

LETTER 129: ROBERT SALAZAR, CITY OF PLACERVILLE

Response to Comment 129-1 (GP/EIR): El Dorado County appreciates the opportunity to work cooperatively with the City to solve problems of mutual interest.

Response to Comment 129-2 (GP/EIR): The identified areas of primary concern are addressed in different sections of both the EIR and draft General Plan alternatives. Growth projections surrounding the city and within its sphere of influence, along with the issue of separation of communities, are discussed in the Land Use Elements of each alternative and in Section 5.1 of the EIR. Traffic impacts are addressed in the Transportation and Circulation Elements and Section 5.4. Parks and recreation issues are addressed in a separate element in the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives and are analyzed in Section 5.7 of the EIR, Public Services. Scenic and biological resources are addressed primarily in the Conservation and Open Space Element, with some policies in the Land Use Element relating to scenic resources. The EIR addresses these areas of concern in Section 5.3, Visual Resources, and Section 5.12, Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 129-3 (EIR): The City of Placerville is included in the Placerville/Camino Market Area. The boundaries of that market area are shown on Exhibit 4-1 of Volume 1 of the EIR and were established based largely on SACOG analysis (see page 4-8 of Volume 1 of the EIR and Appendix B of Volume 3 of the EIR). The impacts of the General Plan scenarios that would affect that market area are assumed to have effects on Placerville as well. However, the County has no jurisdiction over development policies or infrastructure planning (e.g., roadways) within the city limits. For this reason, the General Plan EIR addresses impacts in various topic areas according to the degree to which they can be assessed, but (consistent with CEQA) does not speculate on issues and policies under jurisdictional control of the City. However, the General Plan EIR considers the City of Placerville in Section 7.1, Cumulative Impacts. Regarding traffic impacts, please see Response to Comment 129-4.

Response to Comment 129-4 (EIR): The El Dorado County General Plan Travel Demand Forecasting Model utilizes a land use base organized into Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs). These TAZs cover the entire west slope of the County to include the City of Placerville. The land uses for each of the TAZs were forecasted by EPS. Please refer to Appendix B in Volume 3 of the EIR for information regarding their forecasting methodology.

These forecasts, and hence the traffic modeling effort, include all the TAZs within the city limits of the City of Placerville. The land use forecasting within the City was based on the City's adopted General Plan and made use of the same absorption and adjustment factors as used for the forecasts for the TAZs outside of the City. Those forecasts were then compared to other land use forecasts for the area, such as those done for the Justice Center analysis, to confirm their reasonableness. These forecasts were then used as input to the Travel Demand Model.

The EIR analyzed the major roadways within the unincorporated area that provide access into and out of the City of Placerville. The Travel Demand Forecasting Model includes the major roadways in the City. The major roadways that provide access to Placerville and were analyzed in the EIR include.

- U.S. Highway 50
- State Route 49 (north of Placerville)
- Diamond Road (State Route 49 south of Placerville)
- Green Valley Road
- Cold Springs Road
- State Route 193
- Mosquito Road
- Carson Road
- Newtown Road
- Cedar Ravine Road
- Forni Road

Significant impacts were not identified for these roadways at the city/county interface during the p.m. peak hour in the year 2025 under any of the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives, because they all operate at acceptable Levels of Service (i.e., LOS D or better). The only roadway that did not operate at LOS D or better was U.S. Highway 50, which is projected to operate at LOS F. However, it remains within the maximum volume-to-capacity ratios allowed by Policy 3.5.1.6 of the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives and Policy TC-1c of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained Alternatives.

Further analysis of roadways within the City of Placerville was not considered necessary because the locations with the greatest contribution of county traffic (i.e., those at the city and county interface) all operate within the LOS thresholds established in the Plan. The detailed LOS results for these roadway segments under the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives are contained in Volume 3 of the EIR under Appendices D-3A through D-3D.

The following table was prepared to show the difference in the traffic demand at the city and county interface that was forecasted for all the roads listed above. These are the 2025 forecasted peak hour volumes. All are p.m. peak hour except those noted to be the a.m. peak hour. As can be seen from the table, there are almost no differences in the volumes between the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives. The differences are all within the acceptable error range for traffic demand forecasts of 22 years out. In effect, this table shows that the difference in the impacts to the City of Placerville between the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives is negligible.

