

**SECTION 5.2 GENERAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS  
ROADWAY CONSTRAINED SIX-LANE "PLUS" ALTERNATIVE**

Page i, the ninth line under **LAND USE ELEMENT** is revised as shown:

Visual Quality and ~~Scenie~~ Scenic Values

Page 9, the last paragraph, first line is revised as follows:

During the ~~mid and late 1980s and~~ 1980s and 1990s, the County...

Page 12, the second and third paragraphs under **WILDFIRE HAZARD** are revised as follows:

~~Fire prevention planning is well developed in the County has been initiated but is in the beginning stages and will require much attention in the coming years. Fire Safe Plans are routinely required through conditions of project approval. Over 200 such plans have been developed and approved. Many fire protection agencies have also successfully implemented Public Resources Code Section 4291, which requires clearance of flammable vegetation from around structures. Public Resources Code Section 4290 and Title 14 regulations for fire prevention and the provision of fire support infrastructure in State Responsibility Areas are also successfully applied in the County. Finally, the El Dorado County Fire Prevention Officer's Association will work with the County to incorporate fire prevention information into the Design and Improvements Standards Manual. Ongoing prevention~~ Prevention planning will require the continued cooperation and coordination of County agencies, the fire protection districts, the California Department of Parks and Recreation, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, the U.S. Forest Service, and the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, and local Fire Safe Councils will also play a major role.

~~Part of the planning process involves giving county residents information and assistance to better protect themselves and their neighbors from the hazards of wildfire. It is anticipated that, during the life of the General Plan, a number of Fire Safe Councils (comprised primarily of fire professionals) will provide this information and assistance. This General Plan also contains policies and implementation measures directed toward fire safety.~~

Page 13, the fourth sentence of the first full paragraph is revised as follows:

Additionally, parts of the county is are identified as habitat or potential habitat for a number of special status animal species, including the California red-legged frog, which inhabits riparian zones at lower...

Page 18, the header and paragraph under **LAND USE MAP** are revised as shown:

### **LAND USE MAP-DIAGRAM**

The land uses shown on Figure LU-1, which is a reduced version of the official Land Use ~~Map~~ Diagram on file at the El Dorado County Planning Department, illustrate the land use designation for each parcel in the county. The ~~map~~ diagram uses 13 base designations and three overlay designations to depict the types of land uses that are allowed in the different geographic areas. The following text describes those geographic areas and the land use designations. All references in this General Plan to the Land Use Map are references to the Land Use Diagram.

Page 20, the last two paragraphs are revised as shown:

**Low-Density Residential (LDR):** This designation allows residential dwellings (no more than two dwellings per parcel), accessory structures, and small-scale agricultural operations in a rural setting where infrastructure is generally limited. Although intended for application in Rural Regions only, the LDR designation may be applied in Community Regions and Rural Centers where LDR parcels are surrounded by higher density/intensity land uses (i.e., MFR, HDR, MDR, Commercial, Industrial, and Research and Development), consistent with Policy LU-1c.

**Rural Lands (RL):** This designation allows dispersed residential development in areas of limited infrastructure and public services at a maximum of two residential units per parcel. This designation is also applied to lands that are characterized by steeper topography, high fire hazards, and limited or substandard access. Although intended for application in Rural Regions only, the RL designation may be applied in Community Regions and Rural Centers where RL parcels are surrounded by higher density/intensity land uses (i.e., MFR, HDR, MDR, Commercial, Industrial, and Research and Development), consistent with Policy LU-1c.

Page 21, the first full paragraph is revised as shown:

**Natural Resource (NR):** This designation allows natural resource management activities, resource-based industries (e.g., agriculture, forestry, mineral extraction), protection of important habitat (e.g., riparian corridors, expanses of native vegetation), and protection of river canyons. Federal and state owned lands managed for wilderness, resource values, and multiple use shall also be

designated NR. The NR designation shall also be applied to lands inappropriate for residential development at a density greater than 1 dwelling unit per 40 acres, or where it would restrict land from being subdivided into more than four parcels. A maximum of two residential dwellings are allowed. Although intended for application in Rural Regions only, the NR designation may be applied in Community Regions and Rural Centers where NR parcels are surrounded by higher density/intensity land uses (i.e., MFR, HDR, MDR, Commercial, Industrial, and Research and Development), consistent with Policy LU-1c.

Page 22, Table LU-1 is revised as follows:

<b>TABLE LU-1 Land Use Designation Standards</b>				
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Residential Density<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)<sup>2</sup></b>		
		<b>Community Regions</b>	<b>Rural Centers</b>	<b>Rural Regions</b>
<i>Residential Land Uses</i>				
Multifamily Residential (MFR)	5-24 DU <sup>3</sup> /ac	0.75	0.4	–
High-Density Residential (HDR)	1–5 DU/ac	–	–	–
Medium-Density Residential (MDR)	1 DU/ac	–	–	–
Low-Density Residential (LDR)	1 DU/5 acres	–	–	–
Rural Lands (RL)	1 DU/10 acres	–	–	–
<i>Nonresidential Land Uses</i>				
Natural Resource (NR)		–	–	
<i>At or Below 2,500' Elevation</i>	1 DU/40 acres	–	–	0.05
<i>Above 2,500' Elevation</i>	1 DU/160 acres	–	–	0.05
Commercial (C)				
<i>Mixed Use in Community Regions</i>	0–15 DU/acre	1.0	0.5	0.3
<i>Mixed Use in Rural Centers</i>	0–8 DU/acre	1.0	0.5	0.3
Research and Development (RD)	–	0.3	–	–
Industrial (I)	–	1.0	0.5	–
Tourist Recreational (TR)	Project Dependent	0.5	0.5	0.2
Open Space (OS)	–	–	–	0.05
Public Facilities (PF)	–	0.5	0.5	0.2
<i>Other</i>				
Adopted Plan (AP) <sup>4</sup>	Varies	–	–	–

<b>TABLE LU-1 Land Use Designation Standards</b>				
<b>Designation</b>	<b>Residential Density<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)<sup>2</sup></b>		
		<b>Community Regions</b>	<b>Rural Centers</b>	<b>Rural Regions</b>
<b>Notes:</b>				
<sup>1</sup> Density is further constrained by the limitation that an existing parcel may only be subdivided into a maximum of four parcels. Where no density is specified, residential development is not allowed.				
<sup>2</sup> The gross floor area (total square foot area of each floor of all buildings on a parcel) permitted on a site divided by the total net area of the site (total area of a parcel, less any road right-of-way), expressed in decimals to one or two places. Where no FAR is specified, nonresidential development is not allowed. <u>An increased FAR is allowed as part of a Planned Development where a site-specific traffic impact study demonstrates that measures can be imposed to keep traffic at levels associated with the applicable FAR threshold. The FAR can be calculated over an entire integrated development rather than on a project-by-project basis, so long as the aggregate average FAR within applicable land use designations does not exceed the allowed maximum.</u>				
<sup>3</sup> DU = Dwelling Units				
<sup>4</sup> Densities, parcel sizes, and FARs differ by adopted plan.				
Densities may be higher or lower on a case-by-case basis to implement a transfer of development rights program established pursuant to Policy LU-7f.				

Page 24, Policy LU-1a is revised as follows:

The County shall direct nNew higher intensity lands uses to Community Regions and Rural Centers by allowing Multifamily Residential, High-Density Residential, Medium-Density Residential, Commercial, and Research and Development land uses designations shall be directed to and allowed only in Community Regions and Rural Centers.

Page 25, the following new policies are added under Goal LU-2:

New Policy The County shall coordinate with the incorporated cities in land use planning and development to provide compatibility of land use designations, development standards, funding programs, shared responsibilities for improved infrastructure, including integrated planning for development of transportation, circulation and other capital improvements.

New Policy The County shall coordinate with the incorporated cities to ensure that compatible development occurs within each city's sphere of influence and/or the Community Region adjacent to each city, which is consistent with the County's and each city's respective General Plans.

Page 27, Policy LU-3n is revised as follows:

Policy LU-3n To promote land use compatibility, the County shall consider schools, libraries, and other public facilities used regularly by local residents appropriate on parcels having any land use designation except Natural Resource, Industrial, Research and Development, and Open Space.

Page 28, Policy LU-4c is revised as follows:

Within Rural Regions, residential densities shall be constrained by surrounding resource-based land use activities, wildfire hazards, topography, accessibility, and natural resource conservation.

Page 32-33, Revise Policy LU-7f as follows:

Policy LU-7f The County shall consider methods to permit the transfer of development potential (and thus associated density) from environmentally constrained sites (e.g., lands supporting sensitive plant or wildlife species) to less constrained sites (i.e., to Multifamily Residential, High-Density Residential, Medium-Density Residential, Commercial, Research and Development, and Industrial lands). Lands receiving the density transfer (receiver sites) must be located in Community Regions. Lands granting development potential (donor sites) must be in the Rural Regions and assigned the Low Density Residential, Rural Lands, Natural Resource, or Open Space land use designation or have the Ecological Preserve or Agricultural District overlay designation.

Page 35, the following bullet is added to Measure LU-A:

- Develop standards for use of native plants in landscaping. [Policy CO-12a].

Page 36, the table under Measure LU-E is revised as follows:

Responsibility:	Planning Department <del>and</del> TRPA
Time Frame:	Begin working with TRPA immediately upon adoption of the General Plan. Identification of additional affordable housing opportunities will be ongoing. Adoption of Community Plan within five years of General Plan adoption. Modification of the County Zoning Ordinance within one year of General Plan adoption.

Page 37, Measure LU-H is revised as follows:

**MEASURE LU-H**

Review and identify needed revisions to the *County of El Dorado Design and Improvements Standards Manual*, including but not limited to the following:

- Standards applicable to the scale of development;
- Adequate pedestrian circulation;
- Transit access;
- On-street parking;
- Wildfire safety and emergency circulation;
- Enhancement of visual appeal; and
- Road capacity.

[Policies LU-3d, LU-3e, LU-3f, LU-3g, LU-4c, LU-6h, and LU-7a]

Page 38, the following New Implementation Measure is added to the Land Use Element:

**NEW MEASURE**

Create a joint powers authority or other mechanism to coordinate with the incorporated cities within the county the land use activities, capital improvement programs, and funding opportunities within the spheres of influence of the cities.

Responsibility:	Planning Department, Department of Transportation, and Board of Supervisors
Time Frame:	Creation of JPA or other mechanism within 1 year of adoption of plan; Ongoing thereafter.

Page 45, the first sentence under **Aviation Systems** is revised as follows:

There are four general aviation airports within the county. The Placerville Airport and the Georgetown Airport are both owned and operated by El Dorado County. Cameron Airpark Airport is ~~a privately-owned~~ and operated by the Cameron Park Airport District, a special district facility, and the Lake Tahoe Airport is owned and operated by the City of South Lake Tahoe.

Page 50, the first sentence of the second bullet is revised as follows:

...this program was originally adopted in 1988-1984.

Page 54, Goal TC-1 is revised as follows:

To plan for and provide a unified, coordinated, and cost-efficient countywide road and highway system that ensures the safe, orderly, and efficient movement of people, ~~emergency equipment,~~ and goods.

Page 50, Goal TC-2 is revised as follows:

To promote a safe and efficient transit system that provides an alternative transportation service to all residents including senior citizens, youths, the disabled and those without access to automobiles and that also helps to reduce congestion and improve the environment ~~and provides viable nonautomotive means of transportation.~~

Page 60, Goal TC-3 is revised as follows:

To reduce travel demand on the county's road system and maximize the operating efficiency of transportation facilities, ~~to reduce thereby reducing~~ the quantity of motor vehicle emissions and ~~reduce~~ the amount of ~~travel demand~~ investment required in new or expanded facilities.

Page 62, Policy TC-3a is revised as follows:

Policy TC-3a: The County shall support all standards and regulations adopted by the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District governing transportation control measures and applicable state and federal standards.

