

# CHECKLIST FORM AND INITIAL STUDY

## ***Project Title***

El Dorado County 2025 Regional Transportation Plan Program EIR

## ***Lead Agency Name and Address***

El Dorado County Transportation Commission  
550 Main Street Suite C  
Placerville, CA 95667

## ***Contact Person and Phone Number***

Mike Higgins, Senior Transportation Planner  
El Dorado County Transportation Commission  
(530) 642-5260

## ***Project Location***

El Dorado County is located in the foothills and mountains of the Sierra Nevada, extending eastward from the eastern portion of California's Central Valley. The western portion of El Dorado County is characterized by rolling foothills, increasing in elevation to the east. The County is bordered by Placer County to the north, Amador County to the south, Sacramento County to the west and the State of Nevada to the east. [Figure 1](#) provides a regional perspective of El Dorado County relative to the state. A portion of Lake Tahoe is located in El Dorado County. In total, El Dorado County contains 1,805 square miles ranging in elevation from 200 feet above sea level to 10,881 feet above sea level at the highest mountain peak.

There are two incorporated cities in El Dorado County: Placerville, and South Lake Tahoe, which is within the jurisdiction of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). There are also numerous unincorporated communities located throughout El Dorado County. These include El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Shingle Springs, El Dorado, Diamond Springs, Latrobe, Fairplay, Somerset, Grizzly Flat, Camino, Pollock Pines, Coloma/Lotus, Garden Valley, Georgetown, Rescue, Mt. Akum, Pleasant Valley, Kyburz, Strawberry, and Cool. [Figure 2](#) is a vicinity map of El Dorado County and the City of Placerville.

## ***Project Sponsor's Name and Address***

El Dorado County Transportation Commission  
550 Main Street Suite C  
Placerville, CA 95667

## ***General Plan and Zoning Designations***

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a regional planning document; therefore it covers the entire County with the exception of the Tahoe basin. As such, the General Plan land use and zoning designations for the areas affected by the RTP are all-inclusive—meaning that the land that would be affected by implementation of the RTP will include any and all General Plan land use and zoning designations that are established by the *El Dorado County General Plan*, *El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance*, *City of Placerville General Plan*, and the *City of Placerville Zoning Ordinance*.

El Dorado County began the process of updating their General Plan in 1989 and culminated with adoption in 1996. Litigation challenging the General Plan and General Plan EIR was filed immediately after its adoption. In 1999, the lawsuit was decided in favor of the litigants. To govern land use decisions until a General Plan could be reconsidered, the court issued a Writ of Mandate defining the limits of the County's approval authority. The County then prepared an updated General Plan, which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2004, and subsequently approved by voter referendum in March 2005. Over the next six months to a year, the County will petition the court to remove the Writ of Mandate. When the court discharges the Writ, the new General Plan will become the basis for land use decisions in the County.

The City of Placerville operates under a General Plan that was adopted in 1989.

## ***Project Description***

The proposed project is the adoption and implementation of the El Dorado County RTP. The RTP has been prepared to fulfill the state requirements of AB 402 (Government Code Title 7, Chapter 2.5, Sections 65080-65082) using specific guidance from the California Transportation Commission Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines (revised December 1999 and December 2003). More specifically, the RTP is a blueprint for the systematic development of a balanced, comprehensive, multi-modal transportation system, including but not limited to: roadways, transit, aviation, goods movement, bikeways, pedestrian facilities, transportation systems management and intelligent transportation systems. The RTP is action-oriented and pragmatic, considering both the short-term (five to ten year) and long-term (ten to twenty year) periods. The RTP embodies three elements: Policy Element, Action Element, and Financial Element. These elements are described below.

It should be noted that the RTP is a program level regional planning document. As such, the environmental review for the RTP is at a programmatic level. There are no project specific-level improvement designs or approvals that are contained in the RTP, and approval of the RTP does not preclude future environmental review of project specific improvements. More specifically, any and all transportation improvement that are identified in the RTP will require project level environmental review if, or when, they are funded, designed, and up for approval by a decision making body.

## THE POLICY ELEMENT

The El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) has prepared a Policy Element of the RTP that established goals, objectives, and policies to reflect the region's needs and priorities, and to guide the development and management of the region's transportation systems. The goals, objectives and policies established in the RTP were prepared to address the regional transportation issues and are consistent with the California Transportation Commission Guidelines. Below is a list of the goals, objectives and policies identified in the Policy Element of the RTP.

### **Overall Goals**

Preserve and develop an integrated, multi-modal transportation system which facilitates the movement of people, information, goods, and services through and within the region.

- Provide and maintain a safe, efficient, and convenient countywide roadway system that meets the travel needs of people and goods through and within the region.
- Make the most economical and efficient use of transportation revenues in providing transportation services and facilities, optimizing the movement of people, goods, and information.
- Provide a safe, convenient and efficient transportation system that meets the mobility needs of people of all incomes, ages, and physical conditions.
- Support the achievement of state and federal air-quality standards.
- Provide effective, convenient, coordinated transit service that serves employment centers, activity centers and facilities, and offers a viable option to single occupant vehicle travel.
- Identify and pursue new sources of funds for expansion and improvement of the overall transportation system.
- Incorporate public outreach efforts as a component of the planning process and encourage input from all interest groups and individuals.
- Provide for transportation services, facilities, and vehicles that cause the least amount of environmental damage and yield environmental benefits wherever feasible.
- Strengthen coordination, cooperation and consistency between agencies to maximize the effective use of transportation resources.
- Promote a transportation system which facilitates a balance of jobs and housing in El Dorado County.

- Promote a transportation system which minimizes the dependency of long-distance, single occupant vehicle commute trips.

#### **GOAL 1: HIGHWAYS/STREETS/REGIONAL ROADWAYS**

**Provide and maintain a safe, efficient, and convenient countywide roadway system that meets the travel needs of people and goods through and within the region.**

**Objective A:** Identify and prioritize improvements to the roadway system.

**Policies:**

- 1) Identify roadways in need of major upgrading to meet standards for safety, operations and design, in coordination with Caltrans and local jurisdictions, and plan their improvement through capital improvement programming.
- 2) Encourage jurisdictions to develop and implement pavement management systems that identify and prioritize road maintenance projects.
- 3) Implement capacity increasing strategies that encourage the use of alternative modes, such as HOV lanes.
- 4) Incorporate Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) strategies where feasible.
- 5) Develop parallel capacity to US 50 to reduce congestion and the reliance on US 50 for local trip purposes.

**Objective B:** Maintain roadways at acceptable safety standards.

**Policies:**

- 1) Identify and eliminate unsafe conditions on state highways, in coordination with Caltrans and local jurisdictions.
- 2) Prioritize the roadway projects which maintain safety standards, including required maintenance and repair.
- 3) Maintain roads in the most cost effective manner given available resources.

**Roadways Performance Measures:**

- Improve traffic safety and operations throughout the region.
- Maintain level of service standards as adopted by Caltrans and jurisdictions.
- Maintain reliable traffic operations in order to decrease travel time variability.

- Avoid or mitigate environmental impacts related to highway corridor operation.
- Ensure adequate funding to maintain regional roadways. In El Dorado County, ensure adequate funding to maintain regional roadways in accordance with the adopted Pavement Management System.

**GOAL 2: PUBLIC TRANSIT**

**Promote effective, convenient and desirable public transit for residents of and visitors to El Dorado County.**

**Objective A:** Tailor transit service provision to the area's population characteristics

**Policies:**

- 1) Prioritize transit services in areas where the greatest operational efficiencies exist (i.e., urbanized areas).
- 2) Encourage the development of new and innovative transit systems, particularly in rural areas.
- 3) Support transit projects which serve visitors and residents for commute and recreation trip purposes.
- 4) Encourage coordination of inter- and intra- County transit service.

**Objective B:** Promote a transit system that is responsive to the needs of transit dependent persons.

**Policies:**

- 1) Update and implement the Social Service Transportation Inventory and Action Plan in coordination with the El Dorado County Transit Authority, social service agencies, and the Consolidated Transportation Service Agency.
- 2) Assist with the ongoing implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- 3) Promote the provision of discount fares for the elderly, disabled, and students.
- 4) Work with transit operators to assist social service agencies in providing transportation for Access to Jobs clients.

**Objective C:** Develop and encourage the use of public transit as a primary transportation alternative.

**Policies:**

- 1) Encourage transit operators to provide inter- and intra-County transit routes which are responsive to the needs of commuters.

- 2) Promote coordination with regional transit and paratransit systems, including light rail.
- 3) Involve the business and industrial sector of the region in meeting the transportation needs of their employees and clients.
- 4) Develop and implement a multi-lingual marketing program to promote public transit as a primary transportation option, raise public awareness of the various systems, and increase understanding of how to use them.

**Objective D:** Provide an effective and efficient transit system that best utilizes available resources.

**Policies:**

- 1) Establish and maintain a performance monitoring system which evaluates the effectiveness of transit service as outlined in the Transportation Development Act.
- 2) Ensure that transit services continue to meet all state and federal requirements for funding, including those for farebox recovery ratios.
- 3) Promote an effective and efficient transit planning process.
- 4) Incorporate Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) strategies where feasible.

**Transit Performance Measures:**

- Maintain public transit ridership productivity that meets the standards established in the adopted Western El Dorado County Short Range and Long Range Transit Plan.
- Maintain a ratio of public transit fare revenue to operating cost sufficient to meet State and Federal funding requirements.

**GOAL 3: AVIATION**

**Promote and preserve aviation facilities and services that compliment the regional transportation system.**

**Objective A:** Promote the development, operation, and maintenance of a regional system of airports.

**Policies:**

- 1) Promote the development of aviation system facilities and services necessary to satisfy user requirements.
- 2) Encourage the development of aviation system facilities that serve as a regional economic stimulus.

- 3) Recognize and support the role of public use airports in accommodating the County's general and agricultural aviation needs.
- 4) Participate in Caltrans Division of Aeronautics regional and statewide aviation planning efforts.

**Objective B:** Update and revise Airport Master Plans as necessary.

**Policies:**

- 1) Assist jurisdictions with the development of Airport Master Plans for public airports that address current and forecast conditions.
- 2) Recognize the need for comprehensive, coordinated aviation planning.

**Objective C:** Promote and secure adequate air passenger, goods movement, and other aviation and air transportation services as part of a multi-modal transportation system.

**Policies:**

- 1) Support projects that integrate air transport facilities with other modes of transportation, including street and road access, public transit, and pedestrian and bike paths.
- 2) Integrate air transportation planning and development with other modes of transportation.
- 3) Support projects that facilitate goods movement utilizing the regional system of airports.

**Objective D:** Promote the safe, orderly, and efficient use of airports and air space and compatible land uses through the enforcement of comprehensive Land Use Plans.

**Aviation Performance Measures:**

- Maintain or increase airport operations for business, recreation, and goods movement, within safety and capacity guidelines

**GOAL 4: GOODS MOVEMENT**

**Provide for the safe and efficient movement of goods through and within El Dorado County.**

**Objective A:** Promote a balance of roads and airports for the improvement of goods transport.

**Policies:**

- 1) Support projects that facilitate interregional, multi-modal goods transport to commercial and industrial areas wherever feasible.

- 2) Support projects that facilitate interregional goods movement utilizing the regional system of airports.
- 3) Support projects that address the timely movement of goods and service throughout the region.

**Objective B:** Mitigate conditions that transporters of goods deem dangerous or unacceptable.

**Policies:**

- 1) Encourage jurisdictions to develop pavement management systems that identify and prioritize road maintenance projects.
- 2) Encourage jurisdictions to provide proper road geometry on roadways intended to accommodate truck traffic.
- 3) Improve US 50 in order to facilitate goods movement and access to jobs.

**Goods Movement Performance Measures:**

- Improve operations for commercial/agricultural vehicles.
- Maintain reliable travel times for freight mobility.

**GOAL 5: NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION**

**Promote a safe, convenient, and efficient non-motorized transportation system which is part of a balanced overall transportation system.**

**Objective A:** Plan and develop a continuous and easily-accessible pedestrian and bikeway system within the region.

**Policies:**

- 1) Ensure that jurisdictions have current Bikeway Master Plans that comply with state standards.
- 2) Encourage the completion of existing non-motorized systems and facilities, with an emphasis on closing gaps.
- 3) Consider Class I and II bikeways as preferred linkages in the bicycle facilities network. Use Class III bike routes as connectors only when necessary.
- 4) Develop a visually clear, simple, and recognizable bicycle route map.
- 5) Encourage the development of abandoned railroad right-of-way, irrigation ditches and utility easements for non-motorized facilities.

- 6) Ensure accessibility to non-motorized facilities within new developments.
- 7) Pursue alternative funding mechanisms for the development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

**Objective B:** Provide a pedestrian and bikeway system that emphasizes the safety of people and property.

**Policies:**

- 1) Encourage the adoption of local bicycle ordinances.
- 2) Encourage secure facilities for bicycle storage at industrial, governmental, commercial, recreational, and educational locations.
- 3) Require all bicycle facilities funded through the Transportation Development Act to be designed in accordance with the State Bikeway Design Criteria, Chapter 1000 of the Highway Design Manual.

**Objective C:** Integrate pedestrian and bicycle facilities into a multi-modal transportation system.

**Policies:**

- 1) Incorporate non-motorized facilities when implementing improvements or new developments to the existing roadway network.
- 2) Prioritize roadway and street designs that avoid bicycle-auto, pedestrian-auto, and bicycle-pedestrian conflicts.
- 3) Promote the public use of abandoned railroad corridors for pedestrian and bikeway or other transportation or recreational uses.

**Pedestrian and Bikeways Performance Measures:**

- Improve bicycle and pedestrian options for commuter and recreational travel.
- Add facilities, such as bike lockers, to support bicycling in El Dorado County.
- Close gaps in the bicycle network.
- Maintain accident rates at statewide average or better.

**GOAL 6: TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT**

**Promote the use of alternative transportation to reduce the negative impacts of single-occupant vehicle travel.**

**Objective A:** Create a multi-modal, multi-jurisdictional transportation network between major residential areas, educational and recreational facilities, and employment centers.

**Policies:**

- 1) Prepare and distribute transit service information to educational, commercial, recreational, employment, and civic centers.
- 2) Consider proximity to major travel origins and destinations in siting of new multi-modal transportation facilities.
- 3) Encourage jurisdictions to consider multi-modal transit facility proximity when siting educational, social service, and major employment and commercial facilities.

**Objective B:** Advance the use of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) in a thorough, cost-effective manner.

**Policies:**

- 1) Support the use of public transportation as a transportation control measure to reduce traffic congestion and vehicle emissions.
- 2) Work with Caltrans and local jurisdictions to locate and develop park-and-ride lots.
- 3) Work with the Regional Rideshare Task Force and appropriate agencies to coordinate ridesharing activities and goals.
- 4) Provide outreach to media, employers, and the general public to promote awareness of alternative transportation.

**Alternative Transportation Performance Measures:**

- Develop Transportation Demand Management baseline performance measures.
- Annually measure the effectiveness of alternative transportation methods against the established baseline performance measures.
- Implement strategies to offset any future emissions increases due to population and employment growth and expected increases in vehicle miles traveled.
- Support transportation projects which are consistent with the motor vehicle emissions budget in the State Implementation Plan.

**GOAL 7: INTEGRATED LAND USE, AIR QUALITY AND TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

**Integrate land, air and transportation planning in order to facilitate the development of the most efficient and effective transportation system possible.**

**Objective A:** Provide information and support services to jurisdictions regarding the countywide transportation impacts of local land use decisions.

**Policies:**

- 1) Encourage jurisdictions to maintain their adopted Level of Service (LOS) on local streets and roads in accordance with the applicable general plan Circulation Element.
- 2) Encourage jurisdictions to seek a balance of housing and employment land uses within their communities to reduce trips and trip lengths and to encourage alternative transportation modes.
- 3) Encourage jurisdictions to protect corridors and rights-of-way, when identified, for future transportation facilities through the adoption of specific plans and general plans.
- 4) Support continued review of development proposals in order to encourage alternative transportation modes.

**Objective B:** Provide transportation infrastructure that meets existing and future needs.

**Policies:**

- 1) Encourage jurisdictions to develop roadways that complement planned growth patterns, economic development programs, and requirements of infrastructure to support those land uses.
- 2) Encourage jurisdictions to review and assess the impact of new development proposals on transit system demand.
- 3) Encourage jurisdictions to require street patterns for new roadways, especially in commercial, industrial, and high-density residential areas, to take into consideration the requirements of public transit.

**Objective C:** Ensure that transportation projects do not contribute to increased vehicle emissions.

**Policies:**

- 1) Prioritize and recommend transportation projects that minimize vehicle emissions while providing cost effective movement of people and goods.
- 2) Promote projects that can be demonstrated to reduce air pollution, such as alternative fuel programs.
- 3) Develop plans that meet the standards of the California Clean Air Act and the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments in coordination with the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District.

- 4) Evaluate the impacts of each transportation plan and program on the timely attainment of ambient air quality standards in coordination with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments.
- 5) Solicit the input of the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District on all transportation plans.

**Objective D:** Work with local jurisdictions, tribal governments, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Caltrans, the California Transportation Commission, and other transportation agencies to develop a regional planning and programming process to ensure that El Dorado County jurisdictions have maximum participation and control in the transportation decision-making process.

**Policies:**

- 1) Develop mechanisms such as Memorandums of Understanding and Joint Powers Agreements between jurisdictions to accomplish planning and implementation of multi-jurisdictional transportation projects and programs.
- 2) Facilitate the coordination and implementation of local and regional transportation programs to improve mobility and air quality.

**Objective E:** Participate in state, regional, and local transportation planning efforts to insure coordination of transportation system expansion and improvements.

**Policies:**

- 1) Coordinate transportation planning with local jurisdictions.
- 2) Coordinate transportation planning with the Shingle Springs Rancheria.
- 3) Ensure coordination, cooperation and consistency among all level of transportation planning efforts.
- 4) Build coalitions with key private sector and community groups to develop transportation solutions.
- 5) Ensure coordination of interjurisdictional transportation projects in coordination with Caltrans and other appropriate agencies.

**Integrated Land Use Coordination Performance Measures:**

- Utilize land use forecasts consistent with adopted general plans as the basis for multi-modal transportation planning.

