

EDHAPAC TGPA/ZOU NOP Response Matrix

July 22, 2014

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	7.10.12 NOP Response	7.22.14 DEIR Analysis/Response
<p>Policy 2.2.1.2 and Table 2 Multi-Family Use: Consider amending density from 24 units per acre to 30 units per acre to comply with California Government Code 65583.2(c)(iv) and (e) which requires jurisdictions within Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) of populations greater than 2,000,000 to allow for up to 30 units per acre when determining sites to meet the low and very low housing allocation categories. El Dorado County is located within the Sacramento MSA. Amend the Multi-Family land use to allow for commercial as part of a mixed use project. Amend the Multi-Family land use to encourage a full range of housing types including small lot single family detached design without a requirement for a Planned Development.</p> <p>High Density Residential Use: Consider deleting the requirement for a Planned Development application on projects of 3 or more units per acre.</p>	<p>Amending the density from 24 to 30 units would have a significant impact on site specific projects designated as multi-family use. This change would require that the infrastructure must be in place prior to development of the project.</p> <p>This may be appropriate for small developments on a single acre, but when creating more than 10 units in an area, a Planned Development is appropriate—especially if up to 8 units are on a single acre.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase in size of the buildings to accommodate the additional units could overwhelm the surrounding area. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. Please analysis this issue.</p> <p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional noise at these sites. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Population/Housing The inclusion of the additional density per acre could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>This increase in density should be carefully analyzed to determine all of the impacts caused by increasing the density by 50%.</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>	<p>Page ES-2, 2-7,3.6-5, 3.6-10, 3.7-7, 3.8-2 and 3.1--15. Confirming removal of MFR proposed change as “adoption of the Housing Element in October 2013, this increased density was determined to be unnecessary, and this proposed amendment is not being pursued.” Page 3.6-5. Disagree with change to allow residential use to precede commercial in mixed use developments. Facilitates inaccurate traffic modeling (mixed use) to be used for residential projects which may never see the commercial component built. Disagree with change in MFR that allows higher density without a PD. Allows too much discretion at the Planning department without public review/input. . Disagree with change in HDR that allows higher density without a PD. Allows too much discretion at the Planning department without public review/input. Disagree with Table 2-2 change that increases maximum residential densities for commercial/residential mixed use by 25%. INADEQUATE IMPACT ANALYSIS-NEEDS MITIGATION</p>

<p>Policies 2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.2 and 2.2.5.4- Consider amending the 30% open space requirement inside of Community Regions and Rural Centers to allow lesser area of “improved open space” on site, set criteria for options in meeting a portion of the requirement off-site or by an in lieu fee option as deemed necessary.</p>	<p>This would allow too many discretionary decisions by county policy makers on open space issues. The collection of in lieu fees would reduce open spaces which are highly desirable. Regardless of the “improvement” of the open space, a reduction from 30% open space will dramatically change the feel of an area. Even worse, allowing open space to be off-site completely removes the rural feel of an area that is being developed and again violates the fundamental principles of the county’s citizens.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of open space will detract from the visual appearance of housing project. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces on view shed.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning If open space is not required, project design will put houses on less than desirable land. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Noise Vegetation and trees which are in most open spaces provide sound attenuation. How will this increase in sound and noise be mitigated when open space is removed from housing projects?</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This lost of open space will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>Page ES-2 and 2-7, 2-8, 3.4-22, 3.4-29, 3.4-36, 3.8-4, and 3.8-7. Disagree with change to reduce open space requirement without a thorough impact analysis. Disagree that the impact is “less than significant”. The DEIR didn’t include projected new densities with the reduction of open space to determine impacts. INADEQUATE IMPACT ANALYSIS-NEEDS MITIGATION.</p>
<p>Policy 2.2.4.1 Consider amending the Density Bonus policy which allows incentive for the creation of open space as part of residential projects, and implement policy specifics through Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p>Density Bonus has encouraged developers to request higher density projects for increased profits instead of better projects. The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to have a Density Bonus in Medium Density and Low Density Residential land use areas. Instead, an owner should apply for a change in land use designation and be evaluated on a case by case basis. Otherwise, a Density Bonus in these zones amounts to a change in land use and would significantly change the intention of the land use in the General Plan</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase density would remove natural vegetation and trees which provides a rural atmosphere and a more harmonious environment. Please assess the impact on aesthetics with the increase density from density bonuses.</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from density bonus could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The density bonus will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density could cause traffic congestion. . An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>	<p>Page ES-2, 2-8, 3.6-5. Disagree with change to Density Bonus provisions which will increase densities for residential development. No data was found in the DEIR that calculated the increase in density to determine the impact. INADEQUATE IMPACT ANALYSIS-NEEDS MITIGATION</p>
<p>Policy 2.2.5.4 Policy 2.2.5.4 All development applications which have the potential to</p>	<p>The requirement for a Planned Development belongs in the General Plan as it is one of the fundamental principles of</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The loss of planned development could reduce open space and lower</p>		<p>Page ES-2, 2-7,2-8, 3.6-8, 3.6-9 and 3.8-7. Disagree with change to remove PD</p>