Page 71, the first line of the title is revised as shown:

REVISED DRAFT

Page 75, the following text is added after the Public Participation section:

### CONSISTENCY WITH GENERAL PLAN

The Housing Element is one of seven mandatory elements of the El Dorado County General Plan. The purpose of the Housing Element is to support and increase the supply of housing affordable to lower income households by providing guidance in the development of future plans, procedures, and programs and by removing governmental constraints to housing. To this end, the Housing Element has detailed goals, policies, and specific measures. However, under state law, the entire general plan is required to be "internally consistent" meaning that all elements of the plan have equal legal status and no policy within the General Plan can directly conflict with another. Without consistency, the General Plan cannot effectively serve as a guide to future development. The policies of this Housing

Element have been reviewed for consistency with the remaining element of this General Plan. None of the policies in this element are inconsistent with any other policy. Where General Plan policies seek to achieve seemingly competing objectives, the policies have been designed to allow a balanced approach towards those objectives. For example, while some General Plan policies promote preservation of open space, others set land use designations that allow development of housing on some undeveloped land while leaving other land with a lower intensity of development.

Page 82, the following sentence is added to the end of the first paragraph under **SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS:**

To build support for housing solutions, local participation needs to be at the very core of the process. The County attends regular monthly meetings held by several organizations (One Stop/Job One Partners, Golden Sierra Job Training Agency Youth Council, and MAAT (Multi Area Agency Team) to discuss all factors of special needs groups, including housing, employment as it relates to housing issues, and homelessness.

Pages 84, the first paragraph under **Seniors** is revised as shown:

According to Census 2000 (2002c), the unincorporated portion of the county's population of persons 65 and older increased from 11,762 to 15,749 (33.9 percent) from 1990 to 2000. On a state level, the over 65 population increased 14.9 percent in the same ten-year period. In El Dorado County, a large number of senior households own their home. There were 8,951 senior owner households and 1,138 senior renter households in 2000. Additionally, 7.3 percent of the total households in El Dorado County are made up of seniors who live alone (U.S. Census Bureau 2002c).

Page 85, the second paragraph under **Farmworkers** is revised as follows:

Although the enumeration profiles study indicates that the population of seasonal farmworkers is relatively small, there is still a demand for farmworker housing in the county. The 2001 *Annual Crop Report* shows the biggest agricultural industries as timber (\$23,692,400) and fruit and nut crops (\$11,636,700). Fruit and nut production requires some farmworker labor. The County has limited channels to address the need for farmworker housing. These include Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME) funding and HCD grants (e.g., Joe Serna, Jr. Farmworker Housing Grant Program). Other organizations with local representation, such as the Rural Community Assistance Corporation, also offer farmworker assistance. *[End paragraph here]*

Farmworker housing is allowed with a special use permit in the Agricultural (A), Exclusive Agricultural (AE), Planned Agricultural (PA), and Select Agricultural (SA)

zoning districts. There are approximately 3,800 parcels (558,361 acres) zoned A, AE, PA, or SA countywide. Because most of the land zoned A is federally owned (U.S. Forest Service land), it is assumed that those lands zoned AE, PA, or SA could best accommodate farmworker housing. These lands total 1,446 parcels (80,142 acres). Of these, 1,042 parcels are greater than or equal to 10 acres; a minimum of 10 acres must be in agricultural production for farmworker housing to be built (El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance Sections 17.36.080, 17.36.140, and 17.36.240). This number of potentially available parcels is adequate to meet the housing needs for farmworkers in El Dorado County. In addition, Efforts efforts to provide affordable housing generally and rental housing specifically will help address the housing needs of this group (see also Measure HO-S).

Health and Safety Code Section 17021.6 states that “no conditional use permit, zoning variance, or other zoning clearance shall be required of employee housing that serves 12 or fewer employees and is not required of any other agricultural activity in the same zone.” The County has proposed Measure HO-NN to ensure that farmworker housing permitting procedures are in compliance with Health and Safety Code 17021.6 and that the procedures encourage and facilitate farmworker housing development.

Page 87, the **Homeless** heading is revised as shown:

**Homeless and Other Groups in Need of Temporary and Transitional Affordable Housing**

Page 88, the following text is inserted after the first (partial) sentence and the **Large Families and Households** section:

Many other groups are also in need of temporary and transitional affordable housing. The El Dorado County Community Action Committee believes that victims of domestic violence and at-risk or runaway youth should be priority populations in efforts to provide adequate affordable housing opportunities. The El Dorado County Community Action Committee has pointed out that the lack affordable and/or subsidized housing prevents victims of domestic violence and their children from leaving violent situations. Lack of housing options and fear of escalating violence are recognized as the two primary reasons that victims of domestic abuse do not leave. Providing housing opportunities for these groups will reduce homelessness while ensuring that families move from crisis to safety within the community. These groups have been addressed in Policies HO-4d, HO-4e, and HO-4f.

Residential shelters, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing can be permitted as Community Care Facilities pursuant to the County Zoning Ordinance. Community Care Facilities are defined as “Any facility, place or building

which houses more than six people and is maintained and operated to provide nonmedical residential care, day care or homefinding agency services for children, adults, or children and adults, including, but not limited to, the developmentally disabled, physically handicapped, mentally disordered, or incompetent persons.” Currently, Community Care Facilities are allowed by right in the following districts, subject to the development standards of each:

- Commercial (C)
- Professional Office Commercial (CPO)
- Planned Commercial (CP)

Community Care Facilities are allowed subject to a special use permit in the following districts:

- Limited Multifamily Residential (R2)
- Multifamily Residential (RM)
- One-family Residential (R1)
- One-half Acre Residential (R-20,000)
- One-acre Residential (R1A)
- Single-family Two-acre Residential (R2A)
- Single-family Three-acre Residential (R3A)
- Estate Residential Five-acre (RE-5)
- Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10)
- Tourist Residential (RT)

Special use permits are discretionary, so environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and approval by the appropriate body (i.e., Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission) are necessary. Conditions of approval vary based on the specific nature of the proposal.

Community Care Facilities may be established on currently developed as well as undeveloped parcels. Table HO-9 summarizes the number of parcels, by zone district, assigned a designation that would allow a Community Care Facility either by right or subject to a Special Use Permit. The table is not intended to summarize where Community Care Facilities will be developed but rather how many parcels are currently zoned in a manner that could facilitate establishment of such facilities.

<b>TABLE HO-9</b>
-------------------

<b><u>Parcels Upon Which a Community Care Facility Could be Established,</u></b>	
<b><u>by Zone District</u></b>	
<b><u>Zone District</u></b>	<b><u>Number of Parcels</u></b>
Commercial (C)	958
Professional Office Commercial (CPO)	72
Planned Commercial (CP)	506
Limited Multifamily Residential (R2)	1,843
Multifamily Residential (RM)	103
One-family Residential (R1)	35,477
One-half Acre Residential (R-20,000)	1,469
One-acre Residential (R1A)	4,808
Single-family Two-acre Residential (R2A)	4,337
Single-family Three-acre Residential (R3A)	1,326
Estate Residential Five-acre (RE-5)	11,374
Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10)	8,048
Tourist Residential (RT)	167
<b><u>Note:</u></b> Includes both currently developed and vacant parcels.	
<b><u>Source:</u></b> El Dorado County (2003).	

Implementation Measure HO-GG of this Housing Element includes direction to the County to review and revise its Zoning Ordinance to clarify the placement of shelters and transitional housing.

Page 88, the first paragraph under **Large Families and Households** is revised as follows:

The State Department of Housing and Community Development defines large families and households as those having five or more members (2002c). The 1990 Census data indicate that the distribution of family size in El Dorado County did not change significantly between 1990 and 2000. According to the 2000 Census, 4310 percent of family households in unincorporated El Dorado County were comprised of five or more persons. This has not changed significantly since 1990. Of the large family households, 3,839 were owners and 765 were renters. When nonfamily households (single individuals or unrelated individuals living together) are added into the analysis, the percentage of large households in unincorporated areas drops to remains at about 10 percent. Less than one percent of all nonfamily

~~households have five or more individuals. Statewide the figures are much higher, 23 percent of family households (and 16 percent of all households) have five of more members. In El Dorado County, less than one percent of all nonfamily households have seven or more individuals.~~ Figure HO-8 summarizes 2000 family size in unincorporated El Dorado County.

Page 89, the last sentence in the first paragraph is revised as shown:

Table HO-9 10 summarizes housing unit occupancy.

Page 89, Table HO-9 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~9~~10

Page 89, the first sentence under **Housing Type** is revised as shown:

As shown in Table HO-~~10~~ 11, in 1990....

Page 90, Table HO-10 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~10~~-11

Page 91, the first sentence under **Physical Housing Conditions** is revised as follows:

Table HO-~~11~~ 12 shows the results of a survey on housing conditions....

Page 93, Table HO-11 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~11~~12

Page 94, the second paragraph under **Crowding** is revised as follows:

The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that, in 2000, 2.9 percent of countywide occupied housing units were overcrowded and 2.3 percent were severely overcrowded, resulting in a total overcrowding rate of 5.2 percent (U.S. Census Bureau 2001b). This is considerably less than the 2000 statewide estimates of 6.1 percent overcrowded and 9.1 percent severely overcrowded (total of 15.2 percent living in overcrowded units). By tenure, the Census showed that 2.6 percent of owner-occupied houses in the County were overcrowded and 0.75 percent were severely overcrowded. In renter-occupied units, 4.0 percent were overcrowded and 2.6 percent were severely overcrowded. A comparison with the countywide 1990 Census estimates indicates that the percentages of overcrowded occupied units did not increase over the ten-year period (U.S. Census Bureau 1991); this is consistent with the California Research Bureau's findings that the 2000 statewide crowding rate is not significantly different from the 1990 rate (Moller et al. 2002).

Page 94, the second sentence under **Income Limits** is revised as shown:

Table HO-~~42~~13 shows the 2002 County income limits....

Page 95, Table HO-12 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~42~~13

Page 95, the first sentence in the last paragraph is revised as shown:

According to SACOG, there were 30,132 jobs available on the West Slope for individuals living in 51,685 housing units in 1999 (Table HO-~~43~~14)(SACOG 2002a and 2002b).

Page 96, Table HO-13 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~43~~14

Page 96, the first sentence of the first paragraph is revised as shown:

What the enumerated jobs-to-housing ratios shown in Table HO-~~43~~ 14 do not...

Page 97, the second sentence of the third paragraph is revised as shown:

Table HO-~~44~~15 shows the FMRs for El Dorado County based on the number...

Page 97, Table HO-14 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~44~~15

Page 97, the third sentence of the last paragraph is revised as shown:

According to SACOG, however, the average market rents for one-, two-and three-bedroom units (including houses as well as apartments) are substantially higher than HUD's FMR determination (Table HO-~~45~~16) (SACOG 2002c).

Page 98, Table HO-~~45~~16 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~45~~16

Page 98, the second sentence of the second paragraph is revised as shown:

Table HO-~~46~~17 gives examples of affordable rents.....

Page 98, Table HO-16 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~16~~17

Page 98, the last paragraph is revised as shown:

~~According to the same Census data set, 31.5 percent of owner households and 40.8 percent of renter households paid more than 30 percent of household income for housing in El Dorado County. Overpayment statistics from the 2000 Census indicate that there were 3,553 lower-income renter households earning \$35,000 or less of which 2,372 paid 30 percent or more of their household income on housing, and 5,629 lower-income owner households earning \$35,000 or less of which 3,686 paid 30 percent or more of their household income on housing. When this is combined with the fact that an individual must work 87 hours/week at minimum wage to afford FMR for a two-bedroom unit, it becomes apparent that overpayment is a serious concern for many residents. These high percentages of households overpaying for housing are not unique to El Dorado County; statewide estimates for rental overpayment range from 29 percent (HCD estimate) to 47 percent (National Low Income Housing Coalition estimate).~~

Page 99, the second sentence in the first paragraph is revised as shown:

Table HO-~~17~~18 contains examples of rent affordability....

Page 99, Table HO-17 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~17~~18

Page 99, the first sentence of the second to last paragraph is revised as shown:

Based on HCD's income limits, a two-person moderate income household earns between \$36,650 and \$55,000 annually (see Table HO-~~12~~13), which equates....