## **GOAL 8: FUNDING**

**Secure maximum available funding and pursue new sources of funds for maintenance, expansion, and improvement of transportation facilities and services.**

**Objective A:** Obtain funding for vital transportation needs through all conventional sources.

**Policies:**

- 1) Ensure that required planning documents are current, meet planning regulations and guidelines, and qualify for federal and state transportation funding sources.
- 2) Maximize use of federal and state transportation funding sources.
- 3) Assist jurisdictions to identify and obtain grant funding.
- 4) Seek funding for public transportation implemented to serve social service programs from the agencies responsible for the programs.
- 5) Maximize allocations of statewide funds, such as State Highway Operation Protection Program and Interregional Transportation Improvement Program, for El Dorado County projects, in coordination with the California Transportation Commission and Caltrans, jurisdictions, and other regional agencies.
- 6) Promote the funding of operational improvements that will improve traffic flows and increase the capacity of person trips at relatively low cost.
- 7) Promote the funding of operational improvements, maintenance, and modernization of public transit services and facilities.
- 8) Promote funding of maintenance for existing infrastructure as a top priority.
- 9) Promote the funding of non-motorized projects which are part of a regional or community-wide plan.
- 10) Promote the funding of non-motorized projects which increase accessibility to recreational, commercial, or educational facilities.
- 11) Prioritize transportation projects according to regional transportation system benefit rather than funding source.
- 12) Promote funding of transportation projects consistent with provisions included in adopted general plans and Measure Y.

**Objective B:** Develop innovative funding sources for vital transportation needs where conventional funding sources are insufficient to do so.

**Policies:**

- 1) Encourage jurisdictions to implement user charges which link the financing of new or expanded facilities and services to the development which creates or increases the need for such.
- 2) Consider viable alternative fund sources such as establishment of community-wide assessment districts, user fees, tolls, and/or sales tax increases in the event funding shortfalls for needed projects occur.
- 3) Develop new sources of funding for road rehabilitation and maintenance in coordination with the League of California Cities, California State Association of Counties, legislators, transportation groups, and other interested parties.
- 4) Explore the feasibility of implementing a local option sales tax for transportation purposes.

**Funding Performance Measures:**

- Pursue all funding opportunities for transportation facilities and services in El Dorado County.
- Pursue development and implementation of new funding sources.

**PROJECT CONSISTENCY**

The eligibility criteria for many funding programs include a requirement that the project be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Regional Transportation Plan. The following list of project categories is consistent with this RTP document: (in no priority order)

- Projects that meet the needs of persons whose mobility is limited by inaccessible transportation systems.
- Transportation maintenance and preservation projects.
- Capacity increasing projects only where alternative solutions would not be practical or cost-effective in resolving the problem.
- Connections between different urbanized areas of the County of at least highway standard roads and reasonable public transit service to meet demand.
- Projects to enhance the movement of agricultural, commercial, and industrial goods.
- Projects that maintain the interregional integrity of the state highway system.
- Projects to enhance surface connections to airports.

- System management, demand management, and other transportation control measures included in trip reduction ordinances and/or air quality attainment plans.
- Multi-occupant vehicle systems, such as public transit, ridesharing projects, and park-and-ride facilities.
- Bicycle and pedestrian projects.
- Transportation projects that facilitate higher density or mixed-use development, to the extent desired by local communities.
- Other projects that are shown to reduce congestion without construction of new facilities for single-occupant vehicles.
- Projects that reduce mobile source emissions without construction of new facilities for single-occupant vehicles.
- Proposals to improve transportation safety.
- Transportation enhancement proposals, to integrate transportation facilities into surrounding communities in an environmentally sensitive way.

## **THE ACTION ELEMENT**

The Action Element identifies programs and actions to implement the RTP in accordance with the goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the Policy Element. The institutional and legal actions needed to implement the RTP are also discussed in this section, followed by a detailed assessment of all transportation modes. The priorities for regional transportation programs are established in the Action Element.

### ***Regional Road Network Action Element***

The Action Element of the RTP consists of short-term and long-term projects and activities that address regional transportation issues and needs. The federal conformity regulations (Title 40 CFR 93.106, Content of Transportation Plans) identifies the short term horizon as a period up to ten years in the future and the long term horizon as projects or activities 20 years and beyond. The Action Element implements the Policy Element, must be consistent with the financial constraints identified in the Financial Element, and must conform with the air quality State Implementation Plan (SIP). [Tables 1 & 2](#) list the short term and long term projects.

The Action Plan implements Goal 1 of the Policy Element of this RTP, which pertains to highways, streets and regional roadways and reads as follows: Maintain and upgrade a safe, efficient, and convenient countywide roadway system that meets the travel needs of people and goods through and within the region.

**Table 1**  
**Regional Road Network Short-term Action Plan (Up to 10 Years)**

Project	Segment/Description	Cost Estimate	Responsible/Support Agencies	Program
High Occupancy Vehicle Lane Extension	US 50, from El Dorado Hills Boulevard Undercrossing to South Shingle Road/Ponderosa Road Overcrossing	\$39,299,000	Caltrans, El Dorado County DOT, EDCTC	STIP, LOCAL FUNDS
US 50/ Missouri Flat Interchange Improvements	Modify interchange and widen Weber Creek Bridge on US 50	\$38,780,000	Caltrans, El Dorado County DOT, EDCTC	STIP, LOCAL FUNDS
Western Placerville Interchanges	US 50, from Placerville /Forni Road interchange to Ray Lawyer Drive overcrossing	\$27,475,000	Caltrans, City of Placerville, EDCTC	STIP, LOCAL FUNDS, FED EARMARK
Placerville Operational Improvements	US 50 from West Placerville Dr. to Bedford	\$31,983,000	Caltrans, City of Placerville, EDCTC	STIP
Construction of a 2-way left turn lane, install stop sign and associated bicycle and pedestrian facilities	SR 49 in Coloma, from the South Fork American River Bridge #25-21 to Marshall Road.	\$1,300,000	Caltrans, El Dorado County DOT, EDCTC	SHOPP
Construction of a left turn pocket.	SR 193 about 10 kilometers east of Cool, at Sliger Mine Road.	\$556,000	Caltrans, El Dorado County DOT	SHOPP
Widen and add shoulders	SR 49, from .2 kilometers south of Ore Court to .2 kilometers south of China Hill Road	\$7,700,000	Caltrans, El Dorado County DOT	SHOPP
Placerville Drive improvements	Placerville Drive	\$564,780	City of Placerville, EDCTC	RSTP
Realign to 4-way intersection	Clay St. at Cedar Ravine, re-construct bridge and Ivy House parking lot	\$1,500,000	City of Placerville, EDCTC	RSTP, LOCAL FUNDS
Westbound US 50 on/off ramps and signalization	Cambridge Road, MerryChase Drive, US 50	\$430,000	El Dorado County DOT, Caltrans, EDCTC	RSTP

<b>Project</b>	<b>Segment/Description</b>	<b>Cost Estimate</b>	<b>Responsible/Support Agencies</b>	<b>Program</b>
Operations, safety analysis and improvements	Cameron Park Drive/Palmer Drive/Green Valley Road	\$395,346	El Dorado County DOT, EDCTC	RSTP
Construction of left turn lanes at intersection	Cameron Park Drive/Mira Loma Drive	\$400,000	El Dorado County DOT, EDCTC	RSTP
Construction of left turn lanes and signalize intersection	Missouri Flat Road/El Dorado Road	\$460,000	El Dorado County DOT, EDCTC	RSTP
Two way left turn widening	Mother Lode Drive, South Shingle to French Road intersection	\$380,000	El Dorado County DOT, EDCTC	RSTP
Intersection signalization	Cameron Park Drive/Meder Road	\$243,000	El Dorado County DOT, EDCTC	RSTP
Road Rehabilitation	City of Placerville	\$1,076,849	City of Placerville, EDCTC	RSTP
Road Rehabilitation	El Dorado County	\$1,400,000	El Dorado County, EDCTC	RSTP
US 50 Placerville Aesthetic Elements	Enhance aesthetic architectural elements, to include decorative bridge railing, historic lighting, fencing and additional signage	\$903,000	Caltrans, City of Placerville	STATE TEA
US 50 Hangtown Creek Beautification	Remove abandoned eastbound off-ramp at Main St. and re-establish riparian vegetation	\$405,000	Caltrans, City of Placerville	STATE TEA
Harvard Way Project	Component of El Dorado Hills CSD Master Facilities Plan	\$187,044	El Dorado Hills CSD, EDCTC	REGIONAL TEA
10 year Capital Improvement Program* (Improvements are listed in Table 3 after the CIP discussion below)		\$494,800,000	El Dorado County	CIP
10 year Capital Improvement Program** * (Improvements are listed in Table 3 after the CIP discussion below)		\$36,270,000	City of Placerville	CIP

\*Pending adoption by the County Board of Supervisors estimated July 2005 \*\*Adjusted to current dollars

**Table 2**  
**Regional Road Network Long-term Action Plan (20 Years and Beyond)**

Project Description	Cost Estimate	Responsible/Support Agencies
Improve parallel roadways North & South of US 50, to increase parallel capacity and improve conditions along US 50	Unknown	El Dorado County DOT, City of Placerville, EDCTC, Caltrans
Camino Freeway Conversion US 50 between Smith Flat Road and the Cedar Grove interchange	\$56,000,000	Caltrans, El Dorado County DOT, EDCTC
General County-wide road rehabilitation	To be provided by County DOT May 2005	El Dorado County DOT, City of Placerville, EDCTC
High Occupancy Vehicle lanes along US 50*	Unknown	Caltrans, EDCTC, El Dorado County DOT
Increased capacity for goods movement/ truck climbing lane along US 50	Unknown	Caltrans, El Dorado County DOT, EDCTC
Realignment of Highway 49 in the vicinity of Placerville	Unknown	Caltrans, El Dorado County DOT, EDCTC
Elk Grove-Rancho Cordova-El Dorado Connector	\$2,446,356**	SACOG, EDCTC, El Dorado County DOT

\* HOV lanes from West County line to Ponderosa Road included in short term action plan

\*\* Connector components included in the SACOG 2025 MTP, in addition to County CIP projects in Table 3

## **STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for El Dorado County, EDCTC is responsible for prioritizing and distributing 75% of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds to the region. This portion is referred to as the Regional Improvement Program (RIP). The remaining 25% is the Interregional Improvement Program (IIP) is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans to fund projects with interregional benefits. The El Dorado County STIP projects are described in detail below, and are also summarized in [Tables 1 and 2](#), Regional Road Network Short Term and Long Term Action Plans.

### ***US 50 High Occupancy Vehicle Lane Extension***

The proposed project will add two high-occupancy vehicle (HOV, or carpool) lanes (one eastbound and one westbound) in the median of US 50 in western El Dorado County from the El Dorado Hills Boulevard Undercrossing to South Shingle Road/Ponderosa Road Overcrossing. The project will also include bridge modifications, lighting improvements, new overlay, and CHP enforcement areas. Caltrans has completed the Project Approval and Environmental Document phase with the approval of the Project Report on June 28, 2002. Caltrans has officially put a hold on final design work on this project as a result of current budget conditions.

### ***Us 50/ Missouri Flat Interchange***

This project entails modifying the existing interchange at Missouri Flat and US 50, widening the Weber Creek Bridge and other associated improvements, including potential enhanced bicycle and pedestrian access both across US 50 at the Missouri Flat interchange, and between the Missouri Flat and Forni Road interchanges. El Dorado County completed the environmental phase with the approval of the state and federal environmental documents on August 30 and September 9, 2004 respectively, and is proceeding with the design and right-of-way phases, scheduled for completion as early as 2007.

### ***Us 50/ Western Placerville Interchanges***

This project includes modifying the existing Placerville Road/Forni Road interchange, converting Ray Lawyer Drive overcrossing to a full interchange with US 50, constructing auxiliary lanes and making related improvements. Completion of the environmental phase is estimated for November 2005.

### ***Us 50/ Placerville Operational Improvements***

This project will construct several operational and capacity improvements on and around US 50 in the City of Placerville. The Caltrans' schedule is to complete final design work by February 2005, and to acquire the remainder of the right of way with funds it expects in fiscal year (FY) 2004-05. The project will then be ready to advertise for construction in FY 2005-06.

### ***Us 50/ Camino Freeway Conversion***

This project will convert an existing expressway to a freeway along seven kilometers of the US 50 corridor, between the Smith Flat Road interchange and Cedar Grove interchange in Camino.

The conversion could include new frontage roads, connector roads, a centrally located interchange, and public and private road connection closures. The project is in the project report and environmental review phase, but work has been suspended by Caltrans.

The El Dorado County Department of Transportation's proposed Capital Improvement Program includes \$2 million for preliminary planning, engineering and environmental analysis efforts as part of the potential freeway conversion. EDCTC will continue to work with Caltrans and our partners to pursue future funding opportunities for planning efforts in the Camino area.

#### **STATE HIGHWAY OPERATIONS AND PROTECTION PROGRAM**

Caltrans is responsible for administering the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP), a set of projects funded by state gasoline and diesel taxes to construct maintenance, safety and operational improvements on the State Highway System. Excluding the Tahoe Basin, there are currently three roadway-related SHOPP projects in El Dorado County.

##### ***Coloma/Lotus***

This project will bring the highway up to current design standards and improve safety and operations on the portion of SR 49 from the north end of the South Fork American River Bridge to Marshall Road.

##### ***Cool***

This project involves the construction of a left turn pocket on SR 193 about 10 kilometers east of Cool, at Sliger Mine Road.

##### ***Logtown***

This project will widen the existing lanes and add shoulders on SR 49, from .2 kilometers south of Ore Court to .2 kilometers south of China Hill Road.

#### **FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

The Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) contains projects funded by Federal Aid Highway Program Fund Sources. Traditionally three programs, described below, utilize these federal funds. Regionally significant projects utilizing these funds are listed in [Table 1](#). The categories below cover projects programmed for fiscal years 2002/03 through 2004/05. For a complete list of county-wide projects, refer to SACOG's Interim MTIP on their website at [www.sacog.org](http://www.sacog.org).

#### **CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY (CMAQ) FUNDS**

CMAQ funds are monies returned to states based on population in air quality non-attainment areas adjusted by a pollution severity factor. Eligible projects are limited to those that contribute to the region's ability to attain Federal Clean Air Act Standards, and include pedestrian and bicycle improvements, traffic signal timing, construction of passenger bus or High Occupancy

Vehicle (HOV) lanes, and other projects and programs that have documented emissions reductions.

#### ***Cambridge Park & Ride Lot***

The El Dorado County Transit Authority (EDCTA) has completed right of way acquisition for a park & ride lot at the northeast corner of Cambridge Road and US 50. EDCTA is currently working with Caltrans and El Dorado County DOT to resolve access issues to/from the park & ride lot.

#### ***Central Park & Ride Lot, Diamond Springs***

EDCTA has completed right of way acquisition for a park & ride lot on Commerce Way in Diamond Springs adjacent to the existing EDCTA operations headquarters. This park & ride facility will enable drivers to park at a central location and utilize any one of EDCTA's routes from a single departure point.

### **REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP) FUNDS**

The RSTP authorizes funds for highways, transit capital, bridges, wetlands mitigation, landscaping, bicycles & traffic operations, management and many other programs on Federal-aid roads and bridges. It also includes projects to reduce cold start emissions, sidewalk modifications, and infrastructure improvements.

#### ***Placerville Drive Improvements***

The City of Placerville has completed this project, with the exception of bridge widening over Hangtown Creek, for which the City is preparing environmental documentation to satisfy US Fish & Wildlife requirements. The City hopes to begin bridge construction in the summer of 2005.

#### ***El Dorado Trail Extension***

The design phase was completed and adopted by the Placerville City Council in April of 2004 for the El Dorado Trail segment from Mosquito Road to Clay Street. The trail extension also contains a transportation enhancement activities (TEA) component, which is described below. The project is anticipated for construction in Spring of 2005.

#### ***Clay Street/Cedar Ravine Re-alignment***

This project involves modifying the existing three way intersection to a four way intersection or traffic circle by re-aligning Clay Street in Placerville through the Ivy House parking lot to meet with Cedar Ravine. Construction is anticipated for the 2005/06 fiscal year, but City officials plan to coordinate this project with the operational improvements on US 50 through Placerville.

### ***Cambridge Road/Merry Chase Drive/US 50***

This project includes improvements to the westbound US 50 on/off ramps and signalization. This project must be coordinated with the expansion of the adjacent park & ride lot, as well as pending development in the area. The project is scheduled for delivery in the 2005/06 fiscal year.

### ***Cameron Park Drive/Palmer Drive/Green Valley Road***

This project includes operations, safety analysis and improvements and intersection signalization. The project is scheduled for delivery in the 2005/06 fiscal year.

### ***Cameron Park Drive/Meder Road***

This project includes signalization of the Cameron Park Drive/Meder Road intersection. Project opening is scheduled for August 2005.

### ***Cameron Park Drive/Mira Loma Drive***

This project includes construction of left turn lanes at the intersection and along the commercial frontage north of the intersection. Construction is scheduled for Summer 2005.

### ***Missouri Flat Road/El Dorado Road***

This project includes construction of left turn lanes and signalization of the intersection. Project delivery is scheduled for late in the 2004/05 fiscal year.

### ***Motherlode Drive Left Turn Widening***

This project includes two way left turn widening, from South Shingle Road to the French Road intersection. A public outreach meeting is anticipated in September 2005, and the project scope will be finalized after that meeting.

### ***Road Rehabilitation***

A variety of fund sources can be used for the repair and resurfacing of regional roadways in El Dorado County. The City of Placerville and El Dorado County DOT have claimed RSTP funds for road rehabilitation. Placerville recently completed rehabilitation work on Cedar Ravine within the city limits. Upper Main Street, from Cedar Ravine to Broadway, is the City's next targeted segment for rehabilitation work. County DOT has completed final design for rehabilitation work on Cameron Park Drive, with construction anticipated for Spring 2005. However, this work is being coordinated with other Cameron Park Drive projects, which necessitates flexibility in construction scheduling.

## **TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES (TEA) FUNDS**

Transportation enhancements (TE) are transportation-related activities that are designed to strengthen the cultural, aesthetic, and environmental aspects of the nation's intermodal transportation system. In 2004, the Federally funded Transportation Enhancement (TE) program

was incorporated into the STIP. Eligible TE projects include: pedestrian and bicycle facilities; acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites; landscaping and other scenic beautification; historic preservation; rehabilitation of historic buildings, structures, or facilities; preservation of abandoned railway corridors for conversion to pedestrian or bicycle trails; control and removal of outdoor advertising; archaeological planning and research; mitigation of water pollution due to highway runoff; and transportation museums.

**US 50 Operational Improvements/Enhancements**

EDCTC programmed Regional TEA funds to supplement the State TEA funds by Caltrans for the US 50 operation improvement project. Enhancements include decorative retaining walls, wrought iron fencing and decorative signal lights.