2025 Peak Hour Volumes on Roads Adjacent to the City of Placerville				
Road Segment	No Project	Roadway Constrained	Environmentally Constrained	1996 General Plan
U.S. Highway 50 – west of Placerville – am west bound	2,190	2,280	2,330	2,350
U.S. Highway 50 – west of Placerville – am east bound	2,650	2,830	2,980	2,940
U.S. Highway 50 – west of Placerville – pm west bound	2,930	3,110	3,180	3,140
U.S. Highway 50 – west of Placerville – pm east bound	2,430	2,550	2,560	2,610
U.S. Highway 50 – east of Placerville	1,460	1,470	1,620	1,610
State Route 49 – north of Placerville	300	300	330	320
State Route 49 – south of Placerville	1,230	970	1,340	1,440
Green Valley Road	610	750	880	770
Cold Springs Road	630	710	700	700
Highway 193	310	280	330	320
Mosquito Road	290	290	290	290
Carson Road	250	380	450	370
Newtown Road	350	350	350	390
Cedar Ravine Road	320	300	350	330
Forni Road	210	120	330	470

Source: Appendix D of Volume 3, El Dorado County General Plan Environmental Impact Report

This effect demonstrates that for the area surrounding the City of Placerville, the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives all have very similar land use forecasts. The combination of the lower densities (compared to the west end of the County) and the distances from the major employment bases of the El Dorado Hills Business Park, Folsom, and points west of the County Line, are limiting the absorption of new growth in the area. Additionally, several of the roads serving commuter traffic from growing areas pass around the City instead of through it. These include Pleasant Valley Road to Mother Lode Drive south of the City and Lotus Road to Green Valley Road to the northwest. These other routes are included in the County's proposed circulation plan for all the alternatives and also serve to limit the disparity of the impacts of new traffic on the City road system between the four equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

The County supports the concept of working with the City to develop an integrated transportation plan for the Placerville area. This plan could be used to base traffic impact fees that consider the City's contribution to improvement needs in the County and the County's contribution to improvement needs in the City. This plan could be prepared as an

implementation step of the General Plan in compliance with policies such as 3.2.2.1, 3.3.1.1, 3.3.2.1, and 3.5.1.2 contained in the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives.

Response to Comment 129-5 (GP/EIR): Policy 2.2.2.5 describes the purpose of the NJ, Non-Jurisdictional overlay designation in the 1996 General Plan Alternative. In addition, there are specific directions in Subsection A, C, and D regarding cooperation between the cities, specifically the City of Placerville, and the County. No similar policy language is contained in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative or Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. New policies and an implementation measure have been added to these alternatives to address this issue as provided in Chapter 5.0 of this Response to Comments document.

Response to Comment 129-6 (EIR): The EIR references recreational facilities in the City of Placerville in Table 5.7-9, Volume 1 of the EIR as part of the existing conditions documentation for El Dorado County. Impact 5.7-5 states that development in El Dorado County and proposed General Plan policies will affect parks and recreational facilities in unincorporated areas of the County. Mitigation Measure 5.7-5 calls for a funding program that would allow for the development of new park facilities in response to the demand for new housing accommodated by the proposed General Plan alternatives. The intent and expectation is that sufficient recreational facilities will be set aside/purchased and developed to meet the needs of future county residents. By providing sufficient facilities, existing recreational facilities in Placerville would not be expected to deteriorate as a result of county resident overuse. It is acknowledged that new residents in the County could potentially also use City facilities, not just new facilities in the County. At the same time, new park facilities being developed in the County as part of the proposed mitigation measure could be used by City residents. On balance, there would be no expected net increase in the use of City park facilities that would require additional or revised mitigation measures as part of the EIR.

Response to Comment 129-7 (GP): Although the intent of Policies LU-2a and LU-2b were to direct orderly growth within the city limits and spheres of influence before extending out into the rural regions of the County, the County agrees that coordination between the jurisdictions is appropriate and desirable and agrees that language similar to that in Policy 2.2.2.5 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative should be included in the other alternatives. Please refer to Response to Comment 129-5.

Response to Comment 129-8 (GP/EIR): The Important Biological Corridor (IBC) overlay designation contained in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative includes the Weber Creek area south and west of the City of Placerville. If this overlay is included in the final adopted General Plan, the biotic resource protection requested in this comment will be provided. Each of the alternatives shows the Texas Hill Reservoir "take area" on the Land Use Diagram. The "take area" is designated as Open Space (OS). There is some question whether OS is the most appropriate designation for that area, and an alternative would be to provide a base land use designation representing the existing land use

pattern, with a special overlay designation to identify the limitations on development within the take area. Each of the alternatives includes scenic corridor policies to protect the historic and scenic qualities of certain roads, specifically State Route 49 and U.S. Highway 50 (Policies under Objective 2.6.1 of the 1996 General Plan Alternative and those under Goal LU-6 in the Environmentally Constrained and Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternatives). The latter alternatives also include ridgeline protection policies under the same goal.