<p>create 50 parcels or more shall require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district. However, in no event shall a project require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district if all of the following are true: (1) the project does not require a General Plan amendment; (2) the project has an overall density of two units per acre or less; and (3) the project site is designated High-Density Residential.</p> <p>Consider deleting policy.</p>	<p>our county that ensures preservation of open space as well as having infrastructure in-place prior to the development. It is too important to be moved from the most important planning document of the county, the General Plan.</p> <p>This is how to get rid of the 30% open space requirement. If a PD is not required, then I don't believe <u>any</u> open space is required to develop a property. Pack-um and stack-um! Could look like inner-city development on any parcels that are left to be developed.</p> <p>Question, can EDH CSD create more stringent requirements than the County? Maybe we have the CSD pass an overlay on all CC&Rs for the community region.</p>	<p>County design standards. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces and County design standards.</p>		<p>requirement for subdivisions of 50 parcels or more. Allows too much discretion at the Planning department without public review/input. Disagree that "the impact is less than significant". INADEQUATE IMPACT ANALYSIS</p>
<p>New Policies 2.4.1.5 Consider setting criteria for and identify Infill sites and Opportunity areas that will provide incentives substantial enough to encourage the development of these vacant/underutilized areas</p>	<p>This could increase densities in infill areas without providing the required infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposed language by staff for "Promote Infill Development" item d) should have the following words added at the end of the sentence "<u>but only after all infrastructure is in place that will support such future development</u>".</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density from infill sites will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from infill sites could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Population/Housing The infill sites will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density from infill projects could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>	<p>Page 2-8 and 3.4-29. Proposed "implementation measure" containing "incentives" is not adequately defined. May allow too much discretion at the Planning department without public review/input? Disagree that impact is "significant and unavoidable".INADEQUATE IMPACT ANALYSIS--NEEDS MITIGATION</p>
<p>Policy TC-1a, TC-1b, and Table TC-1- Consider revising policies, and table to bring objectives into conformance with policy TC-1p, TC-1r, TC-1t, TC-1u, Tc-1w, TC-4f, TC-4i, HO-1.3, HO-1.5, HO-1.8, HO-1.18, HO-5.1, and HO-5.2, to allow for narrower streets and road ways and to support the development of</p>	<p>Road widths should not be set by housing issues, but for public safety issues.</p> <p>Allowing narrower streets sacrifices safety of our citizens in a significant way. To do this for financial gain is not appropriate. Highway standards should be based strictly on safety and if a road cannot meet</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The decreasing of road widths will cause traffic accidents and safety issue for pedestrians and bicycles. A very high percentage of El Dorado County streets do not have sidewalks. If the streets widths are narrowed without sidewalks this will</p>		<p>Page 2-8. Disagree with change to allow narrower streets and roadways. Current minimum street and roadway widths are based upon significant safety considerations, including emergency vehicle incident</p>