**Harvard Way Project**

The lead agency for this project is the El Dorado Hills Community Services District (EDHCSD). The Harvard Way Bike path is included in the EDHCSD Master Facilities Plan for their headquarters on Harvard Way.

**LOCAL JURISDICTION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

In addition to projects identified in the SHOPP, FTIP and STIP, [Table 3](#) includes only capacity improvement roadway projects on regionally significant routes contained in the Capital Improvement Programs (CIP) of El Dorado County and the City of Placerville. The funding amounts shown in [Table 3](#) represent the totals for all projects included in the CIP’s. For a complete list of these projects, please contact the appropriate jurisdiction.

**Table 3**  
**Local Jurisdiction Short Term Capital Improvement Programs**  
**El Dorado County & Placerville**

Route/Segment	Project Limits	Project Description
Cameron Park Drive	Durock Rd to Coach Ln	Widen 3 lane divided roadway to a modified 4 lane divided roadway.
Cameron Park Drive	Palmer Dr to Oxford Rd	Widen 2 lane roadway to a 4 lane undivided roadway.
El Dorado Hills Boulevard	Park Dr to Serrano Pkwy/Lassen Ln	Add 3rd SB lane.
Headington Road	Missouri Flat Rd to El Dorado Rd	New 2 lane arterial with median.
Latrobe Road	Investment Blvd to Golden Foothill Pkwy (s)	Widen to 4 lane divided roadway. Add curb, gutter and sidewalk.
Missouri Flat-Pleasant Valley connector road	Missouri Flat Rd to SR 49	New 2 lane road.
Saratoga Way	End of Saratoga Road to county line	New 2 lane arterial.

<b>Route/Segment</b>	<b>Project Limits</b>	<b>Project Description</b>
Serrano Parkway	Collingtree Pkwy to Bass Lake Rd	New 2 lane arterial. Add curb, gutter and sidewalk.
Silva Valley Parkway	US 50 to Serrano Pkwy	Widen 2 lane to 4 lane divided roadway. Add curb, gutter and sidewalk.
White Rock Road	Latrobe Rd to Silva Valley Pkwy I/C @ US 50	Widen 2 lane to 4 lane divided roadway.
US 50/El Dorado Hills Blvd.	Interchange	Phase 1.2B - Enhancements to existing ramps. Lengthen bridge.
US 50/El Dorado Hills Blvd.	Interchange	Phase 1.3 and Phase 2 Ultimate. Westbound 50 Ramps. "Complete improvements" including aux lanes 1/2 way to east Silva Valley I/C and aux lane west bound to county line.
US 50/Silva Valley Parkway	Interchange	Construct new interchange with overcrossing and ramps. Add aux lanes 1/2 way to next I/C west bound to EDH and aux lane east bound connecting to existing truck climbing lane.
US 50	El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Ponderosa Road	Add 1 WB HOV and 1 EB HOV lane
US 50/Bass Lake Road	Interchange	Modify existing interchange by widening off-ramps to provide turn lanes, widen on-ramps for ramp metering and HOV bypass lanes, install traffic signals add aux lanes 1/2 way to next I/C east bound. Lengthen bridges.
US 50/Cambridge Road	Interchange	Modify existing interchange by installing traffic signals, construct w/b slip on-ramp, widen off-ramps to provide turn lanes, widen on-ramps for ramp metering and HOV bypass lane, add aux lanes 1/2 way to next I/C east and west bound. Widen bridge.
US 50/Cameron Park Drive	Interchange	Modify existing interchange by widening off-ramps for turn lanes, widen on-ramps for ramp metering and HOV bypass lanes, add aux lanes 1/2 way to next I/C east and west bound. Lengthen bridges.
US 50/Ponderosa Road	Interchange	Modify existing interchange by widening off-ramps to provide turn lanes, widen on-ramps for ramp metering and HOV bypass lanes, relocate N. Shingle Road and Durock Road, and add aux lanes 1/2 way west bound to next I/C and widen bridge.
US 50/El Dorado Road	Interchange	Modify existing interchange to ultimate improvements: add traffic signals to the ramps, widen ramps for turn lanes, widen bridge.
US 50/Missouri Flat Road	Interchange	Phase I - modify existing interchange to tight diamond configuration.

<b>Route/Segment</b>	<b>Project Limits</b>	<b>Project Description</b>
US 50	Through Camino - may include an Interchange	Preliminary planning, engineering and environmental analysis for conversion of expressway to freeway and future construction of a new interchange.
Ray Lawyer Drive Extension	Forni Road to SR 49	Preliminary planning, engineering and environmental analysis for future construction of a new 2 lane road..
Forni Road	City Limits to City Limits	Preliminary planning, engineering and environmental analysis for future widening to a standard 2 lane road.
<b>City of Placerville</b>		
Main Street	Washington Street.. to Broadway at U.S. 50 WB off ramp	Realign Main St. to provide two one-way roadways
Washington Street	Cedar Ravine Road to Main Street	Widen and realign Washington Street to Turner Street
Ray Lawyer Drive Extension	US 50 to SR 49	Construct new two lane roadway with sidewalk
Placerville Drive	Fair Lane to Ray Lawyer Drive	Widen to four travel lanes, two way center turn lane, bicycle lanes and sidewalks
Placerville Drive	Cold Springs Road East to US 50	Widen to four travel lanes, two way center turn lane, bicycle lanes and sidewalks

\*1998 dollars escalated to 2005

### ***Transit Action Plan***

This Action Plan implements Goal 2 of the Policy Element of this RTP, which pertains to public transit and reads as follows: Promote effective, convenient and desirable public transit for residents of and visitors to El Dorado County.

The Western El Dorado County Short Range and Long Range Transit Plan, completed in 2003, highlights service, capital, and institutional/management improvement recommendations to the year 2025 in order to meet future demand. A summary of the recommended service and capital improvements, for both the short-range and long-range plans, is provided below in [Tables 4 and 5](#).

**Table 4****Transit Short-term Action Plan (Up to 10 Years)**

Goal	Description	Increase in Annual Operating Costs	Fare Revenues	Required Subsidy
Provide Transit Service to Planned Light Rail in Folsom in 2005	Upon the opening of the Sacramento Regional Transit's light rail service to Folsom, EDCTA will operate one bus on a 90-minute schedule from the Missouri Flat area. The schedule will be timed to allow direct transfers from other EDCTA routes serving Placerville, El Dorado, and Pollock Pines.	\$178,290	\$46,430	\$131,860
Expand Service on Pollock Pines, El Dorado/Diamond Springs, Cosumnes River College and Cameron Park Routes	Add a third bus to the operating plan, allowing hourly service on the El Dorado/Diamond Springs and Pollock Pines routes, while service on the Cameron Park and Cosumnes River College routes will be provided every 90 minutes. This will also improve on-time performance and provide service along Mother Lode Drive. The Pollock Pines Route will be redesigned to serve as an "express bus" across Placerville.	\$149,860	\$14,140	\$135,720
Expand Commuter Service to Meet Increasing Demand	A new route will be added to meet existing and near-term future capacity issues. The existing bus used for Route 9 service to Rancho Cordova will be replaced by a van and used to provide additional service between El Dorado Hills and Sacramento.	\$71,850	\$19,250	\$52,600
Other Potential Future Service Improvements	Several additional service improvements have been found to be operationally feasible, but financially unconstrained. These consist of skier service to Sierra-At-Tahoe Ski Area, and service to a potential casino in Shingle Springs. Implementation of these additional improvements will be dependent upon obtaining additional financial resources.	Both require a subsidy and the RTP Advisory Committee commented that these services should be self-sufficient		
Convert Placerville/Hangtown Shuttle to Fixed Route & Provide Complementary ADA Service	This will improve on-time performance, meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and increase the usefulness of this service to the community.	\$51,800	\$2,940	\$48,860
Expand Dial-A-Ride Service	An additional 8 vehicle service-hours of Dial-A-Ride service will be provided per weekday to meet existing and potential future demand. The daily vehicle service hours will be allocated by operations staff depending upon anticipated needs and observed operating patterns. One additional vehicle will be required.	\$114,810	\$9,640	\$105,170

Goal	Description	Increase in Annual Operating Costs	Fare Revenues	Required Subsidy
Contract for Provision of Weekly Georgetown / Cool / Pilot Hill Service to Auburn	To serve the public transit needs of the northwestern portion of the County, including the communities of Georgetown, Cool and Pilot Hill, EDCTA will fund services to and from Auburn, so long as financial and institutional issues can be addressed. This service will be operated one day a week initially, with a single morning run and a single afternoon run.	\$11,200	\$2,880	\$8,320
Revise the Commuter Schedule	EDCTA will revise the commuter schedules to show the earliest potential eastbound arrival times in El Dorado Hills (with no traffic delays) to ensure that passengers waiting to board the commuter buses for an eastbound trip from El Dorado Hills will not be inconvenienced by buses leaving early.	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Table 5**  
**Transit Long-term Action Plan (20 Years and Beyond)**

Goal/Description	Responsible/ Support Agencies
Expansion of Placerville – Folsom LRT service to a minimum of hourly services between the Silverbrook LRT station and Placerville Station. The span of service (days and hours of service) will expand as warranted to meet ridership demand.	City of Folsom EDCTA
Continuation of direct Sacramento Commuter bus service subsequent to expansion of LRT service, in order to continue providing a high level of service to El Dorado County residents.	EDCTA
Reconfiguration of the Cameron Park Route to coordinate with Folsom LRT service along the US 50 corridor.	EDCTA City of Folsom
Establishment of an El Dorado Hills local route, when demand within El Dorado Hills warrants, including a park and ride stop along route.	EDCTA
Continuation of Dial-A-Ride services, as augmented to address increases in population and changing mobility needs of the region.	EDCTA
Expansion of local Hangtown Shuttle, Pollock Pines, and CRC Routes as warranted by ridership demand, including half-hourly service on busier routes.	EDCTA
Coordination with schools and transit service, including design review, to provide children with transportation alternatives	EDCTA School Districts
Increased bicycle rack capacity on transit buses	EDCTA

Goal/Description	Responsible/ Support Agencies
Monitoring of ridership on the planned Folsom Light Rail extension	City of Folsom EDCTA
Pursue light rail extension to El Dorado County	City of Folsom EDCTC EDCTA DOT
Coordination with neighboring transit agencies	EDCTA Regional Transit City of Folsom Placer County

## Aviation Action Element

This Action Plan implements Goal 3 of the Policy Element of this RTP, which pertains to aviation and reads, “Promote and preserve aviation facilities and services that compliment the regional transportation system.” Tables 6 and 7 provide a list of short-term actions at the Cameron Park Airpark and Georgetown Airport, respectively.

**Table 6**  
**Cameron Park Airport Short-term Action Plan (Up to 10 Years)**

Project/Description	Total Cost	Responsible Agency	Support Agencies	Construction Year
Extend Culvert	\$360,000	Cameron Park Airport District	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2005
Construct North Parallel TW	\$340,000	Cameron Park Airport District	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2005
Acquire Parcels A and B	\$540,000	Cameron Park Airport District	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2006
Construct Apron on Parcels A and B	\$320,000	Cameron Park Airport District	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2006
Construct South Parallel TW	\$290,000	Cameron Park Airport District	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2007
Drainage Improvements, East, North and South	\$395,000	Cameron Park Airport District	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2007
Acquire Parcel D	\$720,000	Cameron Park Airport District	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2008
Widen RW to 60 feet	\$260,000	Cameron Park Airport District	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2008
Construct Stopway (60' x 500')	\$150,000	Cameron Park Airport District	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2008
Acquire Parcel E	\$600,000	Cameron Park Airport District	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2009

**Table 7**  
**Georgetown Airport Short-term Action Plan (Up to 10 Years)**

Project/Description	Total Cost	Responsible Agency	Support Agencies	Construction Year
Environmental Assessment Study	\$140,000	El Dorado County	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2006
Engineering Design – West Side Development	\$156,000	El Dorado County	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2006
Crack Seal and Slurry Seal Ramp and Hangars	\$115,000	El Dorado County	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2006
Ramp Security Lighting	\$165,500	El Dorado County	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2007
West Side Development Construction	\$2,560,000	El Dorado County	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2008-09

<b>Project/Description</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>Responsible Agency</b>	<b>Support Agencies</b>	<b>Construction Year</b>
Nested Hangars – 10 Units	\$275,000	El Dorado County	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2010

### **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY**

An Airport Layout Plan Update Study is currently underway for the Georgetown Airport. In order to allow proper development of the airport, environmental clearances and permits must be obtained. A detailed Environmental Assessment is required.

### **ENGINEERING DESIGN – WEST SIDE DEVELOPMENT – 10 ACRES**

All of the areas available for development at the Georgetown Airport are filled with aircraft tiedown aprons or hangars. There is a waiting list for 30 additional hangars at the Georgetown Airport.

An Airport Layout Plan (ALP) Update Study is currently underway and forecasts indicate the need for additional hangars. The baseline environmental studies have been completed for the ALP Update Study. The studies indicate that environmental mitigation requirements will, at a minimum, require replacement of the picnic area located on the west side of the airport in the area proposed for additional aeronautical use. The proposed mitigation will consist of grading the hill (which is an obstruction) at the north end of the runway and developing the area as an aircraft tiedown and picnic area. The tiedown area will be for pilots that fly to Georgetown to enjoy the picnic facilities.

In order to have engineering completed so the County can meet F.A.A. requirements to issue grants based on bids, it is proposed in this project to provide complete engineering design including surveys, geotechnical studies, engineering design, and preparation of plans and specifications. The construction engineering, testing and inspection, and Resident Engineering work will not be included in this project, but will be included in a future contract.

### **CRACK SEAL AND SLURRY SEAL RAMP AND HANGARS**

Several cracks have developed in the AC pavement at the Georgetown Airport. Most of the cracks are caused by thermal stresses caused by the many annual cycles of extreme daily changes in temperature at the airport. The pavements are old and have significant surface weathering distress.

It is proposed in this project to shape the cracks to receive joint seal and then seal the cracks. After the cracks have been sealed, all of the old pavements on the tiedown apron, tee hangar taxiways, and airport taxiways will be slurry sealed. All pavement areas sealed will be remarked.

No work is required on the runway since it will be reconstructed in 2005.

## RAMP SECURITY LIGHTING

It is proposed to install security lights for the existing ramp. The lights will consist of 60-foot poles with high-pressure sodium floodlights located on the easterly edge of the apron. The lights will be installed by photocell and time clock so that during the early evening hours when most operations occur, all of the lights are operational; whereas, during the late hours some of the lights at each pole will automatically turn off leaving the minimum light required for security.

## WEST SIDE DEVELOPMENT CONSTRUCTION – 10 ACRES

The project will consist of clearing, grading to approximate runway grade, providing required drainage, and paving the areas proposed for development. The finished paved areas will be sawed and sealed to protect the pavement from thermal cracking. Floodlighting will be provided. The pavements will be marked with standard airport marking.

The existing hill located northwest of the northern end of the runway is an obstruction to aircraft operations and needs to be removed. Environmental mitigation necessary to allow development of the west side facilities will require relocating the existing picnic area. The picnic area can be relocated to the graded area produced by removal of the north hill. A tiedown apron will be constructed at the north end of the runway to allow pilots to continue to fly in to use the picnic area. The development of this area will consist of grading the hill, paving the apron area, relocating the existing rest room and providing water to the site.

## NESTED HANGARS – 10 UNITS

After Projects 1 through 5 have been completed, all required aviation facilities at Georgetown Airport will be completed. In Project No. 6, it is proposed to construct a 10-unit nested hangar. The income from rental of these hangars will assist in making the airport self-sufficient.

## PLACERVILLE AIRPORT

Table 8 provides a list of short-term actions at the Placerville Airport.

**Table 8**  
**Placerville Airport Short-term Action Plan (Up to 10 Years)**

Project/Description	Total Cost	Responsible Agency	Support Agencies	Construction Year
Environmental Assessment Study	\$200,000	El Dorado County	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2006
Engineering Design – East End Apron	\$301,000	El Dorado County	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2006
East End Development Construction, Service Road to East End Development	\$6,830,000	El Dorado County	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2007-08
Crack Repair and Slurry Seal Runway 5-23, Taxiways and Ramp	\$236,900	El Dorado County	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2008

<b>Project/Description</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>Responsible Agency</b>	<b>Support Agencies</b>	<b>Construction Year</b>
Replace MIRL Runway 5-23, Relocate Threshold Runway 23, Remark Runway 5-23, Install PAPI Runway 23	\$430,000	El Dorado County	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2009
Runway Exit Taxiway East End	\$35,400	El Dorado County	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2009
Security Fence and Gates	\$413,000	El Dorado County	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2009
12 Nested Tee Hangar Unit	\$375,000	El Dorado County	FAA, Caltrans, El Dorado County	2010

### **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY**

An Airport Layout Plan Update Study is currently underway for the Placerville Airport. In order to allow proper development of the airport, environmental clearances and permits must be obtained. A detailed Environmental Assessment is required.

### **ENGINEERING DESIGN – EAST END APRON**

An Airport Layout Plan Update Study, including forecasts and baseline environmental studies is underway for Placerville Airport. The study indicates a need for additional aircraft storage facilities. The airport is currently full and there is a waiting list for 90 new hangars. New east end development is proposed to accommodate the additional hangars.

FAA requires that grants be issued based on bids, so it is proposed to perform the Engineering Design at least one year prior to construction. The project includes surveys, geotechnical studies, engineering design and preparation of plans and specifications for the East End Development. It does not include construction surveillance, Resident Engineering or testing and inspection required during construction.

### **EAST END DEVELOPMENT CONSTRUCTION (18 ACRES), SERVICE ROAD TO EAST END DEVELOPMENT (24' X 2,600')**

The increased demand for aircraft storage at the Placerville Airport indicates the necessity to develop a new on-site aircraft storage facility. The only feasible area for this development is at the east end of the runway on the north side. The development will include clearing, grading to the approximate grade of the taxiway, drainage, paving of the hangar and apron areas, and marking and lighting the east end area. The pavement will be sawed and sealed in an appropriate pattern to protect the pavement from thermal cracking. A new service road will be constructed between the existing terminal and the new east end development.

### **CRACK REPAIR AND SLURRY SEAL RUNWAY 5-23, TAXIWAYS, RAMP**

Some cracking of existing pavements has occurred due to thermal stresses and the pavements have weathered to a point that a slurry seal is required. It is proposed to repair these cracks and

then slurry seal the runway, taxiway, and apron. Studies will also be conducted to determine the advisability of installing a joint pattern in the pavements to control further cracking.