Page 99, the first sentence of the last paragraph is revised as follows:

Table HO-~~18~~19 summarizes housing affordability for one- and two-person....

Page 100, Table HO-18 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~18~~19

Page 100, the second assumption is revised as shown:

Affordable housing cost is 30 percent of monthly income and that an average rent for a two-bedroom unit is \$990 (see Table HO-~~15~~16)

Page 100, the last sentence is revised to read:

Figure HO-11 summarizes the median home price by postal ZIP code, and Table HO-19~~20~~ shows examples of home ownership...

Page 101, Table HO-19 is revised as shown:

Table HO-19~~20~~

Page 102, the second to last paragraph is deleted as follows:

~~There are many reasons why a property owner may choose to convert a government-assisted rental unit to a market-rate unit. These include a determination that the unit(s) can be operated more profitably as a market-rate development; difficulties in dealing with HUD oversight and changing program rules; the depletion of tax advantages available to the owner; and a desire to roll over the investment into a new property. Units at risk of conversion are those that may have their subsidized contracts terminated ("opt out") or that may "prepay" the mortgage, thus terminating the rental restrictions that keep the unit affordable to lower income tenants.~~

Page 102, the last paragraph is revised as shown:

In April 2001, the California Housing Partnership Corporation reported that El Dorado County has 745 federally assisted units (Table HO-20 ~~-21~~) countywide. ~~Table HO-21 summarizes the risk of conversion of these units to market rate. Table HO-22 lists assisted housing developments in the unincorporated areas of El Dorado County.~~

Page 103, Table HO-20 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-20~~21~~

Page 103, insert the following paragraph immediately after Table HO-21 (which was Table HO-20):

Units at risk of conversion are those that may have their subsidized contracts terminated ("opt out") or that may "prepay" the mortgage, thus terminating the rental restrictions that keep the unit affordable to lower income tenants. There are several reasons why the property owner may choose to convert a government assisted unit for a market rate unit, including a determination that the unit(s) can be operated more profitably as a market-rate development; difficulties in dealing with

HUD oversight and changing program rules; the depletion of tax advantages available to the owner; and a desire to roll over the investment into a new property.

Table HO-22 identifies the level of conversion risk for assisted units. “Units at Risk” identified as being “at risk” in Table HO-21 are, for the most part, units with contracts that will expire between 2001 and 2005. The risk assessment does not measure the likelihood that a property owner will renew a contract; it cannot be assumed that those units identified as “at risk” will actually be lost. In El Dorado County, Section 8 contracts first began expiring in 1999. Between 1999 and April 2001, all of the expiring Section 8 contracts were renewed (i.e., none of the owners chose to opt out). Assuming this trend continues, a substantial loss of affordable housing due to conversion to market rate is not expected. Regardless, this Housing Element contains a number of policies that address conversion and conservation of affordable units.

Page 103, Table HO-21 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-2122

Page 103, the following paragraph is inserted immediately after Table HO-22 (which was Table HO-21):

Table HO-23 lists the assisted housing developments at-risk in the unincorporated areas of El Dorado County. As the table shows, the unincorporated County has 99 units with contracts at risk of expiring by 2005. Section 515 assistance was funded by the Farmer’s Home Administration (now Rural Development). The loans are for 40 years and may be prepayable in 20 years. Due the lack of available land, high construction costs, and limited resources, the County has determined that preserving at-risk units is more cost effective than replacing them. To this end, the County has proposed several specific measures to monitor and preserve assisted housing developments (see Measures HO-BB and HO-CC). In addition, several other funding sources, such as the housing trust fund (Measure HO-K), could be used for the preservation of at-risk units once the trust fund is implemented.

Page 104, Table HO-22 is revised as shown:

<b>TABLE HO-22 -23</b>				
<b>Assisted Housing Developments in El Dorado County <u>At Risk</u></b>				
<b>Development and Monthly Rate<sup>1</sup></b>	<b># of Assisted Units</b>	<b>Type of Assistance Received</b>	<b>Handicapped Accessible</b>	<b>Senior Complex</b>
<b>Cameron Park</b>				
<del>Camerado Gardens</del> <del>2 Bedroom: \$690 and up</del>			✓	
<del>Cameron Oak Apartments</del> <del>2 Bedroom: \$725</del> <del>3 Bedroom: \$825</del>			✓	
<del>Garden Circle Apartments</del> <del>2 Bedroom: \$665</del> <del>3 Bedroom: \$765</del>			✓	
<del>Glenview Apartments</del> <del>2 Bedroom: \$413-\$532</del> <del>3 Bedroom: \$469-\$606</del>	88	Tax Credit	✓	✓
<del>Cameron Park Apartments</del> <del>1-3 Bedroom: 50-60% of Income</del>	120	Tax Credit		✓
<del>Green Valley Apartments</del> <del>1 Bedroom: \$386 and up</del> <del>2 Bedroom: \$448 and up</del> <del>3 Bedroom: \$517 and up</del>	40	Section 515	✓	
<b>Diamond Springs</b>				
<del>Diamond Springs Apartments</del> <del>1 Bedroom: \$393</del> <del>2 Bedroom: \$458 and up</del> <del>3 Bedroom: \$503 and up</del>	23	Section 515	✓	
<del>Diamond Springs Senior Apartments</del> <del>1 Bedroom: 30% of Income</del>	24	Section 515	✓	✓
<del>Diamond Terrace Apartments</del> <del>2 Bedroom: \$416</del> <del>3 Bedroom: \$486</del> <del>4 Bedroom: \$533</del>			✓	
<b>Shingle Springs</b>				
<del>Barnett Village Apartments</del> <del>2 Bedroom: \$825 and up</del>			✓	

<b>TABLE HO-22 -23</b>				
<b>Assisted Housing Developments in El Dorado County <u>At Risk</u></b>				
<b>Development and Monthly Rate<sup>1</sup></b>	<b># of Assisted Units</b>	<b>Type of Assistance Received</b>	<b>Handicapped Accessible</b>	<b>Senior Complex</b>
Shingle Terrace Apartments 2 Bedroom: \$417 3 Bedroom: \$485 4 Bedroom: \$535	12	Section 515	✓	
<b>Notes:</b> <sup>1</sup> Rental rates from November 2001.				
<b>Source:</b> El Dorado County Department of Community Services: <del>Apartments for Rent (November 2001)</del>				

Page 104, the first sentence on the page is revised as follows:

Table HO-23~~24~~ shows future housing needs in the unincorporated areas....

Page 105, Table HO-23 is revised as shown:

Table HO-23~~24~~

Page 107, the first sentence of the third paragraph is revised as shown:

Table HO-24~~25~~ shows the land use designations outlined in the Land Use Element.

Page 108, Table HO-24 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-24~~25~~

Page 109, the last sentence is revised as follows:

Table HO-25~~26~~ shows the maximum residential density permitted in each existing zoning district.

Page 110, Table HO-25 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-25~~26~~

Page 110, the following text and tables are inserted after Table HO-26 (which was Table HO-25):

Table HO-27 provides setback, coverage, and height requirements throughout the unincorporated portions of El Dorado County. Setbacks in multifamily residential zones are slightly less restrictive, providing the option for a larger footprint on the

parcel. The setbacks, maximum coverage and height requirements are comparable to other communities throughout the state and are not considered a constraint to the development of affordable housing.

<b>TABLE HO-27 Zoning District Setbacks</b>					
<b>Zoning District</b>	<b>Front Setback</b>	<b>Side Setback</b>	<b>Rear Setback</b>	<b>Maximum Coverage</b>	<b>Maximum Height</b>
One-family Residential (R1)	20 feet	5 feet <sup>1</sup>	15 feet	35 percent	40 feet
Limited Multifamily Residential (R2)	20 feet	5 feet	15 feet	50 percent	40 feet
Multifamily Residential (RM)	20 feet	5 feet	10 feet	50 percent	50 feet
Tourist Residential (RT)	20 feet	5 feet	10 feet	50 percent	50 feet
Residential Agricultural Twenty-acre (RA-20)	50 feet on all yards	50 feet on all yards	50 feet on all yards	None	45 feet
<b>Note:</b> <sup>1</sup> Side yard will be increased one foot for each additional foot of building height in excess of twenty-five feet.					
<b>Source:</b> <i>El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance (as amended through 2003).</i>					

Table HO-28 lists the off-street parking requirements for different residential uses in the County. The County's parking requirements are consistent with other communities and are not considered to unnecessarily burden affordable housing construction.

<b>TABLE HO-28 Schedule of Off-Street Vehicle Parking Requirements</b>	
<b>Use</b>	<b>Minimum Off-Street Parking</b>
Conventional single-family detached	2 spaces, not in tandem
Single-family with second unit	2 spaces, not in tandem plus 1 space for each additional unit
Single-family attached	2 spaces, not in tandem per unit
Apartments	
Studio/1 bedroom	1.6 spaces per unit
2 or more bedrooms	2 spaces per unit
Rooming house, boarding home, fraternity,	1 space per bedroom

<b>TABLE HO-28</b>	
<b>Schedule of Off-Street Vehicle Parking Requirements</b>	
<b>Use</b>	<b>Minimum Off-Street Parking</b>
Mobile Home	1 space per mobile home space plus one visitor space for every 5 units.
<b>Source:</b> <i>El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance (as amended through 2003).</i>	

Page 110, the first sentence of the paragraph under Table HO-26 (previously Table HO-25) is revised as shown:

Table HO-26~~29~~ outlines the extent of permitted housing types by zoning district.

Page 111, the first paragraph is revised as follows:

As shown on Table HO-26 ~~29~~, some housing types require issuance of permits or other discretionary approval for development under the current Zoning Ordinance. While most housing types are allowed by right in most residential zone districts, others may be subject to site plan review, issuance of a special use permit, or approval of a planned development. Multifamily housing is permitted by right in the Multifamily Residential (RM), Limited Multifamily Residential (R2), and Tourist Residential (RT) zones.

Page 112, Table HO-26 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-26~~29~~

Page 111, the following text is inserted between the **Special Use Permit** paragraph and the **Planned Development** paragraph:

The following outlines the approval process for a Special Use Permit:

1. **Prepare and submit application.** The applicant prepares required materials and submits his/her package to the Planning Department.
2. **Receive application.** The Planning Department reviews the application with the applicant. If the application is complete, the Planning Department accepts the project, assigns it to a planner, and distributes copies of application materials to affected agencies for review and comment.
3. **Process application.** The Planning Department processes the application in coordination with other departments and agencies as necessary. Processing normally includes:

- A site meeting with applicant and representatives of other appropriate County departments.
  - A “Technical Advisory Committee” meeting with the applicant and representatives of concerned County departments and agencies. The other County departments and agencies may state a requirement for additional information or studies at the meeting.
  - Preparation of a draft environmental document pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Depending upon the potential impacts of the project, a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) may be required. If an EIR is required, the applicant is responsible for the costs of the EIR process.
  - Noticing of the public hearing for the project and environmental document in the local newspaper (notice shall include information regarding public review time frame).
  - Preparation of a staff report, which is presented to the decision-making body in advance of the project hearing. The applicant reviews the staff report a minimum of two weeks before the public hearing so that he/she understands staff-recommended conditions of approval.
4. **Hold public hearing.** A public hearing is held before the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission to make a decision on the proposed project. The hearing includes certification of environmental document and may result in conditions of approval that are different from staff recommendations. If the hearing body approves the project, the applicant may proceed pursuant to the conditions of approval. If the hearing body denies the project, the applicant may choose to modify the project and repeat the process.
5. **Post-decision procedure.** If any party wishes to appeal the decision of the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission, he/she must file appeal within ten working days after the decision. The appeal hearing, which is publicly noticed, is held before the Board of Supervisors at one of its regular meetings. For appealed projects, the Board of Supervisors makes a final decision. The timing of the appeal hearing is approximately 30 days after the filing of the appeal.

The entire process is generally completed within six to eight months. The length of time is mainly determined by the level of environmental review required, changes or modifications made to the project by the applicant, or additional information needed to resolve issues or complete the environmental document.

