local service providers, and through Policy PR-5b (and Implementation Measure PR-F), which states that the County would investigate alternative funding sources for the construction of park facilities. However, there is no way to ensure that funding would be available to develop sufficient park facilities to meet local CSD and County standards concurrent with development.

The potential inability to meet established park standards could result in the potential overuse of existing park facilities, which may lead to substantial physical deterioration of existing facilities. This impact is considered significant.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

A total of 104,137 new residents could be accommodated under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative at buildout, requiring a total of 506 acres of parkland to serve potential new population growth; this is substantially higher than under 2025 conditions. Because funding for the physical development of park facilities may not be available, fee programs would not ensure the development of park facilities outside of existing parks and recreation districts, and adequate parkland may not be available, the impacts described for the 2025 scenario would likely continue through buildout. This impact is considered significant.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Alternative #3)

Relevant Goals/Policies—Environmentally Constrained Alternative

For the relevant policies of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, please refer to the policies listed above under Relevant Goals/Policies—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

The Environmentally Constrained Alternative is projected to result in the development of roughly 32,290 new dwelling units, which translates into an anticipated population increase of 80,730 residents through the planning horizon (2025). In order to meet parkland standards for this level of projected growth, approximately 404 acres of developed parks would be required through 2025.

The Environmentally Constrained Alternative would result in impacts comparable to those of the Roadway Constrained Alternative 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative. (Please refer to Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above.) This is based on the fact that these alternatives implement the same policies and both alternatives allow residential subdivision, which triggers Quimby Act requirements. The distinction between these two alternatives is that more parkland would be required through 2025 under the Environmentally Constrained Alternative based on population projections. However, emphasis of development in existing community regions and rural centers would result in lower development intensity on surrounding lands. The quantity of land suitable for parkland would be less limited. Therefore, this impact is considered significant.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Impacts described for the 2025 scenario would continue through buildout. (Please refer to Environmentally Constrained Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above.) Because more people could be accommodated at buildout, requiring 688 acres of additional parkland, impacts would be more severe than under 2025 conditions. This impact is considered significant.

1996 General Plan Alternative (Alternative #4)

Relevant Goals/Policies—1996 General Plan Alternative

For the relevant policies of the 1996 General Plan Alternative, please refer to the policies listed above under Relevant Goals/Policies—No Project Alternative.

1996 General Plan Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

The 1996 General Plan Alternative is projected to result in the development of roughly 32,491 new dwelling units through 2025. This level of development would result in an anticipated population increase of 81,241. In order to meet county parkland standards, approximately 406 acres of developed parks would be required through 2025.

The 1996 General Plan Alternative would result in impacts comparable to those of the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative. (Please refer to Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above.) This is based on the fact that both of these alternatives allow residential subdivision, which triggers Quimby Act requirements. The distinction between these two alternatives is that more parkland would be required under this alternative through 2025 based on population projections. There are also distinctions in policies between these two alternatives; however, neither set of policies could ensure that adequate funding would be available to develop the quantity of required parkland prescribed by local CSD and county standards, in particular, outside of local districts providing recreation services. Therefore, this impact is considered significant.

1996 General Plan Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Impacts described for the 2025 scenario would continue through buildout. (Please refer to 1996 General Plan Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above.) Because more people could be accommodated at buildout, requiring 984 acres of additional parkland, impacts would be more severe than under 2025 conditions. This impact is considered significant.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-5: Provide Funding Mechanisms for New Park Development

Mitigation Measure—No Project Alternative

The County shall replace Policies 9.1.1.8, 9.2.2.2, and 9.2.2.5 as follows and shall implement the following new policy. Revised Policies 9.1.1.8 and 9.2.2.2 are based on Implementation Measure PR-A, and Policies PR-5a and PR-5b of the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives.

New Policy 9.1.1.8: The County shall prepare, implement, and regularly update a Parks Master Plan and Parks and Recreation Capital Improvement Program to meet current and future park and recreation needs.