**REPLACE MEDIUM INTENSITY RUNWAY LIGHTS (MIRL) ON RUNWAY 5-23, RELOCATE THRESHOLD RUNWAY 23, REMARK RUNWAY 5-23, INSTALL PRECISION APPROACH PATH INDICATOR (PAPI) ON RUNWAY 23.**

The existing runway edge lights on Runway 5-23 are stake mounted with direct burial cable. These lights are old and difficult to maintain. It is proposed to install a new MIRL system with new base mounted lights, new underground electrical duct, new cable and new regulator. Existing signs will be reused. A new 2-box PAPI unit will also be installed on Runway 23.

The threshold to Runway 23 must be displaced approximately 200 feet to meet requirements for extended runway safety area. Some of the existing runway marking will have to be removed and new marking will be applied. To provide uniform marking, the entire runway will be remarked.

**RUNWAY EXIT TAXIWAY EAST END**

Runway 23 is the most commonly used runway at the Placerville Airport. There are currently no taxiways between the threshold of Runway 23 and the apron. The project is proposed to construct a new cross taxiway approximately halfway between the Runway 23 threshold and the first high-speed bleed-off taxiway. The pavement section for the taxiway will consist of 6 inches of aggregate subbase, 6 inches of aggregate base course, and 3 inches of bituminous surface course. Standard airfield marking will be applied.

**SECURITY FENCE AND GATES**

It is important that a security fence be constructed around the Placerville Airport to protect it from human or animal incursion from off site. Housing developments are approaching the airport and there is significant human activity in the area. The proposal is to construct a 6-foot chain link fence with three barbwire on top. This fence will be constructed around the property line. Electrically operated automatic gates will be installed into the main operational areas and additional sliding gates, swing gates, and pedestrian gates will be installed as necessary.

**12 NESTED TEE HANGAR UNIT**

After Projects 1 through 7 have been completed, all required aviation facilities at the Placerville Airport will be complete. In Project No. 8, it is proposed to construct a 12-unit Nested Tee Hangar in the East end development area. The income from the rental of these hangars will assist in making the airport self-sufficient.

**EL DORADO COUNTY AIRPORTS**

[Table 9](#) provides a list of long-term actions at El Dorado County Airports.

**Table 9****El Dorado County Airports Long-term Action Plan (20 Years and Beyond)**

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Responsible/Support Agencies</b>
Continue efforts to avoid conflicts over noise issues	El Dorado County, FALUC, EDCTC, Airport Managers
Continue to protect airspace and runway approaches	El Dorado County, FALUC, EDCTC, Airport Managers
Continue to maintain and improve existing airport facilities in accordance with the Airport Master Plans and Airport Layout Plans	El Dorado County, FALUC, EDCTC, Airport Managers
Assist operators of public use airports in pursuing funding sources	El Dorado County, EDCTC, Airport Managers

**Goods Movement Action Plan**

This Action Plan and the projects listed in [Table 10](#) implement Goal 4 of the Policy Element of this RTP, which pertains to Goods Movement and reads, “Provide for the safe and efficient movement of goods through and within El Dorado County.”

**Table 10****Goods Movement Short and Long-term Action Plan (Up to 10 Years and 20 Years and Beyond)**

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Responsible/Support Agencies</b>
Support projects that facilitate interregional, multi-modal goods transport to commercial and industrial areas wherever feasible	Local jurisdictions, EDCTC, SACOG, Caltrans, Industry
Support projects that facilitate interregional goods movement utilizing the regional system of airports	Local jurisdictions, EDCTC, SACOG, Caltrans, Industry
Support projects that address the timely movement of goods and service throughout the region	Local jurisdictions, EDCTC, SACOG, Caltrans, Industry
Improve State Route 50 in order to facilitate goods movement and access to jobs	Caltrans, SACOG, EDCTC, Local jurisdictions

**Non-Motorized Transportation Action Plan**

The RTP Action Plan for non-motorized transportation includes projects derived from the El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan and from the City of Placerville Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. The Bicycle and Non-Motorized Advisory Committees for the County and City planning documents identified the projects as priorities based on regional connectivity, ability to close gaps between separate regions, and ability to fulfill the goals and objectives of the Bicycle and Non-Motorized Plans. The priority project list was then presented to the RTP Advisory Committee who made further recommendations for priorities and projects. [Table 11](#) is the RTP short-term action plan for non-motorized transportation which reflects the priorities of the RTP Advisory Committee. The short-term action plan takes into account the historical and projected funding levels in El Dorado County for non-motorized projects. The long-term action plan includes projects from Tiers 2 and 3 from the El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan and additional long-term projects from the City of Placerville Non-Motorized Transportation Plan to be completed beyond the 20 year horizon.

This Action Plan implements Goal 5 of the Policy Element of this RTP, which pertains to non-motorized transportation and reads, “Promote a safe, convenient, and efficient non-motorized transportation system which is part of a balanced overall transportation system.”

**Table 11****Non-Motorized Transportation Short-term Action Plan (Up to 10 Years)**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Segment/Description</b>	<b>Planning Level Cost Estimate</b>	<b>Responsible/Support Agency</b>
Highway 50 Grade Separated Crossing in El Dorado Hills	Over or undercrossing from Raley's Center to El Dorado Hills Town Center	\$2 Million	El Dorado County DOT, El Dorado County Parks and Recreation, El Dorado Hills CSD
SPTC – El Dorado Trail – Ray Lawyer to Missouri Flat	Class I Bike Path from Ray Lawyer Drive (in the City of Placerville) to Missouri Flat Road	\$1.2 Million	El Dorado County DOT, El Dorado County Parks and Recreation, City of Placerville
El Dorado Hills to Bass Lake Connection – (phase 1)	Class III Bike Route on Tong Road, Class III Bike Route on Old Bass Lake Road, use existing roadway as Class I Bike Path between gates from Tong to Old Bass Lake Road	\$25,000	El Dorado County DOT, El Dorado Hills CSD
Green Valley Road Bike Lanes	Class II Bike Lanes from the County Line to Cameron Park Drive	\$50,000	El Dorado County DOT, El Dorado Hills CSD
Silva Valley Road Bike Lanes	From the new connection with White Rock Road to Green Valley Road	\$700,000	El Dorado County DOT, El Dorado Hills CSD
El Dorado Hills Boulevard Bike Path – (phase 1)	Sign and stripe existing Class I Paths in two locations: 1) From Harvard Way to St. Andrews 2) From Governors Drive to Brittney Way	\$10,000	El Dorado County DOT, El Dorado Hills CSD
Bass Lake Road Bike Lanes	Class II Bike Lanes from Green Valley Road to Highway 50	\$1.5 Million	El Dorado County DOT, El Dorado Hills CSD
White Rock Road Bike lanes	Entire Length, to County Line	\$175,000	El Dorado County DOT, El Dorado Hills CSD
Northside School Bike Path and Class II Bike Lanes	Class I Bike Path from Northside School in Cool to Highway 49/193 intersection. Class II Bike Lanes on Highway 193 from Highway 49 to the Community of Auburn Lake Trails.	\$1 Million	El Dorado County DOT, Georgetown Divide Parks and Recreation District
Cameron Park Drive Bike Lanes	Entire Length	\$525,000	El Dorado County DOT

<b>Project</b>	<b>Segment/Description</b>	<b>Planning Level Cost Estimate</b>	<b>Responsible/Support Agency</b>
El Dorado Trail in Placerville – Main Street to Ray Lawyer Drive	Main Street/Placerville Drive (future connection) to Ray Lawyer Drive	\$400,000	City of Placerville, Caltrans
Placerville Drive Mallard Lane, Green Valley Road Bike Lanes	Mallard Lane from City Limit to Green Valley Road, Green Valley Road from Mallard Lane to Placerville Drive, and Placerville Drive from Ray Lawyer Drive to Hwy 50, and on the bridge over Hangtown Creek	\$400,000	City of Placerville
El Dorado Hills Blvd Bike Lanes	Phase 1: Saratoga Way to Governor Dr./St. Andrews	\$437,500	El Dorado County DOT, El Dorado Hills CSD
El Dorado Hills Blvd Bike Path	Phase 2: Utilizing an existing golf cart undercrossing of Serrano Parkway, extend the bike path from the current terminus at Serrano Parkway to Raley’s Center	\$200,000	El Dorado County DOT, El Dorado Hills CSD
Harvard Way Bike Path	From Clermont Road to El Dorado Hills Boulevard	\$200,000	El Dorado County DOT, El Dorado Hills CSD
Bike Path Parallel to Highway 50 on the north side -EDH to Bass Lake Connection	Phase 2: EDH to Bass Lake Connection From Silva Valley Road to El Dorado Hills Town Center	\$300,000	El Dorado County DOT, El Dorado Hills CSD
Country Club Drive Bike Lanes	Phase 1: Bass Lake Road to Cambridge Road	\$350,000	El Dorado County DOT
Meder Road Bike Lanes	Phase 1: Cameron Park Drive to Paloran Court	\$175,000	El Dorado County DOT
Palmer Drive Bike Lanes	Entire Length	\$87,500	El Dorado County DOT
Coach Lane Bike Lanes	Entire Length	\$131,250	El Dorado County DOT
Palmer Drive Bike Path Connection	From Wild Chaparral Drive to Palmer Drive	\$200,000	El Dorado County DOT
Durock Road Bike Lanes	Entire Length	\$350,000	El Dorado County DOT
Ponderosa Road Bike Lanes	Highway 50 to Meder Road	\$131,250	El Dorado County DOT

<b>Project</b>	<b>Segment/Description</b>	<b>Planning Level Cost Estimate</b>	<b>Responsible/Support Agency</b>
Latrobe Road Bike Lanes	Investment Boulevard to Deer Creek/SPTC	\$525,000	El Dorado County DOT
SPTC/El Dorado Trail	Phase 3: Latrobe Road to County Line	\$2.4 Million	El Dorado County DOT, El Dorado Hills CSD Potential Developer Funds
Missouri Flat Road Bike Lanes	Phase 1: Campus Drive to existing Class II on the south side of Highway 50	\$350,000	El Dorado County DOT
Missouri Flat Road Bike Lanes	Phase 2: SPTC near Wal-Mart to Pleasant Valley Road	\$175,000	El Dorado County DOT
Jaquier Road Bike Lanes	Placerville City limit to Carson Road	\$175,000	El Dorado County DOT
Pleasant Valley Road Bike Lanes	Phase 1: Big Cut Road to Missouri Flat Road	\$350,000	El Dorado County DOT
Pleasant Valley Road Bike Lanes	Phase 2: Missouri Flat Road to Mother Lode Drive	\$525,000	El Dorado County DOT
Mother Lode Drive Bike Lanes	Phase 1: Missouri Flat Road to Lindberg Ave	\$175,000	El Dorado County DOT
Enterprise Drive Bike Route	Entire Length	\$1,000	El Dorado County DOT
Gold Hill Road Bike Route	Highway 49 to Lotus Road	\$4,000	El Dorado County DOT
Commerce Way Bike Route	Entire Length	\$1,000	El Dorado County DOT
Pleasant Valley Road Bike Lanes	Bluff Road to Blackhawk Lane	\$262,500	El Dorado County DOT
Carson Road Bike Lanes	Jaquier Rd to Larsen Drive (on climbing shoulder)	\$787,500	El Dorado County DOT
Lotus Road Bike Lanes	Phase 1: Gold Hill Road to Highway 49	\$525,000	El Dorado County DOT
Gold Hill Road Bike Route	Highway 49 to Lotus Road	\$4,000	El Dorado County DOT

## **Transportation Systems Management/Transportation Demand Management Action Plan**

This Action Plan implements Goal 6, Objective B, of the Policy Element of this RTP, which pertains to TDM and reads, “Advance the use of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) in a thorough, cost-effective manner.” [Table 12](#) provides a list of the short and long-term action plans for transportation systems management and transportation demand management.

**Table 12**

### **Transportation Systems Management/Transportation Demand Management Short and Long-term Action Plan (Up to 10 Years and 20 Years and Beyond)**

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Responsible/Support Agencies</b>
Work cooperatively with neighboring jurisdictions to implement ITS improvements in the region	EDCTC, SACOG, TRPA, NCTC, PCTPA, Sierra County, Caltrans
Continue to work cooperatively with Caltrans, SACOG, SMAQMD, and 50Corridor.com on implementation and enhancement of regional rideshare programs that encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation.	Caltrans, SACOG, SMAQMD, EDCTC, 50Corridor.com, local employers, schools
Implement traffic flow improvements on regionally significant roadways	EDCTC, jurisdictions, Caltrans
Improve and expand public transportation systems as feasible.	EDCTC, EDCTA
Develop and expand facilities to support the use of alternative transportation such as pedestrian and bicycle facilities and park-and-ride lots (Green valley Road)	EDCTC, EDCTA, jurisdictions, Caltrans
School congestion mitigation – school pool, walking school buses	El Dorado County/City of Placerville/School Districts/EDCTC
Expand the use of alternative fuels to reduce impacts on air quality.	EDCTC, SACOG, EDC APCD, SMAQMD, EDCTA, jurisdictions

## **Intelligent Transportation Systems Action Plan**

This Action Plan and the projects listed in [Table 13](#) implement Goals 1.A.4 and 2.D.4 of the Policy Element of this RTP, which pertain to Intelligent Transportation Systems and reads, “Incorporate Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) strategies where feasible.”

**Table 13**

### **Intelligent Transportation Systems short and Long-term Action Plan (Up to 10 Years and 20 Years and Beyond)**

<b>Project Number</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Cost</b>
EC1	Placerville Signal System Technology Advances	High	\$800,000
EC2	Lower U.S. 50 Freeway Management	High	\$500,000
EC3	U.S. 50 Winter Traffic Management	High	\$250,000
EC4	U.S. 50 Traveler Information	High	\$1,500,000

Project Number	Project Description	Priority	Cost
EC5	U.S. 50 Surveillance	High	\$1,100,000
EC6	Implement/Expand AVI/AVL/CAD Technologies for Public Transit	High	\$600,000
EC7	Install Ice Detection and Warning Systems	Medium	\$200,000
EC8	Install Downhill Speed Warning System on U.S. 50 Near Camino	Low	\$100,000
EC9	Install Animal Vehicle Collision Avoidance Systems-Hwy 49 and U.S. 50	Low	\$150,000
EC10	AVI/AVL For Emergency Vehicles	Low	\$400,000
EC11	Install Rock/Mudslide and Avalanche Detection and Warning System	Low	\$200,000

SACOG is responsible for maintaining and updating the Tahoe Gateway Regional Architecture as required in coordination with the Tahoe Gateway Maintenance Team. SACOG will update its four-County ITS Strategic Deployment Plan and will address integration with the Tahoe Gateway Regional Architecture as part of that process.

## **THE FINANCIAL ELEMENT**

The purpose of the Financial Element is to discuss the financial issues involved with implementing the transportation projects and programs contained in the RTP. The Financial Element provides estimates of the costs and revenues necessary to implement the projects identified in the Action Element. It also identifies the funding constrained list of short-term and long-term candidate projects, and potential funding shortfalls. Lastly, it identifies the candidate projects if additional funding becomes available.

### ***Federal Programs***

The Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century (TEA 21) is a federal program to fund highways, transit, and safety programs over the six years of funding authorization, from 1997 to 2003. As of January 1, 2005, this federal program has not been reauthorized; rather, TEA-21 has been extended through a series of continuing resolutions. Funding is generated almost entirely by a motor fuel tax and distributed through over twenty different programs that control application by facility type, permitted use, and geographic location. Federal programs of interest to El Dorado County include: the Regional Surface Transportation Program,

### **REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP)**

RSTP was established by the 1991 Federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and continued with the passage of TEA 21 in 1997. Of all the funding programs in TEA 21, RSTP is most flexible. A broad variety of transportation projects and modes, including streets and roads, are eligible.

Examples of projects eligible for RSTP include highway projects; bridges (including construction, reconstruction, seismic retrofit and painting); transit capital improvements; carpool, parking, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities; safety improvements and hazard elimination; research; traffic management systems; surface transportation planning; transportation enhancement activities and control measures; and wetland and other environmental mitigation.

Eighty percent of the apportionment is distributed among the urbanized and non-urbanized areas of the State through Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies. The remainder goes directly to counties in a formula equal to 110 percent of the Federal Aid Urban/Federal Aid Secondary (FAU/FAS) funding in place prior to 1991.

The estimated annual program level is \$320 million statewide and \$1 million for El Dorado County.

### **CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROGRAM (CMAQ)**

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program was established by the 1991 Federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and was re-authorized with the passage of TEA-21. Funds are directed to transportation projects and programs which contribute to the attainment of maintenance of National Ambient Air Quality Standards in non-attainment or air quality maintenance areas for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter under provisions in the federal Clean Air Act. As part of the Sacramento Valley air basin, which is in non-attainment for ozone, El Dorado County is eligible for CMAQ funds.

Eligible federal-aid projects include public transit improvements; high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes; Intelligent Transportation Infrastructure; traffic management and traveler information systems (i.e., electric toll collection systems); employer-based transportation management plans and incentives; traffic flow improvement programs (signal coordination); fringe parking facilities serving multiple occupancy vehicles; shared ride services; bicycle and pedestrian facilities; flexible work-hour programs; outreach activities establishing Transportation Management Associations (TMAs); fare/fee subsidy programs; and under certain conditions, PM-10 projects.

The estimated annual program level is \$360 million statewide and \$1.8 million for El Dorado County.

### **TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES PROGRAM (TEA)**

Federal Transportation Enhancement Activity funds are to be used for transportation-related capital improvement projects that enhance quality-of-life in or around transportation facilities. Projects must be over and above required mitigation and normal transportation projects, and the project must be directly related to the surface transportation system. The projects should have a quality-of-life benefit while providing the greatest benefit to the greatest number of people. TEA funds are programmed as part of the State Transportation Improvement Program process.

Under TEA 21, California received approximately \$60 million per year for six years, starting in 1997. This is divided into the following four shares: 1) Regional; 2) Conservation Lands; 3)

Caltrans; and 4) Statewide Transportation Enhancement. Regional Transportation Planning Agencies receive 75 percent of the TEA dollars in California, which are distributed to regions via the same formula as State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds. The remaining 25 percent goes to the State.

The estimated annual program level is \$271,000 for El Dorado County.

#### **HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM (HBRR)**

The intent of the Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation program is to rehabilitate or replace bridges that are unsafe because of structural deficiencies, physical deterioration, or functional obsolescence.