Page 112, Table HO-26 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-2629

Page 114, the last sentence in the last paragraph is revised as shown:

Table HO-2730 lists impact and related development fees...

Page 114, the following text is inserted after the second paragraph under Impact Fees discussion:

As noted on table HO-30, a portion of total fees are payable to entities other than the County (i.e., fire districts, school districts, park and recreation providers, community services districts, and water providers). The County has no authority to change or waive fees assessed by non-County entities. County-levied fees for single-family dwellings are based on costs to process applications (building permit and septic system fees), ordinance requirements (rare plant fees), and costs to construct improvements. Developments that consist of something other than a single unit may have additional processing fees depending upon the type and size of the project (e.g., a large subdivision project may require preparation of an Environmental Impact Report pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, which would be funded by the applicant).

County-levied fees are established or changed using a formal process. To determine an appropriate fee (or fee change), the County conducts a study that identifies details of the service and the cost to administer that service. The Board of Supervisors then considers the new or amended fee based on the results of the study. The Board has final say in the established fee amounts. The County regularly reviews its fee programs and conducts fee studies in responses to changes in requirements, changes in demand, and changes in the value of its services (e.g., influenced by inflation).

Page 115, Table HO-27 is revised as shown:

TABLE HO-27 -30 Single-Family Dwelling Impact and Other Fees <sup>1</sup>			
Type of Fee	Amount of Fee	Agency Collecting Fee	Time of Assessment
Building Permit	\$0.83-87/sq. ft. <sup>2</sup>	El Dorado County	Building Permit
Road, County	\$4,223-8,418/d.u. \$4,337-8,645/d.u. <sup>3</sup>	El Dorado County	Building Permit
Road, State	\$1,632-2,832/d.u. \$1,676-2,908/d.u. <sup>4</sup>	El Dorado County	Building Permit

**TABLE HO-27 -30  
Single-Family Dwelling Impact and Other Fees<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Type of Fee</b>	<b>Amount of Fee</b>	<b>Agency Collecting Fee</b>	<b>Time of Assessment</b>
Road, Special District	<del>\$94-5,864/d.u.</del> <del>\$97-6,791/d.u.</del> <sup>5</sup>	El Dorado County	Building Permit
Fire	\$281-1,915/d.u.	Fire District	Building Permit
School	\$2.14-3.07/sq. ft.	School Districts	Building Permit
Park Dedication In-Lieu Fee	Varies <sup>6</sup>	Park Agency	Final Subdivision or Parcel Map
Recreation	\$2,331-2,747/d.u. <sup>7</sup>	Community Services Districts	Building Permit
Rare Plant, County	\$0-885/d.u. <sup>8</sup>	El Dorado County	Building Permit
Rare Plant, EID <sup>9</sup>	\$345	EID	Building Permit
Water, EID	\$5,210/d.u. <sup>10</sup>	EID	Building Permit or Final Map <sup>11</sup>
Water, GDPUD <sup>12</sup>	\$100-5,000/d.u.	GDPUD	Building Permit or Final Map <sup>13</sup>
Water, Grizzly Flats CSD	\$3,650/d.u.	GFCSD	Building Permit
<u>Water, Permit to Drill Well</u>	<u>\$245</u>	<u>El Dorado County</u>	<u>Building Permit</u>
Sewer	\$7,467-8,902/d.u. <sup>14</sup>	EID	Building Permit or Final Map
Septic System	<del>\$326</del> <del>\$490</del>	El Dorado County	Building Permit

**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup>Based on January 1, 2003, fee schedule. Fees in effect as of October 19, 2003.

<sup>2</sup>Varies based on construction type.

<sup>3</sup>Road Impact Fee (RIF) for El Dorado Hills Area; Traffic Impact Mitigation fee (TIM) for remainder of West Slope.

<sup>4</sup>Varies based on location by Regional Analysis Zone (RAZ).

<sup>5</sup>Varies based on location and size of structure.

<sup>6</sup>Park fees based on the value of the land and the amount of land required for dedication.

<sup>7</sup>Recreation fees are only collected in the El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park Community Services Districts boundaries.

<sup>8</sup>Plant fee varies based on location.

<sup>9</sup>El Dorado Irrigation District.

<sup>10</sup>Based on a ¾" meter.

<sup>11</sup>Fee is collected at recording of a subdivision final or parcel map, unless the lot is pre-existing and does not already have an EDU allocated to it.

<sup>12</sup>Georgetown Divide Public Utility District.

<sup>13</sup>\$100 is basic service fee for previously assessed parcels; \$5,000 or more is due at time of recording

TABLE HO-27 -30 Single-Family Dwelling Impact and Other Fees <sup>1</sup>			
Type of Fee	Amount of Fee	Agency Collecting Fee	Time of Assessment
a map creating new parcels.			
<sup>14</sup> Varies based on location.			
<b>Source:</b> El Dorado County Building Department, Planning Department, El Dorado Irrigation District, and Georgetown Divide Public Utility District (2003).			

Page 115, the following text is inserted immediately after Table HO-30 (which was Table HO-27):

Though not indicated on the table, larger residential projects (subdivisions more than four parcels or development of more than four multifamily units) may require additional road improvement fees or road construction in order to comply with policies first adopted pursuant to Measure Y, "The Control Traffic Congestion Initiative." This initiative, passed by the voters in 1998, added five policies to the General Plan. These policies are currently in effect under the Writ of Mandate. Similar policies are included in the draft general plans currently being considered by the County. The policies with the greatest potential to affect fees related to housing development are as follows:

- Traffic from residential development projects of five or more units or parcels of land shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service "F" (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange, or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the County.
- Developer-paid traffic impact fees shall fully pay for building all necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development upon any highways, arterial roads, and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the County; and
- County tax revenues shall not be used in any way to pay for building road capacity improvements to offset traffic impacts from new development projects. Exceptions are allowed if County voters first give their approval.

In summary, if subject residential development were to cause or contribute to existing Level of Service (LOS) F conditions (gridlock, stop-and-go), the developer would be required to fund its share of roadway improvements to ensure that the impact would not occur (i.e., ensure that development would not cause/contribute to LOS F conditions). The cost for necessary roadway improvements would vary depending upon the location of the development and roadway LOS conditions in the area. If the necessary roadway improvement(s) were substantial (e.g., adding

lanes or reconstructing interchanges), the costs associated with the developer's share could be high. This cost factor could constrain development.

Page 116, the first paragraph under "Building Codes and Enforcement" is revised as follows:

Uniform codes regulate new construction and rehabilitation of dwellings. These codes include building, plumbing, electrical, mechanical, and fire codes. The codes establish minimum standards and specifications for structural soundness, safety, and occupancy. At the time of publishing this plan, El Dorado County enforced the 1998 editions of the California Building, Plumbing, Mechanical, and Fire Codes and the 1997 National Electrical Code. The County last updated Title 15, the Building Ordinance, in November of 2002, adopting by reference the above codes and defining the County's administrative processes and specific County provisions for construction. More recent updates may subsequently be adopted. The building codes enforced by El Dorado County are typical of those enforced throughout the state. [265-19]

Page 117, the fourth sentence of the paragraph under Writ of Mandate is revised as follows:

Adoption of a new General Plan is expected to occur by ~~December 2003~~ June 2004.

Page 117, the following sentence is inserted at the end of the first paragraph under Existing Commitments:

The majority of units associated with these commitments are near the westernmost boundary of the county, close to the job centers of Folsom, Sacramento, and the El Dorado Hills Business Park.

Page 121, the following text is inserted after the last sentence under the Building Code Constraints heading:

### **Lessening the Effects of Governmental Constraints**

This Housing Element proposes a number of programs to help alleviate the effects of some governmental constraints. The following text summarizes those measures that may lessen the effects of the constraints, as appropriate.

For the most part, proposals outlined in this Housing Element addressing governmental constraints are focused on affordable housing. However, a number of the constraints are requirements of state law and are necessary to ensure maintenance of public health and safety. The County lacks the authority to reduce the effects of these constraints.

### Land Use Control: General Plan

General Plan land use controls are required by state law, including land use designations that protect open space. Other designations allow for residential development. The land use map designates sufficient land for housing development, so no adjustments are necessary.

### Land Use Control: Zoning

Zoning land use controls are required by state law. The County will update its Zoning Ordinance upon adoption of a new General Plan. As outlined in this Housing Element, the County is proposing some Implementation Measures that would facilitate or encourage certain types of residential development. Measure HO-G directs the County to review and revise Zoning Ordinance standards to provide more flexibility for developers of affordable housing. Measure HO-T directs the County to amend the Planned Development combining zone district in a manner that provides incentives for the development of a variety of housing types. Measure HO-U directs the County to adopt standards for affordable housing development so that it may be considered for ministerial approval; such standards would likely be included in the Zoning Ordinance. Finally, Measure HO-EE directs the County to review the Zoning Ordinance for constraints to housing for persons with disabilities. These measures are sufficient to lessen the effect of the Zoning Ordinance as a constraint to housing development.

### Land Use Control: Subdivision Ordinance

The County's Subdivision Ordinance is consistent with state law. The subdivision requirements are comparable with those of jurisdictions having similar topography and demographics. The ordinance does not create excessive obstacles to residential development. No changes are necessary.

### Development Processing Procedures

The County's development processing procedures are similar to those of other jurisdictions statewide. The procedures do not create excessive obstacles to residential development, though this Housing Element includes programs to relax the procedures for certain types of projects. These include HO-N, which directs the County to review its current procedures to identify opportunities for streamlining; HO-R, which directs the County to establish a working group to ensure consistent application of processing requirements; HO-U, which directs the County to adopt standards that would facilitate ministerial approval of affordable housing projects; and HO-MM, which directs the County to develop a procedure for processing reasonable accommodation requests. No additional changes are necessary.

## Impact Fees

As noted above, only a portion of impact fees associated with residential development are established by the County. The combination of the County's fees and those of other agencies and service providers collectively pose a constraint to the development of affordable housing because developers cannot as easily pass the cost on to the purchaser or future inhabitants. The County is proposing a fee waiver/fee reduction ordinance (Measure HO-I) to help alleviate some of its fee requirements. Other Implementation Measures that may be used to help developers offset fee requirements include HO-E, which directs the County to partner with other entities obtain grant money or negotiate fee waivers to develop affordable housing; Measure HO-K, which would establish a Housing Trust Fund that could potentially be used to offset fees for affordable housing construction; Measure HO-V, which directs the County to consider ministerial approval of affordable housing, which could lead to overall lower development fees; and Measure HO-EE, which directs the County to adopt an ordinance addressing reasonable accommodation for disabled persons, including funding for such development.

In addition to the measures addressing impact fees (discussed above), the County will continue to consider ways to reduce the adverse effects of impact fees on affordable housing projects as it develops new fee programs.

## On and Offsite Requirements

On and offsite requirements, such as those for parking and landscaping, are consistent with the Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance, and other County codes. Jurisdictions across California have these types of requirements. Although these requirements do not place an undue hardship on developers of residential projects, this Housing Element contains incentives that may relax standards for certain types of development. Measure HO-G, directs the County to review and revise Zoning Ordinance standards to provide more flexibility for developers of affordable housing. Measure HO-J directs the County to work with TPRA to consider changes to its Code of Ordinances that would facilitate the construction of affordable housing. Measure HO-O directs the County to develop and infill incentive ordinance, which will address standards for such development. Finally, Measure HO-T directs the County to amend the Planned Development combining zone district in a manner that provides incentives for the development of a variety of housing types.

It should be noted that some of the new measures proposed in this Housing Element may lead to additional development requirements. No mitigation is proposed for these new requirements.

### Building Codes

Building code requirements are intended to protect public health and safety. No changes are necessary.

### Writ of Mandate

The Writ of Mandate, issued by a Superior Court Judge, will be in effect until the Court agrees that the County has met the terms of the Writ. Upon adoption of a new General Plan, the County will return to the Court and ask that the Writ be lifted. Other than following the procedure to have the Writ lifted, there are no other changes that can be made.

### Existing Commitments

Because of the location of units associated with the majority of the existing commitments, these projects promote housing development near job centers. Generally, the agreement(s) may only be changed if both parties agree to renegotiate the terms. No mitigation is available.