New Policy 9.2.2.2: New development projects creating community or neighborhood parks shall provide mechanisms (e.g., homeowners' associations or benefit assessment districts) for the ongoing development, operation, and maintenance needs of these facilities if annexation to an existing parks and recreation service district/provider is not possible.

New Policy 9.2.2.5: The County shall establish a countywide development fee program applicable to all new development to fund park and recreation improvements and acquisition of parklands such that minimum neighborhood, community, and regional park standards are achieved. This fee is in addition to Quimby Act requirements that address parkland acquisition only. The fee will be adjusted periodically to fully fund the improvements identified in the Parks and Capital Improvement Program concurrent with development over a five-year period.

With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level because the policies would aid in attaining the necessary funding for the acquisition, development, and maintenance of new parkland and park and recreation facilities.

Mitigation Measure—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative

The County shall implement the following new policies:

New Policy: The County shall establish a countywide development fee program applicable to all new development to fund park and recreation improvements and acquisition of parklands such that minimum neighborhood, community, and regional park standards are achieved. This fee is in addition to Quimby Act requirements that address parkland acquisition only. The fee will be adjusted periodically to fully fund the improvements identified in the Parks and Capital Improvement Program concurrent with development over a five year period.

With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level because the policies would aid in attaining the necessary funding for the acquisition, development, and maintenance of new parkland and park and recreation facilities.

Mitigation Measure—Environmentally Constrained Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measure for the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative above. With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure—1996 General Plan Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measure for the No Project Alternative. With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.



Potential Land Use Incompatibility Associated with Development of Park and Recreation Facilities. Projected new development would increase the demand for park and recreation facilities. The greatest amount of parkland would be required under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, followed by the Environmentally Constrained, Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus,” and No Project alternatives (see Impact 5.7-6). New facilities would be developed in response to population growth as funding allows. Local (passive) park facilities, as well as more developed facilities, are allowed under all General Plan designations under the No Project and 1996 General Plan alternatives, and under all but Natural Resource, Industrial, Research and Development, and Open Space designations under the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” and Environmentally Constrained alternatives. Park and recreation facility development may require land use permits in some instances. The development of park facilities could potentially result in adverse physical effects on the environment. These potential environmental impacts are generally addressed by proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures described in other sections of Chapter 5 of this EIR. Apart from the issues discussed elsewhere in this EIR, operation of park facilities could result in potential incompatibility with adjacent land uses from nighttime lighting, noise, and traffic, and these issues are not fully addressed by general plan policies. This impact is considered **significant**. Impact significance before and after mitigation is shown in the table below.

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation*							
	Alt. #1 (No Project)		Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus")		Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)		Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)	
	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout
5.7-6: Potential Land Use Incompatibility Associated with Development of Park and Recreation Facilities	S ₃	S ₄	S ₂	S ₃	S ₁	S ₂	S ₁	S ₁
Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation*							
	Alt. #1 (No Project)		Alt. #2 (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus")		Alt. #3 (Environmentally Constrained)		Alt. #4 (1996 General Plan)	
	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout	2025	Buildout
5.7-6(a), Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b); and 5.7-6(b) Implement Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(d)	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
* Notes: LS = Less than Significant; N/A= Not Applicable; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable. Significant impacts that would occur under a given time frame (e.g., conditions at 2025) are ranked against each other by alternative, from 1 (Worst Impact) to 4 (Least Impact). Where the impact under two different alternatives during the same time frame would be roughly equal in severity, the numerical ranking is the same.								

No Project Alternative (Alternative #1)

Relevant Goals/Policies—No Project Alternative

The relevant policies included in the 1996 General Plan that are applicable to the No Project Alternative, and that pertain to the general types of environmental impacts and specific land use compatibility issues associated with the development of park facilities, are located throughout the No Project Alternative policy set. Please refer to the appropriate policy discussion that relates to the resource issue of interest.

No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

The analysis of future parkland needs across alternatives is presented in Impact 5.7-6 above. Based on population projections, the most parkland would be needed under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, followed by the Environmentally Constrained, Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus,” and No Project Alternatives (see Table 5.7-10).