Deficient highway bridges eligible for replacement or rehabilitation must be over waterways, other topographical barriers, other highways, or railroads. HBRR funds may be used for:

- The total replacement of a structurally deficient or functionally obsolete highway bridge on any public road with a new facility constructed in the same general traffic corridor
- The rehabilitation that is required to restore the structural integrity of a bridge on any public road, as well as the rehabilitation work necessary to correct major safety (functional) defects
- The replacement of low-water crossings
- Bridge painting and bridge railing replacement

Funding is distributed by continuous competitive project selection through Caltrans. The estimated annual program level is \$160 million statewide and \$1 million for El Dorado County.

#### **HAZARD ELIMINATION SAFETY PROGRAM (HES)**

The purpose of this program is to eliminate or reduce the number and severity of traffic accidents at hazardous locations. To be eligible for federal HES funds, the project must be located on any local road. Projects must correct an identified safety hazard or problem.

The estimated annual program funding level is \$10 million statewide and \$500,000 for El Dorado County.

#### **SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROGRAM (SR2S)**

Caltrans has established a “Safe Routes to School” construction program utilizing federal transportation funds for construction of bicycle and pedestrian safety and traffic calming projects. To be eligible for SR2S funds, the project must be located on either a state highway or local road. Projects must correct an identified safety hazard or problem or a route that students use for trips to, and from, school. The SR2S program was created as a subset of the Hazard Elimination Safety (HES) program.

The annual program funding level is approximately \$20 million. No funding from this program is assumed for El Dorado County. This program is a demonstration program extended to sunset on January 1, 2008.

### **EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM (ER)**

The ER Program is intended to assist local agencies when local resources are inadequate to cope with disasters or catastrophic failures. For a declared disaster, ER funds are intended to aid state and local highway agencies in paying unusually heavy expenses or repairing serious damage to Federal-aid highways resulting from natural disasters or catastrophic failure. Only work that exceeds heavy maintenance, is extraordinary, and restores the facility to its previous level of service is eligible.

Annually, \$100 million per state per disaster is made available nationally for ER projects. The amount available to an individual state varies each year depending on disasters experienced by the states. No funding from this program is assumed for El Dorado County.

### **FEDERAL DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS**

There are a number of highway, transit, and rail discretionary programs available to California applicants authorized by various sections of TEA-21. Funding for these programs vary – some are formula driven and others are nationally competitive.

Following are some of the programs with a short description and approximate annual nationwide funding:

- **Corridors and Borders:** Provides funds to states for coordinated planning, design and construction of transportation corridors of national significance, economic growth or interregional or international trade. Approximately \$130 million is available annually nationwide.
- **Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program:** Researches relationships between transportation, community preservation and the environment and funds projects to address transportation efficiency and community system preservation. Approximately \$25 million is available nationwide.
- **National Scenic Byways:** Provides funding for eligible scenic byway projects along All-American Roads or designated scenic byways and for the planning, design and development of State scenic byway programs. Approximately \$24 million is available annually nationwide.
- **Public Lands Highways:** Provides funding for eligible transportation projects within, adjacent to, or providing access to the areas served by federal public lands highways. Approximately \$83.6 million is available annually nationwide.

- Interstate Maintenance Discretionary: Provides funding for resurfacing, restoring, rehabilitating and reconstructing, including adding travel lanes, on designated portions of Interstate System routes.
- Intelligent Transportation System Deployment: Provides funds for ITS integration and deployment projects. Funding and projects are congressionally designated. Approximately \$100 million is available annually nationwide.
- Job Access and Reverse Commute Grants: Provides competitive grants to local government and non-profit organizations to develop transportation services to connect welfare recipients and low-income persons to employment and support services. Approximately \$500 million is available over the life of TEA-21.
- Urban and Rural Area Formula Grants (Section 5307 and 5311): Provides formula grants for transit purposes to urbanized areas (El Dorado Hills) and rural areas (remainder of El Dorado County).
- Section 5310 Capital Grants: Provides competitive grants to public and non-profit transportation providers for capital purchases to support transportation of elderly persons and persons with disabilities. Approximately \$7 million is available annually in California.
- Section 5309 Capital Investment Grants: Provides grants for New Start projects, fixed guideway, rail and bus modernization.

The estimated annual federal discretionary program level for El Dorado County is \$1.5 million.

**FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM (HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS)**

A demonstration project is specifically established and funded by Congress through federal law. Demonstration projects are generally provided as part of the periodic transportation authorization acts or the annual transportation appropriation acts. The federal reimbursement rate is 80 percent; however, demonstration funds provided by legislation may not be enough to fully fund a project. Demonstration projects are initiated by Congress, usually at the request of constituents within a given congressional district.

No funding from this program is assumed for El Dorado County.

**FTA SECTION 5307**

Formerly known as the Section 9 program, Section 5307 provides operating and capital assistance funds for transit services in urbanized areas by formula. In El Dorado County, only transit in El Dorado Hills is eligible for these funds. Because the FTA recognizes the overall Sacramento urbanized area as a single unit, Section 5307 funds are funneled to El Dorado Transit via Sacramento Regional Transit.

The estimated annual program level for El Dorado County is \$400,000.

## **FTA SECTION 5311**

Formerly known as the Section 18 program, Section 5311 provides operating and capital assistance funds for transit services in non-urbanized/rural areas by formula. Caltrans administers this program, with the assistance of regional transportation planning agencies.

The estimated annual program level for El Dorado County is \$200,000.

## **AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (AIP)**

The Federal AIP provides grants to public agencies, private owners and entities, for the planning and development of public-use airports that are in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS). Eligible projects include improvements related to enhancing airport safety, capacity, security, and environmental concerns. In general, sponsors can use AIP funds on most airfield capital improvements or repairs, except for terminals hangars, and non-aviation development. Approximately \$165 million was provided to California airports in 1999.

## ***State Programs***

State funding also comes largely from the fuel tax, though recent changes in law now provide for some contribution from the state sales tax on motor fuel. State funds are combined with funding from various federal programs through the biennial State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) programming process and apportioned to the state highway system projects, and other projects throughout the state on the basis of a geographically based formula. State programs of interest to El Dorado County include:

## **STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP)**

The STIP is a multi-year capital improvement program that assists state and local entities to plan and implement transportation improvements and to utilize resources in a cost effective manner. All STIP projects must be capital projects (including project development costs) needed to improve transportation. These projects generally may include, but are not limited to, improving state highways, local roads, public transit, intercity rail, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, grade separations, transportation system management, transportation demand management, soundwalls, intermodal facilities, safety, and environmental enhancement and mitigation, including TEA projects.

STIP funding is split 25 percent to the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) for projects nominated by Caltrans, and 75 percent to County Shares for the state's 58 counties for projects nominated in each county's Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), as decided by regional agencies. The overall STIP is adopted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC), which can accept or reject each RTIP and ITIP in its entirety.

The currently programmed STIP (2004-05 through 2008-09) has total funding of \$7.76 billion, of which RTIP comprises \$5.4 billion and ITIP is \$2.36 billion. EDCTC currently has \$38.512 million in RTIP, with another \$4.4 million in ITIP, programmed in the STIP (refer to [Table 14](#)).

The estimated annual program level for El Dorado County, including both RTIP and ITIP, is \$10.2 million.

**TABLE 14**  
**EDCTC 2004 Regional Transportation Improvement Program**

2004 RTIP	Fiscal Year (\$1,000)							
	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	Total
50 HOV Lane								0
Missouri Flat IC						17,620		17,620
Western Placerville ICs					1,825			1,825
50 Placerville Ops				17,181				17,181
50 Camino IC								0
TE Reserve				649	278	188	240	1,355
EDCTC PPM		100*	100	110	62	80	79	531
Total		100*	100	17,940	2,118	17,935	319	38,512

\*NOTE: Allocated by the California Transportation Commission on February 26, 2004.

#### **STATE HIGHWAY OPERATIONS AND PROTECTION PROGRAM (SHOPP)**

The SHOPP is a ten year program developed by Caltrans for the expenditure of transportation funds for major capital improvements that are necessary to preserve and protect the state highway system. Projects included in the SHOPP are limited to capital improvements relative to maintenance, safety, and rehabilitation of state highways and bridges which do not add capacity to the system.

The estimated annual program level for El Dorado County is \$6.4 million.

#### **LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUND (LTF)**

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) of 1971 added ¼ percent to the statewide sales tax to fund transit services throughout the state. These monies, known as the Local Transportation Fund, are returned to the county of origin for use to operate the transit systems in that area. The funds are administered by the regional transportation planning agency in accordance with TDA regulations. While the primary focus of the LTF is transit service, there are provisions for use of the funds for other transportation modes. For example, under Section 99233.3 of the TDA statute, regions may elect to set aside up to two percent of the LTF for pedestrian and bicycle projects. In regions with less than 500,000 population, some funds may also be used for street and road purposes upon completion of an annual unmet transit needs process.

Funding levels vary both annually and by locale, depending on the sales tax generated. The estimated annual local program level for El Dorado County is \$4.5 million.

#### **STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE (STA) FUND**

In addition to the LTF, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) of 1971 also established a program of direct subvention for transit services through state generated funding, known as the Public Transportation Account (PTA). Funds are allocated through the annual state budget. Distribution is calculated by the State Controller and administered by the regional transportation planning agency. Funds are distributed under Section 99313 of the Public Utilities Code based on population, and under Section 99314 based on the fares generated by the various transit operators.

Funding levels vary annually, based on the state budget. Approximately \$104 million was available statewide for FY 2003/04. The estimated annual program level for El Dorado County is \$400,000.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT AND MITIGATION PROGRAM (EEM)**

The purpose of the EEM Program is to mitigate environmental impacts or new or modified public transportation facilities beyond the mitigation level required by the project's environmental document. Projects must provide mitigation or enhancement in addition to the mitigation required as part of the transportation projects to which they are related. Funding is distributed on a competitive basis and is administered jointly by the Resource Agency and Caltrans.

The annual program level available statewide is \$10 million. No funding from this program is assumed for El Dorado County.

#### **BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION ACCOUNT PROGRAM (BTA)**

The BTA is intended to provide funds for bicycle transportation, which is recognized as an important and low cost mode of public transportation. The BTA provides funds to local agencies for projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters. To be eligible for BTA funding, cities and counties must have an adopted Bicycle Transportation Plan that has been approved by the appropriate regional transportation planning agency and Caltrans. Funding is awarded by competitive grant and administered by Caltrans.

The funding level of the BTA increases each fiscal year, from \$1 million in fiscal year 1999/00 to \$5 million starting in fiscal year 2006/07. Applicants provide a match of at least 10 percent of the total project cost. The estimated annual program level for El Dorado County is \$300,000.

#### **PETROLEUM VIOLATION ESCROW ACCOUNT (PVEA)**

Funds from the PVEA are intended to result in energy savings or displacement of nonrenewable energy. PVEA funds are available as a result of Federal Court decisions and settlement agreements against a number of oil companies and producers which ordered refunds to the States

for petroleum product price overcharges. PVEA projects must result in energy savings or displace nonrenewable energy and provide restitution to the motoring public who were injured by the oil price overcharges.

Program Funding varies and requires legislative approval. No funding from this program is assumed for El Dorado County.

#### **TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF PROGRAM (TCRP)**

The TCRP is a one-time direction of surplus state funds to transportation purposes. At an overall total of more than \$5.3 billion, funding has been provided for selected projects that will relieve traffic congestion, improve goods movement, and provide connectivity between systems. A component of the TCRP program includes approximately \$1.5 billion generated through the dedication of the sales tax on motor fuel over five years (2001/02 through 2005/06), distributed 40 percent to augment the STIP, 40 percent to cities and counties for continued local street and road maintenance, and 40 percent to augment the Public Transportation Account.

No funding from this program is assumed for El Dorado County.

#### **FUEL TAXES**

The State of California imposes an excise tax of 18 cents per gallon on motor fuel. These funds are then distributed by formula directly to cities and counties for street and road maintenance.

#### **CALIFORNIA AID TO AIRPORTS PROGRAM (CAAP)**

The CAAP encompasses three different programs administered by Caltrans Division of Aeronautics. These include discretionary grants for capital improvements, annual grants of \$10,000 each to general aviation airports, and matching funds for Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants.

A total of \$6.6 million was available for the CAAP in 1999. The estimated annual program level for El Dorado County is \$20,000.

#### ***Local Programs***

#### **TRANSIT FARES**

Funds generated by passenger fares on transit are used to help fund that transit system. Under the requirements of the TDA, fares must generate at least 10 percent of the operating revenue for rural transit systems, and 15 percent for others.

The estimated annual local program level for El Dorado County is \$600,000.

## GENERAL FUNDS

At the discretion of the City Council or Board of Supervisors, City and County general funds generated primarily from property and local sales taxes may be used to augment transportation funding. With high demand on such funds, and generally low availability, general funds are not considered a strong source of transportation funding.

The estimated annual local program level for El Dorado County is \$1.7 million.

## TRAFFIC IMPACT FEES

Under state law, jurisdictions may impose fees on development that mitigate their impacts on local services. One common impact fee is for traffic generated by the new development on the road system. Fees must be backed by a traffic study that provides a nexus of the improvements to the traffic generated by the development, as required by AB 1600. El Dorado County currently manages four traffic impact fee programs: Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee (West Slope); El Dorado Hills/Salmon Falls Road Impact Fee (EDH RIF); State Transportation Impact Mitigation Fee (STIM); and Interim Highway 50 Variable Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee (50 TIM).

The estimated annual local program level for El Dorado County is \$25 million in the short-term (2005-2015).

## ESTIMATED REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

Table 15 provides a breakdown of the estimated revenues and expenditures for federal, state, and local funds.

**Table 15**

**Summary of Estimated Revenues (in millions of current dollars de-escalated to 2004)**

Program	Applicable Uses	Short Term 2005-2015	Long Term 2016-2025	Total	Annual Average
<b>FEDERAL FUNDS</b>					
CMAQ - Urban	Roads, Transit, Non-Motorized, TDM, TCM	19.8	18.9	38.7	1.8
Regional STP - Urban	Highways, Roads, Transit, Non-Motorized, TDM, TCM	1.1	1.0	2.1	0.1
Regional STP - Rural	Highways, Roads, Transit, Non-Motorized, TDM, TCM	9.2	5.6	14.8	0.7
FTA 5307	Transit	4.4	5.0	9.4	0.4
FTA 5309	Transit	2.2	2.5	4.7	0.2
FTA 5310	Transit	0.5	0.6	1.1	0.1
FTA 5311b	Transit	2.0	2.4	4.4	0.2
State Transit Assistance (STA)	Transit	3.6	4.2	7.8	0.4
Federal Discretionary Programs	Highways, Roads, Transit	12.0	13.0	25.0	1.2

Program	Applicable Uses	Short Term 2005-2015	Long Term 2016-2025	Total	Annual Average
SUBTOTAL		\$ 54.8	\$ 53.2	\$ 108.0	\$ 5.1
<b>STATE FUNDS</b>					
STIP – RTIP and ITIP share	Highways, Roads, Non-Motorized	\$ 116.2	\$ 110.2	\$ 26.4	\$ 3.9
SHOPP	Highways, Bridges	70.8	64.4	135.2	6.4
Highway Maintenance	Highways, Roads	67.6	77.2	144.8	6.9
California Aid to Airports Program	Airports	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.02
Bicycle Transportation Acct Program	Bicycle	3.3	3.0	6.3	0.3
SUBTOTAL		\$ 258.1	\$ 255.0	\$ 513.1	\$ 24.4
<b>LOCAL FUNDS</b>					
STP Guarantee (for FAS)	Highways, Roads, Transit, Non-Motorized, TDM, TCM	\$ 2.3	\$ 2.1	\$ 4.4	\$ 0.2
Transportation Development Act (TDA)	Highways, Roads, Non-Motorized	45.0	50.1	95.1	4.5
Gas Tax Subventions	Roads	107.3	103.3	210.6	10.0
Transit Fares	Transit	7.1	5.8	12.9	0.6
Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fees	Roads, Transit, Non-Motorized, Highways	258.8	0.0	258.8	12.3
Special District Funds - Local	As directed	2.4	2.2	4.6	0.2
General Funds - Roads	As directed	19.0	17.3	36.3	1.7
Caltrans Discretionary	Highways, Roads	15.2	16.0	31.2	1.5
SUBTOTAL		\$ 457.1	\$ 196.8	\$ 653.9	\$ 31.1
<b>TOTAL FEDERAL, STATE &amp; LOCAL FUNDS</b>		<b>\$ 770.0</b>	<b>\$ 505.0</b>	<b>\$ 1,275.0</b>	<b>\$ 60.7</b>

## REGIONAL ROAD NETWORK

Revenue sources applicable to funding regional road network projects are included in [Table 15](#). The estimate of expenditures for the regional road network short-term action plan is \$608,831,000. The list of projects reflects identified projects on US 50, SR 49, and regionally significant projects within El Dorado County and the City of Placerville. [NOTE: The project list, and estimate of expenditures, will be updated based on the El Dorado County Capital Improvement Program, scheduled for Board of Supervisors action in June 2005 and the El Dorado County Department of Transportation analysis of maintenance and rehabilitation needs, scheduled for May 2005].

The long-term action plan includes several projects for which estimates have not yet been developed. It is reasonable to assume that prior to the next RTP update, scheduled for 2009, planning level cost estimates will be available.

The short-term and long-term regional road network action plans are consistent with the EDCTC Regional Transportation Improvement Program, the El Dorado County General Plan, and the City of Placerville General Plan.

## **TRANSIT**

Revenue sources applicable to funding transit projects are included in [Table 15](#). The estimate of expenditures to support transit operations and maintenance, and to implement the short-term action plan, is \$54,118,790. The list of projects reflects the Western El Dorado County Short Range Transit Plan and maintains current service levels throughout the planning horizon.

The long-term action plan includes several projects for which estimates have not yet been developed. The list of projects reflects the Western El Dorado County Long Range Transit Plan. It is reasonable to assume that prior to the next RTP update, scheduled for 2009, planning level cost estimates will be available.

## **AVIATION**

Revenue sources applicable to funding aviation projects are included in [Table 15](#). The estimate of expenditures to support the Cameron Park, Georgetown, and Placerville Airport operations is \$16,207,800, funded with a combination of California Aid to Airports Program funds, special district funds and user fees. The short-term action plan is consistent with the Cameron Park, Georgetown, and Placerville Airport Master Plans.

The Airport Master Plans do not include a long-term horizon.

## **GOODS MOVEMENT**

Revenue sources applicable to funding goods movement functions, and associated projects, are reflected in the regional road network, transit, aviation, and intelligent transportation systems short and long term action plans.