### Concurrency Requirements

Requirements for concurrency of services and development are contained in the General Plan and County Code. Requirements for utility delivery, such as water, are necessary for public health and safety. Requirements for concurrency of roadway improvements are tied to the County's LOS standard. It is not feasible to lower the LOS standards or concurrency requirements without significant adverse effects on traffic congestion and air quality.

### Special Requirements in the Tahoe Basin

Residential development in the Tahoe Basin is primarily regulated by the TRPA. The County has no authority to relax or otherwise change the standards of TRPA. This Housing Element contains Implementation Measures (Measure HO-J and HO-Q) that encourage closer cooperation with TRPA so that affordable housing issues in the El Dorado County portion of the Basin may be more adequately addressed. No additional measures are necessary.

### Government Constraints and Housing for Disabled Persons

As noted in the text, the County is proposing three Implementation Measures (Measures HO-DD, HO-EE, and HP-MM) to address the constraints associated with the development of housing for persons with disabilities. No additional measures are necessary.

Figure HO-12, following page 126, is revised. Please see Appendix D of this document.

Page 126, the first paragraph under **Survey Summary** is revised as follows:

The survey results show that El Dorado County has enough land appropriately zoned to meet its total 2001–2008 allocation of 9,994 units. As shown on Table HO-28 -31, there is capacity to accommodate ~~12,088~~ 12,059 DUs outside of the Development Agreement areas.

Page 126, the following text is inserted after first paragraph under **Survey Summary**:

Consistent with Section 65583(c)(1) of the Government Code, the survey does not attempt to predict actual rates of residential development, but rather provides an inventory of land available for development. Once the County adopts a new General Plan and the Superior Court of California removes the restrictions outlined in the 1999 Writ of Mandate (see the Writ of Mandate discussion under “Other Land Use Controls” in Section 3: Housing Constraints), the County expects that actual housing development will be influenced by the housing market, housing programs included in this element, and constraints outlined in Section 3 of this element.

The survey numbers reflect development uninhibited by constraints described in Section 3 of this Housing Element. While few of these constraints would affect the physical development potential of vacant sites, the County expects that some could affect development rates and intensities. For example, a landowner wishing to develop a smaller parcel with a limited number of multifamily units could have more difficulty in securing the funds necessary to complete the project. This element proposes a number of programs that could offset or assist landowners with fee payment, including fee waiver/fee reduction (Measure HO-I), a housing trust fund (Measure HO-K), additional grant monies (Measure HO-M), and model or relaxed development standards (Measures HO-N, HO-O, HO-T, and HO-V).

Page 126, the third sentence of the second paragraph under **Survey Summary** is revised as follows:

The inventory and Table HO-28 -31 indicate that there is capacity to supply a total of ~~8,324~~ 8,060 higher density units having public water and sewer (this does not include the Development Agreement areas).

Page 127, Table HO-28 is revised as follows:

<b>TABLE HO-28 -31 Vacant Land Survey Summary</b>			
	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Parcels</b>	<b>Adjusted Maximum Capacity (DUs)</b>
All Lands in Communities Except Lands in Development Agreements <sup>1</sup>			
Total of Vacant Lands	11,985.1	1,575	12,059
Higher Density Lands (4+ DUs/acre)	<del>2,079.7</del> <u>1701.9</u>	<del>349</del> <u>278</u>	<del>9,989</del> <u>9,680</u>
Higher Density Lands Having Public Services	<del>4,086.3</del> <u>1541.4</u>	<del>467</del> <u>120</u>	<del>8,324</del> <u>8,060</u>
<u>2001-2008 Allocations:</u> Very Low = 2,829 units; Lower = 1,890 units; Moderate = 2,100 units; Above Moderate = 3,175 units; Total = 9,994 units.			
<b>Notes:</b>			
<sup>1</sup> Considers land vacant as of August 2002 (information from the El Dorado County Assessor's Office database). See text and Attachment A for further information.			

Page 127, the third sentence on the last paragraph is revised as follows:

(See Table HO-4516 for an example of this)

Page 144, Measure HO-E is revised as follows:

Partner with existing nonprofit and for-profit corporations that are interested and able to construct and manage housing affordable to very low and lower income families in order to expand their ability to serve the county. Partnerships Assistance may focus on include site identification, site acquisition, design standards, and identification of subsidy sources like Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME) funds, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) monies, fee waivers, and expedited permit processing. [Policy HO-1r]

Page 145, Measure HO-G is revised as follows:

Amend the Zoning Ordinance and *Design and Improvement Standards Manual* to consider provide more flexibility and ~~relaxation of certain in~~ development standards as incentives for affordable housing developments. Any amendments to development standards should consider site and ~~potential occupancy~~ characteristics. The specific standards that may be evaluated include, but are not limited to, the following...

Responsibility:	Planning Department
Time Frame:	Within one year of General Plan adoption.
Funding:	General Fund

Expected Outcome:	Adoption of Density Bonus Ordinance.
Objective:	400 150 units

Page 147, the table under Measure HO-J is revised as follows:

Responsibility:	Planning Department; <del>and</del> Department of Community Services; <del>and</del> TRPA
Time Frame:	Ongoing
Funding:	General Fund
Expected Outcome:	Adopted changes in the TRPA code to allow more affordable housing.

Page 149, Measure HO-O is revised as follows:

~~Evaluate the feasibility of~~ Adopting an infill incentive ordinance to assist developers in addressing barriers to infill development. Incentives could include, but are not limited to, modifications of development standards, such as reduced parking and setback requirements, to accommodate smaller or odd-shaped parcels, and waivers or deferrals of certain development fees, helping to decrease or defer the costs of development. [Policy HO-1e]

Responsibility:	Planning Department
Time Frame:	Within two years of General Plan adoption.
Funding:	General Fund
Expected Outcome:	400 200 units

Page 151, Measure HO-U is revised as follows:

~~Work with non-profit and for profit developers to adopt~~ development and design standards that would make affordable multifamily housing ministerial, requiring such housing to blend in with the surrounding area. [Policy HO-1p]

Responsibility:	Planning Department
Time Frame:	Within <del>three</del> two years of General Plan adoption.
Funding:	General Fund
Expected Outcome:	Quicker turnaround of multifamily development applications; reduced cost for multifamily development; and minimization of constraints to new multifamily development.

Page 152, Measure HO-X is revised as follows:

Apply for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) rehabilitation funds annually to provide housing rehabilitation services and continue to provide weatherization services to very low and lower income households. [Policy HO-2a]

Page 153, the table under Measure HO-Z is revised as follows:

Responsibility:	Planning Department and Department of Community Services
Time Frame:	Within two years of General Plan adoption.
Funding:	General Fund
Expected Outcome:	Mobile home park conversion ordinance.
Objective:	200 Mobile Homes

Page 155, Measure HO-FF is revised as follows:

Work with community and local organizations in providing community education on homelessness, gaining better understanding of the unmet need, and developing and maintaining emergency shelter programs, including ~~consideration of funding for programs developed through interjurisdictional cooperation and working with local organizations to annually apply for the End Chronic Homelessness through Employment and Housing grant.~~ [Policy HO-4d]

Page 155, Measure HO-GG is revised as follows:

~~As part of the Zoning Ordinance update, clearly define temporary shelters, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing and identify zone districts within which temporary shelters or transitional housing may be established by right or by Special Use Permit. Once that exercise is complete, identify potential suitable sites for use as establishment of emergency shelters and transitional and permanent supportive housing, with characteristics appropriate for such use, including but not limited to proximity to public services and facilities; and accessibility to and from areas where homeless persons congregate; and having zoning classifications that allow the siting of an emergency shelter or the conversion of an existing structure for such use.~~ [Policy HO-4d]

Responsibility:	Planning Department and Department of Community Services
Time Frame:	<del>Zoning Ordinance to be updated within one year of General Plan adoption. Identification of sites to begin immediately thereafter.</del>
Funding:	General Fund and other
Expected Outcome:	<del>Identification of suitable sites for emergency shelters and transitional housing.</del>

Page 157, Measure HO-LL is revised as follows:

~~Develop a procedure to~~ Continue to refer people who suspect discrimination in housing to the appropriate agency or organization for help. This is ongoing effort by the County. [Policies HO-6b and HO-6c]

Page 157, the following text is added after MEASURE HO-MM:

**MEASURE HO-NN**

As part of the Zoning Ordinance update, ensure that the permit processing procedures for farmworker housing do not conflict with Health and Safety Code Section 17021.6 which states that “no conditional use permit, zoning variance, or other zoning clearance shall be required of employee housing that serves 12 or fewer employees and is not required of any other agricultural activity in the same zone.” The County shall also ensure that such procedures encourage and facilitate the development of housing for farmworkers.

Responsibility:	Planning Department and Department of Community Services
Time Frame:	Zoning Ordinance to be updated within one year of General Plan adoption
Funding:	General Fund and other
Expected Outcome:	Compliance with Health and Safety Code Section 17021.6 and procedures that encourage and facilitate the development of farmworker housing

**QUANTIFIED HOUSING OBJECTIVES**

Table HO-32 summarizes the housing objectives for each measure and shows if the units will be provided by new construction, rehabilitation, or conservation. New construction refers to the number of new units that could potentially be constructed by each measure. Rehabilitation refers to the number of existing units expected to be rehabilitated. Conservation refers to the preservation of affordable housing stock. A subset of the conservation objective is the preservation of units defined as “at-risk”. The quantified objectives are further broken down by income category (e.g. very low income, low income, and moderate income). Because a jurisdiction may not have the resources to provide the state mandated housing allocation (see Table HO-24) the quantified objectives do not need to match the state allocation by income category.

Table HO-32 is shown on the following page.

Page 170, Table A-3 is revised as shown, beginning on page 5.2-35.

**TABLE HO-32  
Quantified Housing Objectives**

Measure	Objective	Construction				Rehabilitation			Conservation		
		Very Low	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Very Low	Lower	Moderate	Very Low	Lower	Moderate
HO-E	400	100	200	100							
HO-F	200 second units, 300 mobile homes	200	250	50							
HO-H	150		50	50	50						
HO-I	225	75	150								
HO-L	50		50								
HO-O	200	75	75	25	25						
HO-X	800					400	300	100			
HO-Z	200 mobile homes								80	70	50
HO-AA	300								175	100	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,825</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>775</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>75</b>
Additional Market Rate Units				80	3,200			160			
<b>Grand Totals</b>		<b>450</b>	<b>775</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>3,275</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>75</b>

**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

Zoning	Acres	# of Parcels	Acres/ Parcels	Parcel Size Range (Acres)	Services <sup>2</sup>	Max DU/Acre	Max Capacity (Units) <sup>3</sup>	Max Expected (Units) <sup>4</sup>
<b>Cameron Park</b>								
Commercial (C)	12.9	2	6.5	4.2-8.7	A	40	129	13
Commercial-Design Control (C-DC)	2.1	4	2.1	-	A	40	24	2
Planned Commercial (CP)	19.1	3	6.4	3.1-8.7	A	40	191	19
Planned Commercial-Design Control (CP-DC)	54.3	5	10.9	2.1-33.7	A	40	543	54
Planned Commercial-Planned Development & Design Control (CP-PD-DC)	18.1	2	9.1	5.1-13.0	A	40	181	18
Professional Office Commercial-Design Control (CPO-DC)	20.2	3	6.7	4.2-11.1	A	40	202	20
Multifamily Residential-Design Control (RM-DC)	2.5	1	2.5	-	A	24	60	48
One-family Residential (R1)	135.5	19	7.1	2.2-31.2	A	7.3	989	791
One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1- PD)	27.4	2	13.7	2.9-24.5	A	7.3	200	160
Limited Multifamily Residential (R2)	3.2	2	1.6	1.6-1.6	A	21.8	70	56
Limited Multifamily Residential-Design Control (R2- DC)	17.3	3	5.8	3.3-10.7	A	21.8	377	302
Limited Multifamily Residential-Planned Development (R2-PD)	16.4	4	4.1	2.8-6.5	A	21.8	358	286
Tourist Residential (RT)	4.7	1	4.7	-	A	21.8	102	82
<b>Cameron Park Total</b>	333.7 acres 207.0 acres	48 parcels 32 parcels					3,423 units 2,156 units	1,851 units 1,725 units