Parks that are developed in response to population growth associated with each alternative could result in adverse physical impacts on the environment. However, because specific locations for new park facilities have not been identified, the specific physical impacts of constructing new parks cannot be determined at this time. It is reasonable to assume that construction and operation of park facilities would not result in significant impacts apart from the impacts of other types of development that are allowed within the various land use categories. The physical impacts that would result from all reasonably expected permitted development in each of the land use categories are addressed in the other sections of Chapter 5 of this EIR.

The developed park facilities needed to serve the future population growth could be developed on all lands in the county, regardless of General Plan land use designation, as a matter of right. Use permits may be required depending the characteristics of the proposed facility (e.g., parks with ballfields that require lighting may require a special-use permit). Further, there are no policies included in this alternative that address land use compatibility issues between the development of public facilities, such as parks, and adjacent land uses. As a result, there is the potential for land use incompatibilities to arise when park and recreation facilities are developed due to issues such as potential nighttime lighting, noise, and traffic. This impact is considered significant.

No Project Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Please refer to No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (Alternative #2)

Relevant Goals/Policies—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative

The relevant policies that are applicable to the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative, and that pertain to the general types of environmental impacts associated with the development of park facilities, are located throughout the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative policy set. Please refer to the appropriate policy discussion that relates to the resource issue of interest. In addition, land use compatibility issues are addressed in Policy LU-3n.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

In the context of potential significant adverse physical effects on the environment, the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative would result in similar impacts as the No Project Alternative; please refer to No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above.

However, this alternative contains policies addressing land use incompatibility issues. Specifically, Policy LU-3n states that public facilities, such as parks, would be considered by the County to be inappropriate in Natural Resource, Industrial, Research and Development, and Open Space land use designations. Therefore, potential incompatibilities between these uses and parks would be minimized. However, there still remains the potential for land use incompatibilities between park and recreation facility developments and other land uses, such as residential uses, because of issues like nighttime lighting, noise, and traffic. This impact is considered significant.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Please refer to Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Please refer to No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Alternative #3)

Relevant Goals/Policies—Environmentally Constrained Alternative

The relevant policies that are applicable to the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, and that pertain to the general types of environmental impacts associated with the development of park facilities, are located throughout the Environmentally Constrained Alternative policy set. Please refer to the appropriate policy discussion that relates to the resource issue of interest. Policy LU-3n in the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative is renumbered as LU-3o in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Of the four equal-weight alternatives, the Environmentally Constrained Alternative would likely result in the least significant adverse physical effects on the environment associated with the development of park and recreation facilities based on the range of relatively protective policies included in this alternative. By implementing the policy set of this alternative, adverse environmental effects would be minimized.

Please refer to Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. For the reasons described above, this impact is considered significant.

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Please refer to Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion. This impact is considered significant.

1996 General Plan Alternative (Alternative #4)

Relevant Goals/Policies—1996 General Plan Alternative

The relevant policies included in the 1996 General Plan that are applicable to the 1996 General Plan Alternative, and that pertain to the general types of environmental impacts associated with the development of park facilities, are located throughout the 1996 General Plan Alternative policy set. Please refer to the appropriate policy discussion that relates to the resource issue of interest.

1996 General Plan Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

Please refer to No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

1996 General Plan Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

Please refer to No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion above. This impact is considered significant.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-6—No Project Alternative

The County shall implement both of the following measures:

- < Mitigation Measure 5.7-6(a): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b)
- < Mitigation Measure 5.7-6(b): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d)

These potential mitigation measures are described below.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-6(a): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b)

The County shall implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b) described in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-6(b): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d)

The County shall implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d) described in Section 5.1, Land Use and Housing.

These mitigation measures would limit potential land use incompatibilities by limiting the range of appropriate land uses within which park and recreation facilities could be developed and would subject such projects to a review of land use compatibility by the County and any subsequent siting and design conditions. As a result, with implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-6—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level for the same reasons as described under the No Project Alternative.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-6—Environmentally Constrained Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level for the same reasons as described under the No Project Alternative.

Mitigation Measure 5.7-6—1996 General Plan Alternative

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level for the same reasons as described under the No Project Alternative.