## **NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION**

Revenue sources applicable to funding non-motorized transportation projects are included in [Table 15](#). The estimate of expenditures to implement the short-term non-motorized transportation action plan is \$16,807,500, funded with a combination of Bicycle Transportation Grant funds, Regional Surface Transportation Program funds, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds, Transportation Development Act funds, and other sources.

The estimate of expenditures to implement the long-term non-motorized action plan is \$25,673,750.

The short-term and long-term action plans are consistent with the adopted El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan and the City of Placerville Non-Motorized Transportation Plan.

## **TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT**

Revenue sources applicable to funding Transportation Systems Management functions, and associated projects, are reflected in the regional road network, transit, non-motorized, and intelligent transportation systems short and long term action plans.

## **INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS**

Revenue sources applicable to funding Intelligent Transportation Systems projects are included in [Table 15](#). The estimate of expenditures to implement the short-term Intelligent Transportation Systems action plan is \$6,950,000 and the long-term action plan is \$2,000,000. Federal Discretionary Programs, as well as traditional regional road network fund sources, are the most likely sources to fund these systems. The short-term and long-term action plans are consistent with the Tahoe Gateway Intelligent Transportation Systems Strategic Deployment Plan.

## **PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION**

Revenue sources applicable to funding EDCTC's planning and administration are included in [Table 15](#). The estimate of expenditures for planning and administration in the short-term (2005-2015) is \$9,790,000 and in the long-term (2015-2025) is \$10,246,800.

### ***Summary of Short-term (2005-2015) Expenditures by Mode***

#### **SUMMARY**

The Regional Transportation Plan identifies a very short list of new projects. In fact, most of the projects identified for State Transportation Improvement Program funding represent existing projects to address existing deficiencies or safety and operational concerns. Based on the preceding revenue/expenditure analysis, the El Dorado County region will not have the necessary funds to implement all of the regions identified transportation projects during the twenty-year horizon of this plan. The most significant funding shortfall has been identified for major state highway improvements, including rehabilitation, maintenance and operations needs of the existing system. As for other transportation modes included in the Action Element, additional revenues are also needed, albeit at a lower cost, to implement the identified transit, aviation, goods movement, non-motorized, and other transportation system improvements.

In May of 1999, the California Transportation Commission published a 10-year needs assessment of California's transportation system, which identified \$117 billion in unfunded needs. El Dorado's portion is \$232.5 million in unfunded high-priority state highway projects; \$103.5 million in unfunded rehabilitation, maintenance, and operations of the existing system; and \$1.6 million in transit capital and operations needs. Several of the projects identified in the 1999 assessment are included in the short-term or long-term action element; however, several projects remain unfunded. [Table 16](#) summarizes the unfunded projects.

**Table 16**  
**Unfunded Projects**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Estimated Cost (in millions)</b>
<b>Local Arterial Projects</b>	
Highway 50 widening (4 to 6 lanes) from South Shingle Road to El Dorado Hills Blvd.	\$ 31.3
Highway 50 through Placerville - ultimate improvements	\$ 118.2
Highway 50 widening (4 to 6 lanes) from Missouri Flat Rd. to Forni Rd.	\$ 7.1
Ray Lawyer Dr. extension	\$ 9.5
City of Placerville local circulation improvements (parallel capacity to Highway 50)	\$ 11.8
Local Arterial Projects subtotal	\$ 177.9
<b>Transit Projects</b>	
Rail Capital - rolling stock	\$ 1.5
Bus Capital - rolling stock, alternate fuel conversion	\$ 2.3
Bus Capital – other, including transit expansion	\$ 3.8
Transit Projects subtotal	\$ 7.6
<b>Total Unfunded projects</b>	<b>\$ 185.5</b>

### **FUNDING STRATEGY CONCEPTS**

The financial projections do not keep pace with the significant transportation infrastructure improvements necessary to address the existing multi-modal needs in El Dorado County.

This section of the Financial Element presents options that El Dorado County could consider in order to obtain additional revenues. Several funding mechanisms are introduced; however, these funding strategies are presented for information purposes and are not presented as recommendations for the 2025 Regional Transportation Plan.

### **LOCAL TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX**

Since 1984, state law has permitted counties to impose a sales tax dedicated to transportation purposes with the approval of a majority of the county voters. Approximately 17 counties passed transportation sales taxes between 1984 and 1994, generating billions of dollars for transportation purposes in those counties. In 1995, however, it was determined by the State Supreme Court that transportation sales taxes were special taxes and under Proposition 62, would require a 2/3 majority vote. As of the November 2004 election, 18 counties, representing approximately 85 percent of the State's population, have passed a local transportation sales tax. The estimated annual program level for a ½ cent sales tax option in El Dorado County is \$9 million.

### **LOCAL OPTION MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX**

The State has raised the gas tax through the passage of Proposition 111 in 1990. The fuel tax is now at 18 cents per gallon. Senate Bill 215 authorizes counties to hold an election to tax local sales of gasoline. An increase in fuel tax requires a 2/3 approval of the general electorate. The

statutes do not limit the amount of tax increase that may be voted upon. One advantage to a motor vehicle fuel tax is that it is user oriented. Fuel consumption is related to roadway use, thus users bear the burden of costs commensurate with their use.

### **PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS**

Public/private partnerships involve cooperative development of projects involving the efforts of a private company and a public agency. Examples of joint development include the private development of a public facility, cooperative financing of public facilities, transfer of development rights, and density bonuses. The legal basis for joint development depends on the circumstances of the agreement; however, generally the authority to require dedication of land or exactions as a condition of development derives from the agency's police power to protect public interests.

### **PEAK HOUR CONGESTION PRICING**

This is a fee charged to those using transportation facilities during the peak period. As a user charge, it is neither a tax nor a toll and, therefore, not subject to state or federal tax restrictions. Congestion pricing, while raising additional funds, has secondary benefits for transportation systems. The imposition of user charges creates a disincentive to the use of transportation systems during peak periods. This provides motivation for transportation system users to spread their use to non-peak periods. As a result, the system demand is more evenly distributed, thus creating greater efficiency of use.

### **BOND MEASURES**

Cities and counties may issue general obligation bonds payable through increased property taxes by a 2/3 majority vote of the general electorate. These bonds may be used to fund government services, including transportation improvements.

### ***Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)***

The EDCTC will be the Lead Agency for the proposed project, pursuant to the State Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 15050. This Initial Study identifies and discusses the environmental topics that are less than significant and do not require further detailed analysis in an EIR as well as those environmental topics that are potentially-significant and require further detailed analysis in a Program-level EIR. The Initial Study and Notice of Preparation will be circulated for agency and public review for 30 days, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15073(d).

The following additional agency approvals apply to the proposed project. No specific permits are required by any other responsible or trustee agencies to approve the proposed project. However, there are numerous permits and approvals that may be required to implement the improvements identified in the RTP.

- City of Placerville

- County of El Dorado
- California Transportation Commission
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)
- Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)
- Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC)
- Regional Transportation Plan Advisory Committee
- Placerville Non-motorized Advisory Committee/El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan Advisory Committee

## ***Environmental Factors Potentially Affected***

This Initial Study identifies environmental factors potentially affected by the proposed project, as indicated below.

<b>X</b>	Aesthetics		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Public Services
	Agricultural Resources		Hydrology/Water Quality		Recreation
<b>X</b>	Air Quality	<b>X</b>	Land Use/Planning	<b>X</b>	Transportation/Traffic
<b>X</b>	Biological Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems
<b>X</b>	Cultural Resources	<b>X</b>	Noise	<b>X</b>	Mandatory Findings of Significance
	Geology/Soils		Population/Housing		

(Note: Because the RTP is a program level regional planning document the environmental review for the RTP is also at a programmatic level. The RTP does not include any project specific-level designs or approvals. Furthermore, approval of the RTP would not preclude future environmental review of project specific improvements. If, when, any transportation improvement that is identified in the RTP gets funding, is designed, and up for consideration by a decision making body, it would require project specific level environmental review.)

## **Determination**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. (Programmatic-level EIR)
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a potentially significant impact or potentially significant unless mitigated. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Higgins,  
Senior Transportation Planner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## ***Evaluation of Environmental Impacts***

In each area of potential impact listed in this section, there are one or more questions (in italic print) which assess the degree of potential environmental effect. A response is provided to each question using one of the four impact evaluation criteria described below. A discussion of the response is also included.

- Potentially Significant Impact. This response is appropriate when there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, upon completion of the Initial Study, an EIR is required.
- Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. This response applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact". The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
- Less than Significant Impact. A less than significant impact is one which is deemed to have little or no adverse effect on the environment. Mitigation measures are, therefore, not necessary, although they may be recommended to further reduce a minor impact.
- No Impact. These issues were either identified as having no impact on the environment, or they are not relevant to the Project.

## Environmental Checklist

This section of the Initial Study incorporates the most current Appendix "G" Environmental Checklist Form, contained in the CEQA Guidelines. Impact questions and responses are included in both tabular and narrative formats for each of the 17 environmental topic areas.

### I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	X			
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	X			
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	X			
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	X			

### Responses to Checklist Questions

**Responses I a), b), c), d):** Based on broad range of landscapes, and the documented scenic resources, scenic highways, and wild and scenic rivers located in the region, it has been determined that the potential impacts on aesthetics caused by the proposed project will require a detailed analysis in the environmental impact report. As such, the lead agency will examine each of the four environmental issues listed in the checklist above in the environmental impact report and will decide whether the proposed project will have a potentially significant impact on aesthetics. At this point a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made, rather all are considered *potentially significant* until a detailed analysis is prepared in the environmental impact report.

The environmental impact report will address the project's potential to substantially impair the visual character of the project site and its surroundings. It will also provide a discussion of viewsheds, proximity to scenic roadways and scenic vistas, existing lighting standards, an impact analysis for each of the four environmental issues related to aesthetics, and recommendations for mitigating potentially significant impacts.

## II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X	
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?			X	

### ***Background Discussion***

#### **AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY**

Agriculture in El Dorado County, including Placerville, has contributed to the economic stability of the County. The total crop production value in 2000 was more than \$24 million, excluding timber (El Dorado County Department of Agriculture 2001). Timber added an additional \$28.3 million for a total countywide agricultural value of \$52.3 million. Other related activities, such as employment, sales, tourism, etc., all contributed to the agricultural economy of the County, which totaled \$320 million in 2000 (El Dorado County Department of Agriculture 2001).

#### ***Agricultural Soils***

The majority of the non-timber agricultural land located in the region has historically been used for grazing of cattle and other livestock. In more recent years, crop production (i.e. fruit, wine grapes, and nuts) has proven to be a significant contributor to the agricultural economy in the County (El Dorado County Department of Agriculture 2001). Land located on the western portion of the County is the most valuable non-timber agricultural land due to the better soil quality and the mild slopes. Approximately 273,619 acres (24%) of the County has soils that are suitable for agricultural uses.

#### ***Important Farmlands***

The Farmlands Mapping and Monitoring Program is a farmland classification system that is administered by the California Department of Conservation. The system includes six categories of important farmland, one category of farmland, and three categories of non-farmland. For CEQA purposes “Prime Farmland” is considered the most significant farmland category. Prime farmland is land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for the production of crops. It has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields of crops when treated and managed according to current farming

methods. The land must have been used for production of irrigated crops at least sometime during the two cycles prior to the mapping date.

Approximately 89,675 acres of County (8 percent) was classified as Important Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance) on the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (California Department of Conservation 2002). In 2000 there were 1,117 acres of prime farmland and 84 acres of prime farmland converted to a non-agricultural use. [Figure 3](#) depicts the important farmlands map for the entire County, including Placerville. Farmland of Statewide Importance in the County totaled 1,016 acres, Unique Farmland totaled 4,406 acres, and Farmland of Local Importance totaled 83,136 acres. Grazing land makes up 16 percent of the County (183,944 acres) (California Department of Conservation 2002).

### ***Agricultural Production (Crops, Grazing, Timber, Related Activities)***

The leading crops (according to production value) in El Dorado County are apples, wine grapes, pasture and rangeland, Christmas trees, and cattle and calves (California Department of Conservation 2002). The community of Apple Hill is one example of a community in the County that has established a local agri-tourism market, where they produce crops on-site and attract the consumer directly to the ranch/farm. The City of Placerville has also established zoning districts (Agricultural Commercial (AC)) that attract agri-tourism markets.

Grazing lands are primarily located in the southwest and south-central portions of the County (Latrobe, Diamond Springs, and Somerset), and some areas in the northwestern part of the County (Coloma, Cool, Pilot Hill, Greenwood, and Georgetown). Land within the City of Placerville is not used for any sizable grazing operations.

Timber is an additional agricultural crop that provides a significant amount of the total production value in the County. The majority of the harvestable timber in the County is located in eastern portion County, predominately on land owned by the US Forest Service. There are several private timber holdings intermixed among the publicly owned timber lands. [Figure 4](#) depicts the timber production zones in the County. Land within the City of Placerville is not used for any sizable timber operations.

### ***Agricultural Regulations and Programs***

**Farmland Protection Policy Act.** The Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) administers the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA). The law was enacted to minimize the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses by ensuring that federal programs are consistent with state, local, and private programs that protect farmland.

**Farmland Protection Program.** The NRCS administers the Farmland Protection Program (FPP). This is a program that is designed to conserve productive farmland. The NRCS provides funds to agencies for the purchase of conservation easements that meet the specific requirements of the program. Landowners that are interested in the program must agree to conserve their farmland for a minimum period of 30 years.

**California Land Conservation Act.** The California Land Conservation Act of 1965, commonly known as the Williamson Act, was established based on numerous State legislative findings regarding the importance of agricultural lands in an urbanizing society. Policies emanating from those findings include those that discourage premature and unnecessary conversion of agricultural land to urban uses and discourage discontinuous urban development patterns, which unnecessarily increase the costs of community services to community residents.

The Williamson Act authorizes each County to establish an agricultural preserve. Land that is within the agricultural preserve is eligible to be placed under a contract between the property owner and County that would restrict the use of the land to agriculture in exchange for a tax assessment that is based on the yearly production yield. The contracts have a 10-year term that is automatically renewed each year, unless the property owner requests a non-renewal or the contract is cancelled. If the contract is cancelled the property owner is assessed a fee of up to 12.5 percent of the property value.

There was approximately 43,704 acres of agricultural land protected under Williamson Act contracts in the 1998 survey and approximately 41,853 acres in the 2000 survey (California Department of Conservation 2000). In 2000, El Dorado County had 430 properties under Williamson Act contracts, and 45 properties that had a notice of non-renewal filed (El Dorado County 2001). [Figure 5](#) illustrates the Williamson Act parcels in the County.

**Farmland Security Zones.** In 1998 the state legislature established a program where farmland could be protected under a Farmland Security Zone (FSZ). FSZ are similar to Williamson Act contracts, in that the intention is to protect farmland from conversion. The main difference however, is that the FSZ must be designated as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance and be within an area that is eligible for a Williamson Act contract. The term of the contract is a minimum of 20 years. The property owners are offered an incentive of greater property tax reductions when compared to the Williamson Act contract tax incentives. The non-renewal and cancellation procedures are similar to those for Williamson Act contracts.

There were approximately 185 acres of land enrolled in FSZs in 2001 (California Department of Conservation 2002).

**Land Use and Zoning Designations.** The County General Plan assigns the Agricultural Land (AL) land use designation to land that is of sufficient size to sustain agricultural use and possess other agricultural characteristics (i.e. under a Williamson Act/Farmland Security Zone Contract, contains the characteristics of choice agricultural land, etc.). The El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance for El Dorado County includes provisions for various types of agricultural lands. These zoning districts include the following: Agriculture (A), Exclusive Agriculture (AE), Planned Agriculture (PA), and Select Agriculture (SA-10). Uses allowed in these zoning districts include livestock grazing, timber growth, fruit and vegetable production, processing, and packaging, as well as numerous other uses that are associated with the main use.

The City of Placerville General Plan assigns the Agricultural/Commercial (AC) land use designation to land for the purpose of allowing agricultural activities in related commercial uses.

This land use designation is intended to provide for agricultural uses that are compatible with the residential character of the area, while allowing for limited commercial development. The City of Placerville Zoning Ordinance identifies two zoning districts that are consistent with this land use designation. These include Agricultural Commercial (AC) and Open Space (OS). Uses allowed in these zoning districts include detached single-family homes, secondary residential uses, agricultural uses such as raising and grazing of livestock, poultry, or other animals, growing and harvesting of trees, fruits, vegetables, flowers, grains, or other crops. Also allowed is sales of agricultural goods.

**Choice Agricultural Soils.** The County characterizes land that is worthy of protection based on several criteria as “choice” agricultural soils. Choice agricultural soils are generally designated as Important Farmlands and have the capability to be in active agricultural production. Choice soils are provided protections including land use restrictions and tax incentive programs. [Figure 6](#) illustrates the choice agricultural land in the County.

**Right to Farm Ordinance.** In 1988 the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors adopted the County Right to Farm Ordinance (County Code §17.13) to conserve and protect agriculturally zoned, commercially viable land within the County and protect agricultural landowners from nuisance complaints related to normal farming operations. The Right to Farm Ordinance protects agricultural operations and the expansion of existing operations in areas zoned for agricultural use (A, AE, PARA) from nuisance complaints that can occur as new urban development encroaches on farmland.

**Ranch Marketing Ordinance.** In 1986 the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors adopted the Ranch Marketing Ordinance (County Code §17.14.190) (as amended) to provide agricultural landowners with the right to sell agricultural products and conduct agriculture-related activities on their property. This ordinance enables landowners to provide retail services that are typical of agri-tourism (i.e. food stands, promotional events, tours, hiking, and picnicking). The ordinance requires that property and operation meet specific eligibility requirements.

**Wineries Ordinance.** In 2001 the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors adopted the Wineries Ordinance (County Code §17.14.200) to promote the development of wineries and encourage agri-tourism industries within the County. Originally the Ranch Marketing Ordinance regulated wineries. With this new ordinance, wineries were allowed to be located within certain agricultural and commercial zoning districts. The ordinance also establishes specific requirements for the winery operation.

### ***Responses to Checklist Questions***

**Response II a):** The proposed project is an RTP that includes policy guidance, action programs, and funding sources and mechanisms for improving regional transportation systems. The improvements identified in the RTP include a variety of improvements that are located throughout the rural and urbanized County and the City of Placerville. Some of the improvements will be located adjacent to land designated for agricultural uses and that which is currently under farming operations or that which may become under farming operations. Some of the improvements will be located adjacent to land that is classified as “Important” under the

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, and some improvements may require construction of an improvement on a linear strip of Important Farmland. Because the implementation of the improvements identified in the RTP would not result in (1) a need for land use changes that accommodate uses other than agricultural, (2) the conversion of any farming operations into a non-agricultural use, (3) the conversion of large plots of Important Farmland into a non-agricultural use, and (4) because the types of improvements identified in the RTP are allowed uses in all land use designations and zoning districts in the County and City of Placerville, the impact on land classified as Important Farmland that would result from implementation of the proposed project is considered *less than significant*.