**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

Zoning	Acres	# of Parcels	Acres/ Parcels	Parcel Size Range (Acres)	Services <sup>2</sup>	Max DU/Acre	Max Capacity (Units) <sup>3</sup>	Max Expected (Units) <sup>4</sup>
<b>Camino/Pollock Pines</b>								
Commercial-Design Control (C-DC)	6.4	2	3.4	2.1-4.0	B	4	24	2
One-family Residential (R1)	37.5	12	3.1	2.0-5.7	B	7.3	274	219
Limited Multifamily Residential (R2)	16.7	3	5.6	2.1-12.5	B	21.8	364	291
Tourist Residential (RT)	2.2	1	2.2	-	B	21.8	48	38
<b>Camino/Pollock Pines Total</b>	62.5 acres 56.4 acres	18 parcels 16 parcels					710 units 686 units	550 units 548 units
<b>Chrome Ridge</b>								
Planned Commercial (GP)	3.5	2	1.8	1.5-2.0	B	4	14	1
<b>Chrome Ridge Total</b>	3.5 acres	2 parcels					14 units	1 unit
<b>Coloma</b>								
Commercial (C)	2.3	1	2.3	-	B, C	4	9	1
<b>Coloma Total</b>	2.3 acres	1 parcel					9 units	1 unit
<b>Cool</b>								
Commercial (C-DC)	10.5	1	10.5	-	B	4	42	4
Planned Commercial-Design Control (CP-DC)	19.6	1	19.6	-	B	4	78	8
One-family Residential (R1)	3.1	2	1.6	1.0-2.1	B	7.3	23	18
Limited Multifamily Residential-Design Control (R2-DC)	40.1	4	10.0	7.1-18.2	B	21.8	874	699
<b>Cool Total</b>	73.3 acres 43.2 acres	8 parcels 6 parcels					1,017 units 897 units	729 units 717 units
<b>Diamond Springs/El Dorado</b>								
Commercial (C)	6.1	3	2.0	0.9-2.9	A	10	61	6

**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b># of Parcels</b>	<b>Acres/ Parcels</b>	<b>Parcel Size Range (Acres)</b>	<b>Services<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Max DU/Acre</b>	<b>Max Capacity (Units)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Max Expected (Units)<sup>4</sup></b>
Commercial-Design Control (C-DC)	42.3	7	6.0	2.1-16.3	A	10	423	42
Commercial-Planned Development (C-PD)	4.7	2	2.4	2.3-2.4	A	10	47	5
Planned Commercial (CP)	2.9	1	2.9	-	A	10	29	3
Professional Office Commercial (CPO)	7.2	4	7.2	-	A	10	72	7
Professional Office Commercial-Planned Development (CPO-PD)	2.2	1	2.2	-	A	10	22	2
Mobile Home Park (MP)	51.1	3	17.0	17.4-27.3	A	7	358	286
One-family Residential (R1)	120.5	12	10.0	3.5-41.8	A	7.3	880	704
One-family Residential-Design Control (R1-DC)	12.0	2	6.0	5.0-7.0	A	7.3	88	70
One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD)	35.3	5	7.1	3.7-11.6	A	7.3	258	206
Limited Multifamily Residential (R2)	17.5	4	4.4	2.2-10.0	A	21.8	382	305
Limited Multifamily Residential-Design Control (R2-DC)	41.5	8	5.2	0.1-16.8	A	21.8	905	724
Limited Multifamily Residential-Planned Development (R2-PD)	9.2	2	4.6	2.1-7.0	A	21.8	201	160
<b>Diamond Springs/El Dorado Total</b>	<b>352.5 acres 287.1 acres</b>	<b>51 parcels 36 parcels</b>					<b>3,726 units 3,072 units</b>	<b>2,520 units 2,455 units</b>

**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

Zoning	Acres	# of Parcels	Acres/ Parcels	Parcel Size Range (Acres)	Services <sup>2</sup>	Max DU/Acre	Max Capacity (Units) <sup>3</sup>	Max Expected (Units) <sup>4</sup>
<b>El Dorado Hills</b>								
Commercial-Design-Control (C-DC)	28.7	4	7.2	2.0-18.7	A	40	287	29
Planned-Commercial-Design-Control (CP-DC)	7.0	1	7.0	-	A	40	70	7
One-family Residential (R1)	228.5	20	11.4	0.1-49.8	A	7.3	1668	1,334
One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD)	10.7	3	3.6	0.2-6.6	A	7.3	78	62
Limited Multifamily Residential-Design Control (R2-DC)	57.5	4	14.4	6.3-22.6	A	21.8	1254	1,003
Multifamily Residential-Design Control (RM-DC)	22.5	2	11.3	0.7-21.8	A	24	540	432
<b>El Dorado Hills Total</b>	354.9 acres 319.2 acres	34 parcels 29 parcels					3,897 units 3,540 units	2,867 units 2,831 units
<b>Garden Valley</b>								
Commercial-Planned-Development (C-PD)	7.0	1	7.0	-	B	4	28	3
<b>Garden Valley Total</b>	7.0 acres	1 parcel					28 units	3 units
<b>Georgetown</b>								
Planned-Commercial (GP)	2.5	1	2.5	-	B	4	40	4
<b>Georgetown Total</b>	2.5 acres	1 parcel					40 units	4 unit
<b>Greenwood</b>								
Commercial (C)	2.0	1	2.0	-	B	4	8	4
<b>Greenwood Total</b>	2.0 acres	1 parcel					8 units	4 unit
<b>Kyburz</b>								
Commercial (C)	0.9	2	0.4	0.2-0.7	C	4	4	0

**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b># of Parcels</b>	<b>Acres/ Parcels</b>	<b>Parcel Size Range (Acres)</b>	<b>Services<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Max DU/Acre</b>	<b>Max Capacity (Units)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Max Expected (Units)<sup>4</sup></b>
One-family Residential (R1)	16.9	41	0.4	0.14-1.9	C	7.3	123	99
<b>Kyburz Total</b>	17.8 acres 16.9 acres	43 parcels 41 parcels					127 units 123 units	99 units
<b>Little Norway</b>								
Commercial (C)	2.3	4	2.3	-	E	4	9	4
One-family Residential (R1)	14.9	25	0.6	0.2-2.67	C	7.3	109	87
<b>Little Norway Total</b>	17.2 acres 14.9 acres	26 parcels 25 parcels					118 units 109 units	88 units 87 units
<b>Mosquito</b>								
Planned-Commercial (GP)	1.5	1	1.5	-	E	4	6	4
<b>Mosquito Total</b>	1.5 acres	1 parcel					6 units	4 unit
<b>Mt. Aukum</b>								
Commercial (C)	23.0	5	4.6	4.3-5.2	E	4	92	9
<b>Mt. Aukum Total</b>	23 acres	5 parcels					92 units	9 units
<b>Mt. Ralston</b>								
Commercial (C)	0.2	1	0.2	-	E	4	4	0
One-family Residential (R1)	11.9	34	0.4	0.2-2.1	C	7.3	87	69
<b>Mt. Ralston Total</b>	12.1 acres 11.9 acres	35 parcels 34 parcels					88 units 87 units	69 units
<b>Phillips</b>								
Commercial-Planned-Development (C-PD)	21.8	4	21.8	-	E	4	87	9
One-family Residential (R1)	3.2	9	0.4	0.14-0.73	C	7.3	23	19
<b>Phillips Total</b>	25.0 acres 3.2 acres	10 parcels 9 parcels					110 units 23 units	28 units 19 units

**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b># of Parcels</b>	<b>Acres/ Parcels</b>	<b>Parcel Size Range (Acres)</b>	<b>Services<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Max DU/Acre</b>	<b>Max Capacity (Units)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Max Expected (Units)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Pilot Hill</b>								
One-family Residential (R1)	0.2	1	0.2	–	C	7.3	1	1
<b>Pilot Hill Total</b>	0.2 acres	1 parcel					1 unit	1 unit
<b>Placerville<sup>5</sup></b>								
Mobile Home Park (MP)	4.2	2	2.1	2.0-2.2	A	7	29	24
One-family Residential (R1)	3.4	1	3.4	–	A	7.3	25	20
<b>Placerville Total</b>	7.6 acres	3 parcels					54 units	44 units
<b>Pleasant Valley</b>								
Planned Commercial (CP)	2.0	1	2.0	–	B	4	8	4
<b>Pleasant Valley Total</b>	2.0 acres	1 parcel					8 units	1 unit
<b>Shingle Springs</b>								
Commercial (C)	8.0	2	4.0	2.9-5.1	A	10	80	8
Commercial-Design Control (C-DC)	2.2	1	2.2	–	A	10	22	2
Planned Commercial (CP)	2.7	1	2.7	–	A	10	27	3
Professional Office Commercial-Design Control (CPO-DC)	7.3	3	2.4	2.1-2.8	A	10	73	7
Commercial-Planned Development (C-PD)	16.9	4	4.2	2.2-9.8	A	10	169	17
Limited Multifamily Residential (R2)	5.5	1	5.5	–	A	21.8	120	96
Limited Multifamily Residential-Planned Development (R2-PD)	26.1	2	13.1	2.1-24.0	A	21.8	569	455
<b>Shingle Springs Total</b>	68.7 acres 31.6 acres	14 parcels 3 parcels					1,060 units 689 units	588 units 551 units
<b>Somerset</b>								

**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b># of Parcels</b>	<b>Acres/ Parcels</b>	<b>Parcel Size Range (Acres)</b>	<b>Services<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Max DU/Acre</b>	<b>Max Capacity (Units)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Max Expected (Units)<sup>4</sup></b>
Commercial (C)	7.7	2	3.9	2.7-5.0	C	4	31	3
One-family Residential (R1)	4.0	1	4.0	-	C	7.3	29	23
<b>Somerset Total</b>	11.7 acres 4.0 acres	3 parcels 1 parcel					60 units 29 units	26 units 23 units
<b>Strawberry</b>								
One-family Residential (R1)	9.8	25	0.4	0.2-0.7	B	7.3	71	57
<b>Strawberry Total</b>	9.8 acres	25 parcels					71 units	57 units
<b>Tahoe Basin<sup>6</sup></b>								
One-Family Residential (R1)	659.5	14	47.1	4.7-189.9	A	7.3	4,814	404
Tourist Residential (RT)	29.4	3	9.8	5.0-16.2	A	21.8	641	50
<b>Tahoe Basin Total</b>	688.9 acres	17 parcels					5,455 units	454 units

**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b># of Parcels</b>	<b>Acres/ Parcels</b>	<b>Parcel Size Range (Acres)</b>	<b>Services<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Max DU/Acre</b>	<b>Max Capacity (Units)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Max Expected (Units)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>TOTAL HIGHER DENSITY</b>	2,079.7 acres	349 parcels					20,092 units	9,989 units
	1,701.9 acres	278 parcels					16,996 units	9,680 units
<i>Total With Both Water And Sewer Service</i>	1,086.3 acres 1,541.4 acres	167 parcels 120 parcels					17,615 units 14,966 units	8,324 units 8,060 units

**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup>Higher density development is ~~4-7~~ or more dwelling units (DUs) per acre. Survey focuses on established communities in the unincorporated areas of El Dorado County. See Figure HO-12 for locations of communities.

<sup>2</sup>A = public water and sewer service available

B = public water and septic

C = private water and septic

<sup>3</sup>Maximum density from Zoning Ordinance. ~~For commercially zoned lands, the maximum amount of residential units allowed as part of mixed-use projects is 10 DU/acre in urbanized communities and 4 DU/acre in rural communities.~~

<sup>4</sup>Adjusted maximum capacity is 80% of maximum capacity for residential development in all areas of the county except the Tahoe Basin. ~~Adjusted maximum capacity for commercially zoned lands is 10% of maximum capacity.~~ See the text for more information.

<sup>5</sup>Refers to land on the periphery of the Placerville city limits. Does not include parcels in the City of Placerville.