housing affordable to all income levels.	the standards, that becomes what limits the use and development of a parcel—we should not let the use and development of a parcel dictate the safety level	cause a safety issue. The EIR should analyze these impacts and provide detailed mitigation measures.		response. INADEQUATE IMPACT ANALYSIS-NEEDS MITIGATION
Policy TC-1m, TC-1n(B), TC-1w Consider amending policies to clean up language including; TC-1m delete “of effort” TC-1n(B) replace accidents with crashes; and TC-1w, delete word maximum.	Why replace the word “accidents” with the word “crashes”? Are they considered the same? Is one more inclusive of incidents that the other? Why not include both “accidents and crashes”? Or, are all accidents a subset of crashes? We need to make sure that this change does not reduce the need for safety improvements on our roads	No Comment at this time		Page 2-8. APAC’s concerns related to definitions and potential reductions in safety improvements were not addressed. INADEQUATE IMPACT ANALYSIS
Policy 7.1.2.1 Consider amending the restrictions for development on 30% slopes, and set standards in the Zoning Ordinance and Grading Ordinance.	Construction of homes on 30% grade would cause additional environmental impacts on the area (grading, water runoff, and erosion). The existing language in the General Plan seems appropriate. If there are additional exceptions that are appropriate but not currently included, then add them to the General Plan. Keeping this in the general plan allows a proper EIR to be performed.	*Hydrology/Water Quality Construction of homes on 30% or greater grades would cause additional environmental impacts on the area (grading, water runoff, and erosion). How will this be mitigated?	*Hazards & Hazardous Material Construction on steeper slopes will cause additional exposure to soil perturbations and will cause air born particles of dust and asbestos. Please analyze this issue and provide mitigation measures.	Page 2-10 and 3.4-29 & 30. Disagree with change without thorough impact analysis related to APAC’s expressed concerns. Policy 7.4.2.2 does not go far enough, and implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1a is insufficient. Impacts could be very significant. INADEQUATE IMPACT ANALYSIS-NEEDS MITIGATION
Policy 2.2.1.2 <u>High Density Residential</u> : Consider analyzing the effects of increasing High Density Residential Land use density from a maximum of 5 units per acre to 8 units per acre	Increasing the density to 8 units per acre would put a tremendous load on the supporting infrastructure. This amounts to giving away the Density Bonus without earning it! The analysis for this type of density should be done through the Density Bonus provision.	*Aesthetics The increase density would remove natural vegetation and trees which provides a rural atmosphere and a more harmonious environment. Please assess the impact on aesthetics with the increase density from 5 units to 8 units/acre. *Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented? *Land Use/Planning The increase density from 5 to 8 units per acre could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and	*Noise The increase in density will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated? *Population/Housing The 5 to 8 units per acre increase in density and will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this out of balance condition be prevented? *Transportation/Traffic The increase density from 5 to 8 units per acre will cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic	Page ES-2 and 2-7. Disagree with change to allow increased densities without a PD. Allows too much discretion at the Planning department without public review/input. INADEQUATE IMPACT ANALYSIS-NEEDS MITIGATION

		services. How will this be prevented?	modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.	
<p>Policy 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.2.1 Consider analyzing the possibility of adding new, amending or deleting existing Community Regions or Rural Center planning areas</p>	<p>These areas should be identified before analysis to determine public support for the change. The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The changing or adding new areas in either the rural or Community Regions could have a major visual impact on the affect areas. Please analyze the visual impacts that would be caused in areas that would be subject to this policy.</p> <p>*Air Quality Please analyze the air quality impact of all possible change that could occur with the new policy.</p> <p>*Population/Housing Please analyze all of the population changes and impacts that will occur as result of the policy.</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The change or adding of these centers could cause different traffic patterns. Please analyze all of the possible impacts to roads in any area that might be subject to this new policy.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning Please analyze the entire existing infrastructure that would be affected by this policy.</p>	<p>Could not find any reference in the DEIR to these policy sections? Were they removed from consideration?</p>
<p>Policy 2.1.1.3 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. <u>The maximum residential density of 20 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provide concurrent with development.</u></p>	<p>Language should be added that stipulates that the number of APPROVED dwelling units will be dependent on approved traffic studies and the application of appropriate traffic mitigation measures concurrent with development.</p>	<p>No Comment at this time.</p>		<p>Page ES-1, 2-6, and 3.4-22. Disagree with change to allow an increase in maximum residential density for mixed use development in community regions. 2004 EIR finding of (significant and unavoidable) needs to be re-evaluated given the TDM and other current traffic impact analysis tools. INADEQUATE IMPACT ANALYSIS-NEEDS MITIGATION</p>
<p>Policy 2.1.2.5 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible</p>	<p>Language should be added that stipulates that the number of APPROVED dwelling units will be dependent on approved traffic studies and the application of appropriate</p>	<p>No comment at this time.</p>		<p>Page ES-1, 2-7, and 3.4-22. Disagree with change to allow an increase in maximum residential density for mixed</p>

and encouraged within Community Regions. The maximum residential density shall be 10 dwelling units per acre in Rural Centers in identified mixed use areas as defined in the Zoning Ordinance. The residential component of a mixed use project may include a full range of single and/or multi family design concepts. The maximum residential density of 10 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provide concurrent with development.

Policy TC-Xd, TC-Xe, and TC-Xf

Consider revising the policies to clarify the definition of "worsen", what action or analysis is required if the threshold of "worsen" is met, clarification of the parameters of analysis (i.e. analysis period, analysis scenarios, methods), thresholds and timing of improvements.

traffic mitigation measures concurrent with development.

"Identified" mixed use areas must be disclosed in the Zoning Ordinance before an EIR is prepared.

This should be a scientific term that has a measurable value and infrastructure trigger points must be established to prevent reduction of traffic circulation and degrading of service.

Is the term being revisited to dilute impacts of increased traffic caused by new developments?