**Response II b):** The improvements identified in the RTP include a variety of improvements that are located throughout the rural and urbanized County and the City of Placerville, some of which will be located adjacent to land that is zoned for agricultural uses and land that is currently under a Williamson Act contract. Some improvements may require construction on a linear strip of land zoned for agricultural uses. Implementation of the improvements identified in the RTP would not result in (1) a need for a zone change, (2) it would not conflict with the allowed uses under existing General Plan or Zoning Ordinance in the County or City of Placerville, (3) it would not result in the need for a cancellation or the filing of a notice of non-renewal of a Williamson Act contract, and (4) it would not conflict with a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the RTP would have *no impact* on zoning or Williamson Act contracts.

**Response II c):** There is land located throughout the County that is designated and used for agricultural purposes, including Agricultural Commercial uses in the City of Placerville. The improvements identified in the RTP would improve transportation systems throughout these agricultural areas, which are expected to improve the ability for farmers/ranchers product retailers to move the agricultural products to the existing markets and/or bring the markets directly to the farms/ranch/retail shop. These transportation improvements would not cause any other changes that could result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use. Because the implementation of the improvements identified in the RTP would not result in (1) the conversion of any of farming operations into a non-agricultural use, and (2) because they would provide improvements to farmer/ranchers and agricultural retailers throughout the County and the City of Placerville in their effort to move products to market or bring the market to their farm/ranch, the RTP would have a *less-than-significant* impact on agricultural uses.

### **Sources Referenced**

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan*.

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR*.

California Department of Conservation 2003, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*.

California Department of Conservation 2001, *2000 Field Report for El Dorado County*

California Department of Conservation 2002. *El Dorado County - 1998-2000 Land Use Conversion*.

El Dorado County Department of Agriculture. 1991-2001. *El Dorado County Crop Report 1991-2000. Placerville, CA.*

El Dorado County Planning Department 2002. *Agricultural Preserves, Williamson Act Contracts, and Farmland Security Zones.*

El Dorado County Planning Department 2002, 2003. *County Assessor's Office GIS Database of Land Uses in El Dorado County. Placerville, CA.*

City of Placerville Planning Department 1989. *City of Placerville General Plan Policy Document. Placerville, CA.*

### III. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	X			
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or Projected air quality violation?	X			
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	X			
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	X			
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	X			

#### **Responses to Checklist Questions**

**Responses III a), b), c), d), e):** Based on the current air quality conditions in the air basin and the requirement to show conformity with the applicable air quality plan, it has been determined that the potential impacts on air quality caused by the proposed project will require a detailed analysis in the environmental impact report. As such, the lead agency will examine each of the five environmental issues listed in the checklist above in the environmental impact report and will decide whether the proposed project has the potential to have a significant impact on air quality. At this point a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made, rather all are considered **potentially significant** until a detailed analysis is prepared in the environmental impact report.

The environmental impact report will describe the federal, state, and local regulatory environment and existing air quality conditions impacting the region (i.e. extreme non-attainment for ozone), including a discussion of the Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan, and the efforts to update the Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan. We will discuss the requirement that the RTP must “conform”, or show that it does not harm the region’s chances of reaching the ozone standard or other standards. This section will also describe emission sources, regional emission estimates, vehicle use, and construction emissions. We will conclude this section with a discussion of feasible mitigation measures that should be implemented during implementation of roadway improvement projects to reduce impacts on air quality and to ensure conformity with the Clean Air Plan. It is anticipated that the emissions from transportation improvement programs will remain within the Clean Air Plans emissions budget.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	X			
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	X			
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	X			
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	X			
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	X			
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	X			

**Responses to Checklist Questions**

**Responses IV a), b), c), d), e), f):** Based on the documented special status species, sensitive natural communities, wetlands, waters of the US, and other biological resources in the region, it has been determined that the potential impacts on biological resources caused by the proposed project will require a detailed analysis in the environmental impact report. As such, the lead agency will examine each of the five environmental issues listed in the checklist above in the environmental impact report and will decide whether the proposed project has the potential to have a significant impact on biological resources. At this point a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made, rather all are considered **potentially significant** until a detailed analysis is prepared in the environmental impact report.

The environmental impact report will include a California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) background search to determine all documented occurrences of special status plants and animals in the regional vicinity of the project site. A regional biological review of the

roadways in the County will be conducted utilizing aerial reconnaissance. This section of the environmental impact report will provide a discussion of the biological resources within the region, the results of the CNDDDB search, an impact analysis, and recommendations for mitigating potentially significant impacts.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	X			
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	X			
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	X			
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	X			

**Responses to Checklist Questions**

**Responses a), b), c), d):** Based on known historical resources in the region, and the potential for undocumented underground cultural resources in the region, it has been determined that the potential impacts on cultural resources caused by the proposed project will require a detailed analysis in the environmental impact report. As such, the lead agency will examine each of the four environmental issues listed in the checklist above in the environmental impact report and will decide whether the proposed project has the potential to have a significant impact on cultural resources. At this point a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made, rather all are considered *potentially significant* until a detailed analysis is prepared in the environmental impact report.

The environmental impact report will include an overview of the prehistory and history of the area, the potential for surface and subsurface cultural resources to be found in the area, the types of cultural resources that may be expected to be found, a review of existing regulations and policies that protect cultural resources, an impact analysis, and mitigation that should be implemented with each improvement project.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located in a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

**Background Discussion**

**REGIONAL GEOLOGY**

El Dorado County is located in the Sierra Nevada geomorphic province of California, which is east of the Great Valley province and west of the Range and Basin province. The Sierra Nevada province is characterized by steep-sided hills and narrow, rocky stream channels. This province consists of Pliocene and older deposits that have been uplifted as a result of plate tectonics, granitic intrusion, and volcanic activity. Subsequent glaciation and additional volcanic activity are factors that led to the east-west orientation of stream channels.

**Seismicity**

The geographic distribution of earthquake activity is referred to as seismicity. Seismicity can result in hazards caused by fault displacement and rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, lateral

spreading, and landslides and avalanches. Seismicity is generally measured based on the amount of energy released at a fault.

El Dorado County has a relatively low potential for seismic activity based on historical records of seismic activity and fault zone hazards mapping. The entire state of California is considered seismically active and is susceptible to seismic ground shaking, although the most highly active fault zones are along the coastal areas.

### ***Fault Systems***

Seismicity is directly related to the distribution of fault systems within a region. Depending on activity patterns, faults and fault-related geologic features may be classified as active, potentially active, or inactive. [Figure 7](#) illustrates the known fault systems in the region.

Fault systems in western El Dorado County include the West Bear Mountains Fault; the East Bear Mountains Fault; the Maidu Fault Zone; the El Dorado Fault; the Melones Fault Zone of the Clark, Gillis Hill Fault; and the Calaveras–Shoo Fly Thrust. No active faults have been identified in El Dorado County.

### ***Seismic Hazards***

**Seismic Ground Shaking.** The potential for seismic ground shaking is illustrated on seismic hazard maps. In El Dorado County the potential for ground shaking is the highest in the east and the potential risk is reduced toward the western portion of the County. The risk in the City of Placerville is located toward the western portion of the County where the risk is relatively low.

**Fault Rupture.** A fault rupture occurs when the surface of the earth breaks as a result of an earthquake, although this does not happen with all earthquakes. These ruptures generally occur in a weak area of an existing fault. Ruptures can be sudden (i.e. earthquake) or slow (i.e. fault creep). The Alquist-Priolo Fault Zoning Act requires active earthquake fault zones to be mapped and it provides special development considerations within these zones. There are no mapped earthquake fault zones in El Dorado County.

**Liquefaction.** Liquefaction typically requires a significant sudden decrease of shearing resistance in cohesionless soils and a sudden increase in water pressure, which is typically associated with an earthquake of high magnitude. There are no areas in the County that are mapped as a zone that is prone to liquefaction on the Seismic Hazards Mapping Program. The entire region is at a low risk of hazards from liquefaction.

**Lateral Spreading.** Lateral spreading typically results when ground shaking moves soil toward an area where the soil integrity is weak or unsupported, and it typically occurs on the surface of a slope, although it does not occur strictly on steep slopes. Oftentimes, lateral spreading is directly associated with areas of liquefaction. The entire County is not considered an area that has a high risk of lateral spreading.

**Landslides.** Landslides include rockfalls, deep slope failure, and shallow slope failure. Factors such as the geological conditions, drainage, slope, vegetation, and others directly affect the

potential for landslides. One of the most common causes of landslides in the construction activity that is associated with road building (i.e. cut and fill).

Some historical maps show that the western-most portion of the County (i.e. along the Foothills Fault Zone) is an area that has a risk of landslides due to seismic activity. Historically, the County has been prone to landslide hazards. As a result of past landslides (most notably along Highway 50), the US Geological Survey and the US Forest Service have actively monitored landslide activity along Highway 50.

**Avalanche.** Avalanches are landslides that involve snowpack failure. These failures typically occur on steep slopes that have a large amount of snowpack. Avalanche conditions occur after heavy snowfall events generally above 5,000 feet.

The risk of avalanches in the western portion of the County is typically associated with Highway 50 around Echo Summit, which is closed several times each winter season. Caltrans provides avalanche control in this area. The City of Placerville is below the 5,000 foot gradient and has essentially no risk of avalanches.

**Soils**

A soil survey for the western portion of El Dorado County was prepared by the Soil Conservation Service (currently known as the National Resources Conservation Service) in 1974. A supplemental soil survey was prepared in 1985 for parts of the National Forest land. [Table 17](#) provides a list of the soil types located within the western portion of the County, including the City of Placerville. [Figure 8](#) illustrates the soil associations in the western portion of the County, including the City of Placerville.

**Table 17**  
**Soil Characteristics in Western El Dorado County**

Soil Association	Shrink-Swell Potential	Slope Range	Elevation Range (feet)
Auberry-Ahwahnee-Sierra	low/moderate	5–50%	500–2,500
Auburn-Argonaut	low/moderate/high	2–70%	500–1,800
Boomer-Auburn	low/moderate	2–70%	500–3,500
Rescue	low/moderate	2–50%	1,000–2,500
Serpentine Rock Land-Delpiedra	moderate	3–50%	500–1,800
Cohasset-Aiken-McCarthy	low/moderate	3–50%	2,000–5,500
Holland-Musick-Chaix	low/moderate/high	5–70%	1,800–5,000
Mariposa-Josephine-Sites	low/moderate	3–70%	1,500–5,500

Source: Soil Conservation Service, 1974 and EDAW.

## **Erosion**

Erosion naturally occurs on the surface of the earth as surface materials (i.e. rock, soil, debris, etc.) is loosened, dissolved, or worn away, and transported from one place to another by gravity. Two common types of soil erosion include wind erosion and water erosion. The steepness of a slope is an important factor that affects soil erosion. Erosion potential in soils is influenced primarily by loose soil texture and steep slopes. Loose soils can be eroded by water or wind forces, whereas soils with high clay content are generally susceptible only to water erosion. The potential for erosion generally increases as a result of human activity, primarily through the development of facilities and impervious surfaces and the removal of vegetative cover. More than half of the County's land area has a slope greater than 25% and there is a relatively high potential for erosion in these areas. [Figure 9](#) illustrates the critical slopes in the County.

## **Responses to Checklist Questions**

**Responses VI a.i), a.ii):** The proposed transportation improvements are not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and there are no active faults located within the County. There will always be a chance that a fault located anywhere in the state (or region) could rupture and cause seismic ground shaking, although the relative risk to safety from the potential ground shaking within the County is considered low even though there are several fault systems (inactive) that traverse the County. Implementation of the proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant** impact from rupture of an earthquake fault and seismic ground shaking.

**Response VI a.iii):** Liquefaction typically requires a significant sudden decrease of shearing resistance in cohesionless soils and a sudden increase in water pressure, which is typically associated with an earthquake of high magnitude. From a regional perspective, the soils located within the County are considered to have a low potential for liquefaction. There is a potential for soil inclusions that have a higher liquefaction potential. Each improvement project would be required to have a specific geotechnical study prepared and incorporated into the improvement design. The geotechnical study would identify if there were any unknown soil inclusions that posed a higher risk of liquefaction, and recommendations for mitigating the potential risk. Based on the known conditions of the soils within the County, implementation of the RTP would have a **less-than-significant** impact from liquefaction.

**Responses VI a.iv), c):** A relatively high percentage of the County is prone to landslides based on the slopes. There will be an ongoing potential for areas of the County to be or become unstable and result in landslides. Some transportation improvements identified in the RTP will traverse across areas where the soil characteristics, drainage, slope, vegetation, and others factors cause the landslide potential to be relatively high. Each improvement project would be required to have a specific geotechnical study prepared and incorporated into the improvement design. The geotechnical study would identify the specific soil conditions, surface and subsurface drainage capability, slope steepness, and other factors that may contribute to landslide risk. Based on specific findings at each locality, the geotechnical engineer will recommend detailed engineers measures that are necessary to reduce the safety risks associated with landslides. Implementation of project specific geotechnical engineering measures would reduce the safety risks of landslides to a reasonable level. Therefore, implementation of the RTP would have a **less-than-significant** impact from landslides. The potential risk of lateral spreading, subsidence,

liquefaction or collapse is considered low and implementation of the RTP would have a *less-than-significant* impact from these issues.

**Responses VI b):** As discussed in (a.iv) above, the site has a relatively high risk of landslides (a form of erosion) due to the steep slopes located in the region. The potential for loss of topsoil and erosion is relatively high due to the natural characteristics of the region. Grading activities associated with the transportation improvements identified in the RTP would increase the potential for erosion during construction. The Regional Water Quality Control Board will require a project specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be prepared for each transportation improvement that disturbs and area one acre or larger. The SWPPPs will include project specific best management measures that are designed to control drainage and erosion. The County adopted, and the SWRCB subsequently approved, the County of El Dorado Storm Water Management Plan in 2004. The document describes “the minimum procedures and practices that the County uses to reduce the discharge of pollutants in effluent from storm drainage systems owned or operated by the County.” Furthermore, each transportation improvement will include detailed project specific drainage plans that control storm water runoff and erosion. Implementation of the proposed RTP itself would therefore result in a *less-than-significant* impact on soil erosion.

**Responses VI d):** Expansive soils are those that shrink or swell with the change in moisture content. The volume of change is influenced by the quantity of moisture, by the kind and amount of clay in the soil, and by the original porosity of the soil. Shrinking and swelling can damage roads and other structures unless special engineering design is incorporated into the project plans. Implementation of the proposed RTP itself would result in a *less-than-significant* impact from expansive soils.

**Responses VI e):** The proposed RTP would not result in the generation of sewer water or the expansion of septic infrastructure. Implementation of the proposed project would have *no impact* on this environmental issue.

### **Sources Referenced**

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan*.

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR*.

City of Placerville Planning Department 1989. *City of Placerville General Plan Policy Document*. Placerville, CA.

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS — Would the project:**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?				X
f) For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the Project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

***Background Discussion***

**HAZARDOUS WASTE**

A “hazardous material” is a substance or combination of substances that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics, may pose a potential hazard to human health or the environment when handled improperly.

As of January 25, 2003, there were 130 business locations and government facilities in the County that were registered as hazardous waste handlers in EPA’s database. As of October 2002, there were 235 hazardous waste-generating facilities on the west slope of the County that had been registered with the County.

### ***Hazardous Materials Transport and Disposal***

Currently there are no treatment, storage, and disposal facilities within the County. Hazardous wastes are collected and transported outside the County for disposal. Various collection methods for hazardous wastes exist for the different sources and types of hazardous wastes. Large generators typically hire a registered hazardous waste hauler to transport the waste for treatment and disposal. There are a number of haulers used by businesses in the County.

The County currently contracts with MES Environmental and Philip Transportation and Remediation, Inc., to transport hazardous wastes generated by households. Registered hazardous waste haulers may use all County roadways to transport hazardous materials. Haulers transport the hazardous waste to a variety of destinations outside the County.

### ***Naturally Occurring Asbestos***

Asbestos is a term applied to several types of naturally occurring fibrous materials found in rock formations throughout California. Asbestos is commonly found in ultramafic rock, including serpentine, which is abundant in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada. Asbestos has been mined in several localities throughout the Sierra Nevada, including the northwest portion of the County. Serpentine rock, which often contains asbestos, has also been used extensively as base material in the construction of new roads. Exposure and disturbance of rock and soil that contains asbestos can result in the release of fibers to the air and consequent exposure to the public. All types of asbestos are now considered hazardous and pose public health risks. The use of asbestos-containing materials is regulated by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the County.

The potential occurrence and distribution of asbestos in the County has been well researched and documented. The California Department of Conservation (DOC) has developed an environmental-asbestos map for western El Dorado County, entitled “Areas More Likely to Contain Natural Occurrences of Asbestos in Western El Dorado County,” and a corresponding open-file report. The report and map suggests that asbestos may be present; although the information has not been field verified in it’s entirety.

Figure 10 illustrates the areas that are likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos in the western portion of the County. This figure indicates that the presence of naturally occurring asbestos is scattered throughout the west slope of the County, with significant concentrations found in El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park/Shingle Springs/Rescue, Coloma/Gold Hill, Latrobe, Cool/Pilot Hill, and Georgetown/Garden Valley.

**Wildland Fire Hazards.** Wildland fire is a major hazard in the State of California, particularly in the foothill areas. Wildland fires have caused major resource damage in the County, requiring large investments in burn site rehabilitation. Wildland fires burn natural vegetation on developed and undeveloped lands and include timber, brush, woodland, and grass fires. While low-intensity wildland fires have a role in the County’s ecosystem, wildland fires put human health and safety, structures (e.g., homes, schools, businesses, etc.), air quality, recreation areas, water quality, wildlife habitat and ecosystem health, and forest resources at risk.

Inadequate access (e.g., streets narrower allowed under design standards) has been a major factor for the destructive nature of numerous fires in the foothills including the Forty-Niner Fire in Nevada County in 1988 and the Cleveland Fire (inadequate bridges across the American River). [Figure 11](#) illustrates the historic fires in the County and [Figure 12](#) identifies the fire hazard rating in the County.

### **Regulations and Programs**

**Hazardous Materials Transportation Act of 1975.** The Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, as amended, is the basic statute regulating hazardous materials transportation in the United States. The purpose of the law is to provide adequate protection against the risks to life and property inherent in transporting hazardous materials in interstate commerce. This law gives the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) and other agencies the authority to issue and enforce rules and regulations governing the safe transportation of hazardous materials (DOE 2002).