<sup>6</sup>Development in the Tahoe Basin is subject to the regulations of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). On average, the County issues 92 building permits per year under TRPA's allocation system. The adjusted maximum capacity units shown are based on the proportion of R1 and TR lands as compared to all vacant residential lands. According to Table A-1, R1 units account for 88% and TR units account for 11% of the vacant lands in the Tahoe Basin. The adjusted maximum capacity for R1 and TR units, then, is 88% and 11% of the 460 unit five-year allocation. The remaining housing types combined represent approximately 1% of the five-year allocation.

**Source:** El Dorado County Assessor's Records (2002).

Page 205, the first paragraph is revised as follows:

Existing and future development in El Dorado County is dependent on a complex arrangement and association of public services and utilities (e.g., multiple school, water, and fire districts; private utility companies and independent special districts). A complete list of these special districts is available through the El Dorado Local Agency Formation Commission, the agency responsible for overseeing the districts and determining service capabilities and district boundaries. The General Plan sets out goals, policies, and implementation measures to respond to a number of public service needs and constraints. The purpose of the Public Services and Utilities Element is to promote a pattern of development that maximizes the use of existing services while minimizing the costs and environmental effects of providing new facilities and services.

Page 207, the fourth paragraph is revised as follows:

On the West Slope, EID is the largest water provider in terms of area served, followed by GDPUD and GFCSD. In the Tahoe Basin, STPUD serves the vicinity of South Lake Tahoe, and TCPUD serves a portion of the county north and west of Emerald Bay. Figure PS-1 shows the service areas for the five public water providers. One additional special district, the McKinney Water District that serves 21 parcels in both Placer and El Dorado County, is not included in the figure due to its size.

Page 208, the last paragraph is revised as follows:

The El Dorado County Water Agency and purveyors are pursuing several projects in order to increase that supply. ~~Although none of these have been approved, and if approved, may be at levels lower than expected, the most likely projects that would supplement the County's supply are~~ the purchase of Central Valley Project water from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, providing 7,500 AFY each to EID and GDPUD, has been approved pursuant to Public Law 101-514, pending adoption of a general plan by the County, and obtaining more The State Water Resources Control Board has issued permit #21112 for 17,000 acre feet of water for consumptive purposes from Project 184, although certain conditions must be met which may reduce the total amount of water expected.

Page 208, Figure PS-1, following page 208 is revised as shown in Appendix D of this Response to Comments document.

Page 209, the last sentence of the first paragraph under “Groundwater Resources” is revised as follows:

Consequently, specific conclusions about groundwater availability on a county-wide scale are not possible because the rock fractures are not always continuous, become smaller with depth, and water does not move rapidly from one area to another. However, geological and/or hydrological testing is able to determine groundwater availability for individual development projects and is necessary to assure a reliable source of water for such development.

Page 210, the second and third full sentences of the first paragraph is revised as follows:

EID has developed a recycled water master plan, however service is limited to ~~Other than in the El Dorado Hills area, the use of reclaimed water has had minimal application in El Dorado County. However, it~~ is recognized that using reclaimed water for uses such as landscaping irrigation may alleviate some of the demand on potable sources more suitably applied to uses needing treated water.

Page 210, the second paragraph is revised as follows:

Another way existing water supplies can be utilized more resourcefully is through application of water use efficiency practices. Such practices include low flow toilets and showerheads, drip system irrigation, and xeriscaping, such as those developed in EID’s Urban and Agricultural BMP Water Efficiency Program. Efficiency practices can be employed by residential, commercial/industrial, and agricultural water users.

Page 210, Goal PS-2 is revised as follows:

**GOAL PS-2: To ensure that the County has adequate water for existing and proposed residential, commercial/industrial, emergency, and agricultural uses.**

Page 210, Policy PS-2a is revised as follows:

The County shall ~~actively engage in, and support,~~ the efforts of the County Water Agency and public water providers to retain existing and acquire new surface water supplies...

Page 211, the following policies are added under Goal PS-2:

New Policy The County, in cooperation with the Water Agency and water purveyors, shall collect and make available information on water supply and demand.

New Policy The County shall encourage water conservation on parcels dependent upon groundwater.

Page 211, Policy PS-3c is revised as follows:

The County shall ~~use~~require water-conserving landscaping for all new capital improvement projects and commercial, industrial, and multi-family development projects that require landscaping.

Page 212, revise first paragraph as shown:

~~... and effluent varies widely. Many areas have a geology that includes shear zones, serpentine, mélangé, and other rock and soil types that may not be Some regions lack sufficient area of soils suitable for acceptance of septic tank effluent for high and medium intensity uses. Suitability is based on soil type in relation to the size of the parcel, its percolation rate, the depth to groundwater, and other factors. In many cases some areas,~~ connection to an existing wastewater management system (i.e., EID's system) is the only way a parcel on the lower West Slope can develop. Connecting to EID's system may not always be financially practicable and could ultimately result in the extension of service to rural areas that the County has not identified for future growth on the General Plan Land Use Map.

Page 213, add following to 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, after last sentence:

The current permitted capacity of the 550-acre disposal unit at the Lockwood Landfill will expire in 2025. Waste Management, Inc. plans to apply for a permit to utilize an additional 1,000 acres which will extend the life of the landfill for another 200 years (Franchi, pers. comm. 2003). The Portrero Hills Landfill, which was utilized by the county up until a few years ago, has another 10 years of capacity. There are plans to apply for another permit for a 140-acre disposal unit, which would extend the life of this landfill for another 45 years (Covington, pers. comm. 2003)

Page 215, Policy PS-7a is revised as follows:

Policy PS-7a The County shall work with fire, emergency medical, and law enforcement providers to develop standards for emergency response times for unincorporated areas of the county. Optimum fire and emergency medical services shall be encouraged through mutual aid agreements, joint power authorities, or emergency response agreements established by the California Office of Emergency Services.

Page 217, revise last sentence of first paragraph under “Public Schools: Kindergarten Through High School”, and add additional sentences, as follows:

The county’s public school districts ~~and schools~~ are shown on Figure PS-4. None of the school districts have identified surplus school facilities. Most are operating at or over capacity. (El Dorado County 2003).

Page 221, the following is inserted after the last bullet of **MEASURE PS-C**:

- Provide informational/educational materials regarding water usage and conservation to the public.

Page 223, **MEASURE PS-K** is revised as follows:

Establish a working group to develop and oversee implementation of minimum countywide standards for emergency response times, emergency access, emergency water supply and conveyance, and staffing ratios. Development of the minimum standards will not preclude emergency service providers from developing and implementing stricter standards for individual service areas. Standards developed by the working group and standards developed for the Design and Improvement Standards Manual must be consistent. [Policies PS-7a and PS-7b]

Responsibility:	Fire Protection Districts, Emergency Medical Services Agency, <del>and Sheriff’s Department, and Department of Transportation</del>
Time Frame:	Develop and begin implementing standards within three years of General Plan adoption. Meet standard requirements within seven years of General Plan adoption.

Page 224, the following Implementation Measure is added to the Public Services and Utilities element:

**NEW MEASURE**

The Environmental Management Department shall compile and make available information regarding typical water demands associated with rural residential development that is dependent upon groundwater. The information shall be posted on the Department's Internet website and available in hardcopy format at the Development Services Public Counter.

Page 225, add references section, as follows:

Covington, Richard. Manager. Portrero Hills Landfill, Suisun City, CA. Telephone conversation with EDAW, March 20, 2003.

El Dorado County. El Dorado County General Plan. Draft Environmental Impact Report, May 2003.

Franchi, Mark. District Manager. Waste Management, Inc. Telephone conversations with EDAW, January 17 and March 20, 2003.

Page 228, the first heading is revised as follows:

**EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND PLANNING POLICIES**

Page 228, add to end of Policy HS-1a:

The Plan shall also identify evacuation routes appropriate to the types of hazards in El Dorado County.

Page 229, the six paragraphs under **FIRE SAFETY** are revised as follows:

**FIRE SAFETY**

Fire safety for residents of El Dorado County has become a critical concern, particularly in the Rural Regions. Many homes have been and will be constructed in remote areas having high and very high wildfire hazards, limited access (which may lead to long response times), and insufficient water for fire fighting purposes. Recent wildland fires in the County have caused major resource damage, major infrastructure damage, and required large investments to restore resources and infrastructure in restoration.

While non-wildland fires (structural and vehicle fires) pose a threat to human life and property, these fires occur predominantly in urban and suburban areas. Since structural firefighting is similar throughout the state with regard to construction requirements, response time, initial attack, and suppression techniques, this section will focus on wildland fire issues.

Wildland fires are defined as fires occurring on largely undeveloped, or rural, land: ~~Many homes have been built in remote areas with fuels having high and very high fire hazards, limited access, and insufficient water for firefighting purposes.~~ Related policies are contained in the Land Use, Public Services and Utilities, and Conservation and Open Space Elements.

### **FIRE PROTECTION AND EDUCATION**

As noted in the Public Services and Utilities Element, fourteen fire districts, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service (USFS) provide wildland fire protection services in El Dorado County. The agencies have mutual aid agreements and share the responsibilities of fire suppression where jurisdictions abut or in cases of catastrophic fire.

In 1993, California established a statewide Fire Safe Council to address fire prevention education and landowner assistance. The state Council and a number of local Councils utilize the expertise, resources, and distribution channels of its members to preserve California's natural and manmade resources by mobilizing all Californians to make their homes, neighborhoods, and communities fire safe. Fire Safe Councils play a vital role in implementing both the *California Fire Plan* as well as the National Fire Plan, which is a cooperative, long-term effort of the USFS, U.S. Department of the Interior, and the National Association of State Foresters.

Currently, El Dorado County has ~~two one~~-local Fire Safe Councils: ~~one on the west slope and one in the Tahoe Basin, which was established in 2002. There are also several local community-based groups.~~ Representatives from CDF, the local fire protection districts, the California Highway Patrol, the Sheriff's Office, U.S. Forest Service, homeowner associations, and the insurance industry ~~and the public~~ sit on the ~~councils~~. ~~Council. It is anticipated that an additional Council will be created in the Tahoe Basin in the coming years (Daugherty pers. comm. 2002). Fire safe councils~~ Both Councils will seek grant money to promote fire safe education and provide landowner assistance. The ~~west slope existing~~ Council has offered to assist the County in developing a Fire Safe Plan; this ~~element~~ section includes an ~~implementation measure~~ policy addressing development of such a plan.

## **WILDLAND FIRE HAZARD CLASSIFICATION**

The CDF has developed a fire hazard severity classification system, which assesses the fire potential for wildland areas based on three factors: fuel load, climate, and topography. The classification system identifies fuel rank assessment methodology for its California Fire Plan. The methodology assigns ranks based on expected fire behavior for unique combinations of topography and vegetative fuels under a given severe weather condition. The procedure makes an initial assessment based on surface fuels and slope, then further ranks based on the amount of ladder and/or crown fuel present to arrive at a final fuel rank. The methodology then assigns one of three classifications for fire hazard: moderate, high, and very high. (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection [no date].)

Page 230, Goal HS-2 is revised as follows:

**To identify fire hazards and risks and plan for...**

Page 230, Policy HS-2b is revised as follows:

Policy HS-2b Fire Hazard Rating Fuel Rank Maps produced by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection shall be consulted in the review of all projects so that standards and mitigation measures appropriate to each hazard classification can be applied. Land use densities and intensities and development patterns shall be modified reduced as necessary to mitigate the impacts associated with the presence of high or very high wildland fire hazard areas.

Page 231, Policy HS-2c is revised as follows:

Policy HS-2c The County shall discourage development in areas of high and very high wildland fire hazard or in areas identified as "urban wildland interface communities within the vicinity of Federal lands that are a high risk for wildfire", as listed in the Federal Register of August 17, 2001, unless such development can be adequately protected from wildland fire hazard, as determined by the local Fire Protection District and/or California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

Page 231, the following policies are added under Goal HS-2:

New Policy The County shall work with agencies and organizations responsible for fire protection and safety to improve the fire safety of existing developed areas.