***Transportation/Traffic**

The change of the definition of worsen could cause more projects to be approved with out the supporting infrastructure to prevent congestion. Please analyze all of the possible impacts to roads that would be subject to lessening of traffic standards in any area that might be subject to this new definition.

use development in rural centers. 2004 EIR finding of (significant and unavoidable) needs to be re-evaluated given the TDM and other current traffic impact analysis tools. INADEQUATE IMPACT ANALYSIS-NEEDS MITIGATION

Page ES-18 and 3.9-10 contains comments that are very concerning "It should be noted that Caltrans is planning for LOS F on U.S. Highway 50 in the future, while El Dorado County is tasked with maintaining LOS E on U.S. Highway 50 where it runs through Community Regions and LOS D in all other areas of the County, as required by General Plan Policy TC-Xd and Policy 5.1.2.2." The EDCo BOS are mandated by Measure Y of the GP (not tasked) to prevent LOS F. INADEQUATE IMPACT ANALYSIS-NEEDS MITIGATION

Could not find any reference in the DEIR to this policy section? Was it removed from consideration?

Policy 10.2.1.5

Don't see any ROI language indicating a desire to analyze a change in this policy

The way staff has proposed to change this policy violates another fundamental principle. The proposed word change from "shall" to "may" could result in existing citizens subsidizing developers for the cost of facilities, infrastructure, and services. All development applications for subdivision must require a Public Facilities and Services Financing Plan that assures cost burdens do not fall on existing residents.

No comment at this time.

Table TC-2, TC-Xb and, TC-Xd-

Traffic is one of the two most observable

No comment at this time.

Page ES-3, 2-8, and 3.9-11,

<p>Consider amending or deleting table TC-2 and maintain list outside of General Plan and amending any policies referring to Table TC-2.</p>	<p>items to people in the county. A list of these roads belongs in the General Plan. If they are removed, an EIR would have to be performed every time a new road segment was added to the list or the Maximum V/C ratio was changed. The EIR needs to know what to evaluate now and cannot anticipate future changes by the County.</p> <p>In addition, Policy TC-Xf should not have the item "<u>or (2) ensure the commencement of construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County's 10-year (or 20-year) CIP</u>". This second</p>			<p>3.9-16, 3.9-26. Concerned that moving Table TC-2 to another document (unspecified!) will dilute its effect/intent. . INADEQUATE IMPACT ANALYSIS</p>
	<p>item should be eliminated since the CIP changes frequently and is budget dependent. The improvements might never be constructed and then the citizens would have to live with unbearable traffic forever. Or, expecting citizens to tolerate traffic and safety problems for 10 or more years is unreasonable.</p>			

<p>Policies 5.2.1.3 and 5.3.1. Consider amending policies to increase flexibility for the connection to public water and wastewater systems when projects are located in a Community Region.</p>	<p>The proposal is to remove the word “<u>shall</u>” and replace with the word “<u>may</u>” in requirement of connecting to public water and public wastewater. This is not appropriate for a Community Region! The whole idea of a Community Region is that infrastructure is readily available. If a development cannot connect to both public water and public wastewater, it does not belong in the Community Region—especially for high-density residential and multifamily residential development. The use of the word “<u>may</u>” might be appropriate in the case of medium-density residential, commercial, industrial, and research and development projects.</p> <p>Also, the addition of the words “<u>if reasonably available</u>” should be replaced with “<u>if appropriate</u>”, otherwise if public water and public wastewater are not “reasonably available” an applicant could claim that they are allowed to develop using well water and/or septic by right.</p>	<p>*Hydrology/Water Quality The change from shall to may will increase well water use and could cause a lowering of the water table to existing residents. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from these additional sites could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The additional sites approved from this change in policy will cause more houses in the Community region, which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase housing from this policy change could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>	<p>Page 3.6-5, 3.6-10, 3.6-11 and 3.8-8. Disagree that the impact of this change is “less than significant”. The current drought SWRB surface water curtailments will most likely lead to State mandated ground water restrictions that could have enormous impacts on EDCo property owners. Many residents have already had to drill much deeper wells than were historically required to get an adequate residential water supply. This forces continued escalation and competition for surface and ground water. . INADEQUATE IMPACT ANALYSIS-NEEDS MITIGATION</p>
<p>Zoning Ordinance: ROI 183-2011- ; - 6. Provide alternative means to any open space requirement as part of a planned development to provide more flexibility and incentives for infill development and focus on recreation in Community Regions and Rural Centers</p>	<p>This will allow too many discretionary decisions by county policy makers on open space issues.</p> <p>The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of open space will detract from the visual appearance of housing project. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces on view shed.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning If open space is not required, project design will put houses on less than desirable land. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>Vegetation and trees which are in most open spaces provide sound attenuation. How will this increase in sound and noise be mitigated when open space is removed from housing projects?</p>	<p>Could not find any reference in the DEIR to this ROI zoning section? Was it removed from consideration?</p>