New Policy The County shall encourage upgrading and retrofitting of existing development in high and very high fire hazard areas and areas identified as “urban wildland interface communities within the vicinity of Federal lands that are a high risk for wildfire”, as listed in the Federal Register of August 17, 2001, in a manner that results in the same practical effect as current setback and defensible space requirements.

New Policy The County shall work with agencies and organizations responsible for fire protection and safety to improve the fire safety of existing developed areas.

Page 232, add following at end of first partial paragraph:

Since there are no Earthquake Fault Zones subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act or Seismic Hazard Zones pursuant to the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act identified in El Dorado County, the risk of collapsed structures is considered remote.

Page 232, the first paragraph under **GEOLOGICAL HAZARDS** is revised as follows:

Steep slopes and the dominant soil types in parts of the county present potential geological hazards to development countywide in the form of erosion and landslides. These conditions ~~that~~ typically require additional engineering or avoidance to protect against property damage, loss of topsoil, and water quality degradation. ~~include erosion, landslides, and~~ Another risk caused in part by steep slopes is avalanche hazards.

Page 233, Policy HS-4a is revised as follows:

The County shall maintain ~~updated~~ an inventory of geological, seismic, and avalanche hazard maps...

Page 233, Policy HS-4b is revised as follows:

Applications for development shall be reviewed for potential hazards associated with steep or unstable slopes, areas susceptible to high erosion, ~~and~~ avalanche risk, and other geological hazards. Geotechnical studies shall be required when development may be subject to geological hazards. If hazards are identified, applicants shall be required to mitigate or avoid identified hazards as a condition of approval.

Page 233, the third sentence of the second paragraph under **FLOOD HAZARDS** is revised as follows:

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has identified the 100-year floodplain in portions of the county through its Flood Insurance Study and accompanying Flood Insurance Rate Maps. The County is currently on a list of jurisdictions in which FEMA will update flood mapping (in digital format), within the next ten years.

Page 234, Dam Failure discussion is revised as follows:

Policies in this section address development within dam failure inundation zones. A dam failure can occur as a result of an earthquake, structural instability, or during heavy runoff that exceeds spillway design capacity. The State Department of Water Resources Division of Safety of Dams maintains dam failure inundation information for the following reservoirs. These Eleven dams in the county have been identified by the California Department of Water Resources as having the potential of inundating inhabited areas upon failure. They include:

- ~~Echo Lake Dam (Pacific Gas & Electric [PG&E] El Dorado Irrigation District)~~
- ~~Union Valley Reservoir Dam (Sacramento Municipal Utilities District [SMUD])~~
- ~~Ice House Reservoir Dam (SMUD)~~
- ~~Chile Bar Reservoir (PG&E)~~
- ~~Stumpy Meadows Reservoir Dam (Georgetown Divide Public Utilities District)~~
- ~~Weber Creek Dam (El Dorado Irrigation District [EID])~~
- ~~Slab Creek Dam (SMUD)~~
- ~~Loon Lake Auxiliary Dam (SMUD)~~
- ~~Blakeley Reservoir Dam (EID)~~
- ~~Cameron Park Lake/Warren Hollister Dam (EID)~~
- ~~Jenkinson Reservoir (EID)~~

Reservoirs outside of El Dorado County with dams that could cause inundation associated with dam failure in El Dorado County include Caples Lake Dam (PG&E/EID) and Silver Lake (EID).

Page 237, the following text is added to the Air Quality discussion:

### **ASBESTOS**

Asbestos is of special concern in El Dorado County because it occurs naturally in surface deposits of several types of ultramafic materials. Asbestos emissions can result from the sale or use of asbestos-containing materials, road surfacing with such materials, grading activities, and surface mining.

The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District is responsible for implementing and enforcing asbestos-related regulations and programs. This includes implementation of Title 17, Section 93106 of the California Code of Regulations (Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure–Asbestos-Containing Serpentine) and the County’s Naturally Occurring Asbestos and Dust Protection Ordinance. Regulated activities include construction or digging on a site containing naturally occurring asbestos in rock or soils and the sale and use of serpentine material or rock containing asbestos materials for surfacing.

Asbestos-related measures presented in this General Plan are focused on supporting the actions of the AQMD.

Page 238, **Goal HS-9** is revised as follows:

**Goal HS-9: To address air quality problems associated with project grading, and agricultural and fuel reduction burning, and home heating.**

Page 238, Policy HS-8e is revised as follows:

Policy HS-8e The County shall support the establishment of ~~additional electric~~ new technologies that allow for the use of ultra low or zero emission vehicles charging stations throughout the county.

Page 239, the third sentence of the third paragraph under **AIRPORT SAFETY** is revised as follows:

It is typically divided into the ~~clear~~ zone runway protection zone, approach/departure zone, and overflight zone.”

Page 247, **Measure HS-B** is revised as follows:

Work with the local Fire Safe Councils, fire protection districts, U.S. Forest Service, ~~and California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection,~~ and the California Highway Patrol to develop and implement a countywide Wildfire Safety Plan. The Wildfire Safety Plan shall focus on, but not be limited to, the following:

- Identification of areas having special or urgent needs for fire hazard reduction (may include “urban wildland interface communities within the vicinity of Federal lands that are a high risk for wildfire”, as listed in the Federal Register of August 17, 2001);
- Public wildfire safety education and disclosure requirements;

- Basic fire protection standards for different areas of the county;
- Appropriate mitigation for development in areas having high and very high fuel hazards; ~~and~~
- Opportunities for fire fuel reduction; ~~and~~
- Appropriate standards for open space and greenbelts.

Supporting standards shall also be incorporated into the *Design and Improvements Standards Manual*, as appropriate. [Policies HS-2a, HS-2d, and HS-3a]

Responsibility:	<u>Sheriff's Department, Planning Department, Department of Transportation, and Building Department</u>
Time Frame:	<u>Develop draft plan within three years of General Plan adoption.</u>

Page 249, Measure HS-L is revised as follows:

Review the Zoning Ordinance and identify changes that would accomplish the following:

- A. Include an airport combining zone district for each of the Safety Zones as defined in the comprehensive land use plans for each of the County's public airports. The ordinance shall specify maximum density and minimum parcel size; ~~and~~
- B. Develop and apply a combining zone district for areas within the 55 dB CNEL of public airports to discourage the placement of incompatible uses within the contour; ~~and~~
- C. Establish notification requirements regarding the Mather Airport approach zone for new development within that approach zone.

Page 255, Policy CO-1d is revised as follows:

To minimize the potential for erosion and sediment discharge, disturbance of slopes 30 percent or greater shall be prohibited unless it is demonstrated by a California-registered civil engineer or an California-certified engineering geologist that hazards to public safety can be reduced to acceptable levels.

Page 255, the third paragraph under **MINERAL RESOURCES** is revised as follows:

As described in the Land Use Element, the Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay designation is used to identify those areas that are designated as Mineral Resource zone 2 by the State of California, consistent with the most recent Mineral Classification report for the County.

Page 261, the following policy is added under Goal CO-6:

New Policy Development outside an approved building envelope on previously undisturbed sites shall retain existing, native vegetation to the greatest extent feasible.

Page 262, Policy CO-8b is revised as follows:

Discretionary projects that result in ground disturbance shall be required to provide on-site monitoring during construction for the presence of cultural resources by a qualified cultural resource specialist. If ground disturbance would occur in the Mehrten formation, Pleistocene channel deposits, or Pleistocene cave deposits, a qualified paleontologist shall also be present.

Page 262, Policy CO-8d is revised as follows:

Discretionary projects that may cause a substantial impact to a cultural resource (including historic, prehistoric and paleontological resources) shall be required to avoid or substantially reduce the adverse effect(s).

Page 263, **Goal CO-10** is revised as follows:

To identify, preserve, and protect existing cemeteries.

Page 263, add following after last paragraph under "Open Space":

In addition to the policies and implementation measures in this General Plan, the County's actions promoting open space include open space zoning (including exclusive agriculture zones and large-lot zones), supporting public and private acquisition of open space through the -EP overlay and other programs, applying the Quimby Act to fund acquisition of parkland, and requiring open space in specific plans

Page 265, Goal CO-12 and accompanying text is deleted as shown:

~~**Goal CO-12: To maintain the characteristic natural topographic and landscape features unique to each area of the county.**~~

~~*Also refer to Goals CO-5, CO-6, CO-7 and LU-6.*~~

~~Policy CO-12a Development outside an approved building envelope on previously undisturbed sites shall retain existing, native vegetation to the greatest extent feasible.~~

Page 265, the following item is added to **MEASURE CO-AC:**

Update to the Grading Ordinance. [Policy CO-1d]

Page 268, Implementation Measure CO-J is revised as follows:

D. Replanting and replacement standards, including use of native species; and

Page 270, Measure CO-O is deleted as shown:

~~**MEASURE CO-O**~~

~~Develop standards for use of native plants in landscaping. [Policy CO-12a]~~

<del>Responsibility:</del>	<del>Planning Department,</del>
<del>Time Frame:</del>	<del>Within two years of General Plan adoption or as part of the development of revised design review guidelines</del>

Page 279, Policy AF-1e is revised as follows:

~~Agricultural lands shall continue to be protected...~~

Page 279, the following new policy is added under Goal AF-1:

New Policy Agriculturally zoned lands shall be buffered from increases in density on adjacent lands by requiring a minimum of 10 acres for any parcel created adjacent to such lands.

Page 279, the following new policy is added under Goal AF-1:

New Policy The County shall support visitor serving ranch marketing activities on agricultural land, provided such uses do not detract from or diminish the agricultural use of said land.

Page 284, the following is added to **MEASURE AF-A**:

Provisions that permit ranch marketing activities that support agricultural production.

Page 285, **MEASURE AF-E** is revised as follows:

...forestry lands. The procedure shall also include compatibility requirements for AE zoned land pursuant to California Government Code §51238.1.

Page 290, the first bullet is revised as follows:

- United States Government—U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service and U.S. Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management and Bureau of Reclamation.

Page 290, the following sentence is added after the list of recreation providers:

Each of these entities is briefly discussed below. In addition, there are several private entities that provide park and recreation services within individual subdivisions and specific plan areas.

Page 291, the following paragraph is inserted after the first paragraph under U.S. Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management:

The Bureau of Reclamation owns a large area of land, partially in the county near Folsom Reservoir and along the lower South Fork of the American River which is managed by the California Department of Parks and Recreation as the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area.

Page 292, the third paragraph under **General Services Department, Airports, Parks, and Grounds Division** is revised as follows:

In addition to the ~~*Bikeway Master Plan*~~ and ~~*Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan*~~, APGD is updating its *Parks Master Plan*. The revised plan will describe the necessary land/population ratios, program requirements, desired facility quantities, general facilities locations, and capital and maintenance costs for expansion of

County parks and trail systems to meet the future needs of county residents. The *Parks Master Plan* will be complementary to this General Plan but will not be considered part of the Parks and Recreation Element.

Page 293, the first sentence under **El Dorado Irrigation District** is revised as follows:

The El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) operates and maintains the Sly Park Recreation Area, located at Jenkinson Lake near Pollock Pines, as well as developed recreational sites associated with the Project 184 reservoirs....

Page 293, the last sentence in the paragraph under TOURISM is revised as follows:

Many thousands of people also travel to destinations in the Apple Hill and Fairplay, Pleasant Valley, Gold Hill, and other areas of the county to experience country life during the height of the apple harvest season or to taste wine.

Page 302, the first paragraph is revised as follows:

Moving east, the agricultural land in the mid-elevation areas supports a growing wine industry and tourist activity at Apple Hill. Farther east, high Sierra communities maintain ties to resource-related industries, including resource extraction and recreation. These communities are heavily influenced by governmental policy as most of the surrounding lands are publicly owned and/or publicly regulated.

Page 306, the table under **MEASURE ED-E** is revised as shown:

Responsibility	Office of Economic Development <del>and Planning Department</del>
Time Frame	<del>Complete methodology within five years of General Plan adoption. Thereafter, review of General Plan amendments will be as needed for the life of the General Plan.</del>  Ongoing