In El Dorado County, U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50), State Route (SR) 49, and SR 89 are the designated highways for the transport of hazardous materials classified as explosives. None of the highways in the County have been designated for the transport of inhalation hazard and radioactive hazardous materials. Highways have not been designated for other types of hazardous materials, such as compressed gases, flammable and combustible liquids, flammable solids, oxidizers, and corrosives, which may typically be transported on any state highway and other roadways within the County, subject to the limitations described above (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 13).

**Naturally Occurring Asbestos and Dust Protection Ordinance.** This ordinance requires asbestos testing of surface materials and submittal/approval of a Contingent Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan for grading/mining activities in areas identified on the Potential Asbestiform Minerals Map. The County has developed a prescriptive standard for Fugitive Dust Prevention and Control Plans and Contingent Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plans pursuant to Ordinance No. 4548. The intent of the prescriptive standard is to ensure that adequate dust control and asbestos hazard mitigation measures are implemented during project construction. The standard applies to all applications for dwelling, grading, or construction permits(s) through the County Building Department; compliance is required before groundbreaking.

### **Responses to Checklist Questions**

**Responses VII a), d):** The proposed RTP would improve the travel conditions of transportation systems that are currently used for transport of hazardous materials. All transportation of hazardous materials is regulated by federal and state laws and local ordinances. The proposed transportation improvements identified in the RTP would not cause or require routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Nor is any of the transportation improvements located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials site that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, implementation of the proposed RTP would result in a *less-than-significant* impact.

**Response VII b), c):** Implementation of the improvements identified in the RTP would require construction activities, including grading, which has the potential to release naturally occurring asbestos into the air. Construction activities related to each improvement project would be required to comply with the *Naturally Occurring Asbestos and Dust Protection Ordinance* prior to construction. Compliance with this ordinance would require project specific asbestos testing of surface materials and submittal/approval of a Contingent Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan for grading activities in areas identified on the Potential Asbestiform Minerals Map. Implementation of the Mitigation Plan would ensure that adequate dust control and asbestos hazard mitigation measures are implemented during project construction. This ordinance applies to all grading activities in the unincorporated areas. Compliance with the ordinance, and implementation of the Contingent Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan would ensure that the potential impact is reduced to a *less-than-significant* level.

**Response VII e), f):** Some of the transportation improvements identified in the RTP are located at several airports within the County, one of which is located in the vicinity of the City of Placerville. These improvements do not create a safety risk for people residing in the area, and they do not conflict with the airport land use plans for which they are located within. The proposed RTP would improve airport facilities, which is expected to improve the safety conditions located at these airports. This is a beneficial impact. Therefore, the RTP would have *no adverse impact* on this environmental issue.

**Response VII g):** The transportation improvements identified in the RTP would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The proposed RTP would improve transportation systems throughout the County, which is expected to improve the emergency response and evacuation routes throughout the County. Therefore, the RTP would have *no adverse impact* on this environmental issue.

**Response VII h):** The transportation improvements identified in the RTP would not result in the construction of structures that would be occupied by humans; therefore, it would not expose people or structures to a significant risk involving wildland fires. The proposed RTP would improve transportation systems throughout the County and City of Placerville, which is expected to improve the ability for fire protection services to access areas that have a high wildland fire risk rating. This is considered a beneficial impact. Therefore, the RTP would have *no adverse impact* on this environmental issue.

### **Sources Referenced**

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan*.

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR*.

City of Placerville Planning Department 1989. *City of Placerville General Plan Policy Document*. Placerville, CA.

## VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted water?			X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

### **Background Discussion**

#### **FLOODING**

Flood hazards can result from intense rain, snowmelt, cloudbursts, or a combination of the three, or from failure of a water impoundment structure, such as a dam. Floods from rainstorms

generally occur between November and April and are characterized by high peak flows of moderate duration. Snowmelt floods combined with rain have larger volumes and last longer than rain flooding.

### ***Flood-Prone Areas***

Because of a lack of extensive low-lying areas and a great deal of upland areas, the majority of El Dorado County (including Placerville) is not subject to flooding. The primary flood-prone areas on the west slope of the County are the following:

- South Fork, American River from Kyburz to Riverton and below Chili Bar Dam
- Coloma Canyon Creek between Greenwood and Garden Valley
- Weber Creek from Placerville to the American River, including Cold Springs, Dry Creek, and Spring Creek tributaries
- Shingle Creek from Shingle Springs to the Amador County line
- Deer Creek from Cameron Park to Sacramento County line
- Big Canyon Creek from El Dorado to the Cosumnes River, including the Slate, Little Indian, and French Creek tributaries
- New York Creek
- Middle Fork of the Cosumnes River within the Somerset-Fairplay vicinity, and its confluence with the North Fork of the Cosumnes River
- Cedar Creek from Omo Ranch to the Cosumnes River

Figure 13 illustrates the areas with flood hazards in the western portion of the County.

### ***Flood Control***

There are no dams dedicated to flood control on the west slope. All existing reservoirs in El Dorado County are operated for power generation or water storage, not flood control purposes. There is only one known levee in El Dorado County (in El Dorado Hills near Carson Creek). However, this levee is privately owned and it is unknown whether this levee is certified for flood control purposes. Figure 14 identifies the existing drainage study areas in the western portion of the County.

### ***Dam Failure***

A dam failure can occur as the result of an earthquake, as an isolated incident because of structural instability, or during heavy runoff that exceeds spillway design capacity. El Dorado County does not have a history of major dam failure. Nine dams located within the County have been identified as having the potential of inundating habitable portions of the County in the unlikely event of dam failure. These nine dams are Echo Lake Dam (El Dorado Irrigation District [EID]), Union Valley Dam (Sacramento Municipal Utility District [SMUD]), Ice House Dam (SMUD), Chili Bar Reservoir (Pacific Gas and Electric Company [PG&E]), Stumpy Meadows Dam (Georgetown Divide Public Utility District [GDPUD]), Weber Creek Dam (EID), Slab Creek Dam (SMUD), Loon Lake Auxiliary Dam (SMUD), and Blakely Dam (EID). The Caples Lake Dam (EID) and the Cameron Park Lake/Warren Hollister Dam (EID) also have considerable potential to inundate inhabited areas in the unlikely event of dam failure.

## **Stormwater Runoff**

Human activities have an effect on water quality when chemicals, salting of roads (to melt snow) heavy metals, hydrocarbons (auto emissions and car crank case oil), and other materials are transported with stormwater into drainage systems.

## **Regulations**

**Federal Clean Water Act of 1972.** The federal Clean Water Act establishes the basic structure for regulating discharges of pollutants into waters of the United States and setting water quality standards for all contaminants in surface waters. The Clean Water Act defines water quality standards as “provisions of state or federal law which consist of a designated use or uses for the waters of the United States and water quality criteria for such waters based upon such uses. Water quality standards are to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act.”

**National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).** In 1972, the Clean Water Act was amended to provide that the discharge of pollutants to waters of the United States from any point source is unlawful unless the discharge is in compliance with an NPDES permit. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and regional water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) are authorized to implement this program. The NPDES permits cover industrial and municipal discharges, discharges from storm sewer systems in larger cities, storm water associated with numerous kinds of industrial activity, and runoff from construction sites disturbing more than one acre of soil.

**Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.** Under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter-Cologne), the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) has the ultimate authority over State water rights and water quality policy. However, Porter-Cologne also establishes nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Boards) to oversee water quality on a day-to-day basis at the local/regional level.

Regional Boards engage in a number of water quality functions in their respective regions. One of the most important is preparing and periodically updating Basin Plans (water quality control plans). Each Basin Plan establishes: 1) beneficial uses of water designated for each water body to be protected; 2) water quality standards, known as water quality objectives, for both surface water and groundwater; and 3) actions necessary to maintain these standards in order to control non-point and point sources of pollution to the State's waters.

Porter-Cologne regulates the discharge of waste into waters of the state, which are defined as “any water, surface or underground, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the state.” In May of 2004 the SWRCB adopted a general waste discharge requirement permit (WDR) (Water quality Order 2004-0004-DWQ) for projects resulting in the discharge of fill to waters of the State that are not waters of the United States.

Permits issued to control pollution (i.e. waste-discharge requirements and NPDES permits) must implement Basin Plan requirements (i.e. water quality standards), taking into consideration beneficial uses to be protected.

Regional Boards regulate all pollutant or nuisance discharges that may affect either surface water or groundwater. Any person proposing to discharge waste within any region must file a report of waste discharge with the appropriate regional board. No discharge may take place until: 1) the Regional Board issues waste discharge requirements or a waiver of the waste discharge requirements, and 2) 120 days have passed since complying with reporting requirements.

**County of El Dorado Drainage Manual.** The County of El Dorado Drainage Manual provides standard procedures for future designs of drainage improvements. The Drainage Manual supercedes the stormwater drainage system design standards in the County's Design Improvements Standards Manual. The Drainage Manual requires that a hydrologic and hydraulic analysis be submitted for all proposed drainage facilities. The analysis must include an introduction/background, location map/description, catchment description/delineation, hydrologic analysis, hydraulic and structural analysis, risk assessment/impacts discussion, unusual or special conditions, conclusions, and technical appendices. This analysis is usually required on projects undergoing discretionary review.

**County of El Dorado Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP).** The County of El Dorado Storm Water Management Plan, adopted in 2004 and subsequently approved by the SWRCB, addresses storm water pollution control related to project planning, design, construction and maintenance activities throughout the unincorporated area of Western El Dorado County (that portion of El Dorado County within the jurisdiction of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, excluding the Tahoe Basin). In addition, the SWMP describes "the minimum procedures and practices the County uses to reduce the discharge of pollutants in effluent from storm drainage systems owned or operated by the County."

### ***Responses to Checklist Questions***

***Responses VIII a), b):*** Implementation of the improvements identified in the RTP would not violate any waste discharge requirements, substantially deplete groundwater supplies, or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in an aquifer volume.

The construction phase of the projects that are identified in the RTP could cause storm water runoff that could carry topsoil into downstream waterways and ultimately waters of the U.S. As required by the Clean Water Act, each specific improvement project will require an approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that includes best management practices for grading, and preservation of topsoil. However, a SWPPP is not required if the project will disturb less than one acre. SWPPPs are designed to control storm water quality degradation to the extent practicable using best management practices during and after construction.

The lead agency that approves and implements a specific project will submit the SWPPP with a Notice of Intent to the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to obtain a General Permit. The lead agency for specific projects is not identified in the RTP, as funding, designs,

and approvals have not been made. The lead agencies for some projects identified in the RTP may be a state agency such as Caltrans, or a local agency such as the City of Placerville or El Dorado County.

The RWQCB is an agency responsible for reviewing the SWPPP with the Notice of Intent, prior to issuance of a General Permit for the discharge of storm water during construction activities. The RWQCB accepts General Permit applications (with the SWPPP and Notice of Intent) after specific projects have been approved by the lead agency. The lead agency for each specific project that is larger than one acre is required to obtain a General Permit for discharge of storm water during construction activities prior to commencing construction (per the Clean Water Act). The RTP by itself would have a *less-than-significant* impact on water quality.

**Responses VIII c), d), e), f):** Implementation of the improvements identified in the RTP may alter the existing drainage pattern in specific areas, including the alteration of a course of a stream or river, which could result in erosion, siltation, or flooding on- or off-site. The improvement projects are not funded or approved at this point and no project specific plans are available. Each improvement project would require a specific level of design review to ensure that the engineering does not result in substantial alterations in the natural drainage systems. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is responsible for issuing permits for the placement of fill, or discharge of material into, waters of the United States. These permits are required under Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act. Water supply projects that involve instream construction, such as bridges, trigger the need for these permits and related environmental reviews by USACE. Subsequent environmental review, design review, and the Clean Water Act permitting requirements would ensure that the impacts are reduced to a reasonable level. Additionally, a general WDR permit was adopted by the SWRCB in May of 2004 (Water Quality Order 2004-0004-DWQ) for projects resulting in the discharge of fill to waters of the State that are not waters of the United States. Implementation of the RTP by itself would have a *less-than-significant* impact on these issues.

**Responses VIII g), h), i), j):** Implementation of the improvements identified in the RTP would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, place structures which would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area, nor would it expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding (including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow). Therefore, implementation of the RTP would have a *less-than-significant* impact on these environmental issues.

### **Sources Referenced**

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan*.

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR*.

City of Placerville Planning Department 1989. *City of Placerville General Plan Policy Document*. Placerville, CA.

County of El Dorado 2004. *County of El Dorado Storm Water Management Plan.*

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Will the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	X			
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	X			
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

**Background Discussion**

**PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT**

The Sierra Nevada divides El Dorado County into two distinct topographic areas – the west slope and Lake Tahoe Basin. For purposes of this Initial Study, the west slope is the focus of land use discussion due to the fact that the proposed RTP only covers the western slope of the County. The Lake Tahoe Basin is discussed at times during this section for purposes of characterizing the County as a whole.

The west slope extends from the Sacramento County line on the west to the summit of the Sierra Nevada on the east and contains most of the developed land in the County. The density of residential and commercial development gradually decreases and the amount of open space increases heading east from the foothills to the Sierra Nevada summit. The City of Placerville, located approximately 15 miles from the County line, is the only incorporated City on the west slope.

U.S. 50 bisects El Dorado County, traveling east-west from Sacramento County through the City of Placerville to and past the California/Nevada border just south of Lake Tahoe. Historically, development in the County has closely followed this route, with the densest development in the west. Major cities, towns, and developments along this corridor include El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Shingle Springs, the City of Placerville, and Pollock Pines. In addition to being a development pathway, U.S. 50 is a major transportation corridor for residents living in El Dorado County and working in Sacramento County and for recreation-related traffic generated in areas outside of the County.

One reason for the clustering of development in the western portion of the County is the vast areas of forestland that covers much of the eastern two-thirds of the County. Most of this land is in the Eldorado National Forest, administered by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS); other areas are privately owned commercial timberland. Towns and individual residences are scattered

throughout these areas. For the most part, pockets of any substantive development in the area east of the City of Placerville are clustered along the U.S. 50 corridor.

Outside the U.S. 50 corridor, west-slope development follows the other two main highways in the County: State routes (SR) 49 and 193. SR 49 crosses the County from north to south and connects many of the original boom towns founded during the California Gold Rush of 1848. This route is a prime tourist destination, and the towns of Cool, Pilot Hill, Coloma, Lotus, the City of Placerville, Diamond Springs, and El Dorado promote the mining heritage of the region with museums, historic districts, and commercial areas. SR 193 crosses the northern part of El Dorado County from SR 49 to Greenwood and Georgetown, then turns south through Kelsey and into the City of Placerville.

## **LAND USE PATTERNS**

The County encompasses approximately 1,145,385 acres including the waters of Lake Tahoe and Folsom Reservoir. Of this, approximately 46 percent is in public ownership and 54 percent is privately owned. Only 196,355 acres, or approximately 17 percent of land in the County have been developed with the vast majority of this being residential units. Agricultural lands and forestlands make up a large percentage of the undeveloped lands in the County. Forestlands occupy 636,000 acres (55 percent of the County). The County had 153,472 acres of agricultural land in 1997 (13 percent of the County), with 41,852 acres of that land being protected under the Williamson Act.

Much of the land located in the County is not under the jurisdiction of El Dorado County or the City of Placerville. This includes lands owned by the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, the State of California (Department of Parks and Recreation, University of California), and by Native American Tribes. [Figure 15](#) illustrates the land use designations located within the entire County.

## **PLANNING PROCESS**

County and City land use planning efforts are driven in large part by state law (Government Code §65300-65307), which requires that each County or City planning agency prepare a “comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the County or City.”

The County of El Dorado updated their General Plan in 2004, which was subsequently approved by voter referendum in March 2005. There was a Writ of Mandate issued by the Court that defines the limits of the County’s approval authority within their jurisdiction. Because the General Plan was approved by voter referendum in March 2005, the County will petition the court to remove the Writ over the next six or more months. When the court discharges the Writ, the new General Plan will become the basis for land use decisions in the County.

The City of Placerville General Plan was last updated in 1989.

## **Responses to Checklist Questions**

**Response IX a), b):** Based on the connection between transportation planning and land use planning, it has been determined that the potential impacts caused by the proposed project will require a detailed analysis in the environmental impact report. As such, the lead agency will examine each of these environmental issues listed in the checklist above in the environmental impact report and will decide whether the proposed project has the potential to have a significant impact from land use planning. At this point a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made, rather all are considered ***potentially significant*** until a detailed analysis is prepared in the environmental impact report.

**Response IX c):** According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service there are no Habitat Conservation Plans within the County of El Dorado or the City of Placerville. Additionally, according to the California Department of Fish and Game there are no Natural Community Conservation Plans within the County or the City of Placerville. Implementation of the proposed project will therefore have ***no impact*** with regards to this topic and no mitigation is required.

## **Sources Referenced**

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan*.

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR*.

City of Placerville Planning Department 1989. *City of Placerville General Plan Policy Document*. Placerville, CA.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service 2005. *HCP Database*.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Will the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			X	
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

**Background Discussion**

**MINERAL RESOURCES**

The County contains a wide variety of mineral resources. Both the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and the California Geological Survey (CGS) have evaluated the potential locations and production capacity of various types of extractive resources throughout the County. Metallic mineral deposits, gold in particular, are considered the most significant extractive mineral resource. The 1849 California “Gold Rush” originated from gold discovered in El Dorado County. Other metallic minerals found in the County include silver, copper, nickel, chromite, zinc, tungsten, mercury, titanium, platinum and iron. Nonmetallic mineral resources include building stone, limestone, slate, clay, marble, soapstone, sand, and gravel.

**Mineral Resource Classification**

Pursuant to the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA), the California State Mining and Geology Board oversees the Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) classification system. The MRZ system characterizes both the location and known/presumed economic value of underlying mineral resources. The mineral resource classification system uses four main MRZs based on the degree of available geologic information, the likelihood of significant mineral resource occurrence, and the known or inferred quantity of significant mineral resources. The four classifications are described in [Table 18](#) below.

**Table 18**  
**Mineral Resource Classification System**

Classification	Description
MRZ-1	Areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence.
MRZ-2	Areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood exists for their presence.
MRZ-3	Areas containing mineral deposits, the significance of which cannot be evaluated.

Classification	Description
MRZ-4	Areas where available information is inadequate for assignment to any other MRZ classification.

**Location of Mineral Resources**

According to the El Dorado County General Plan EIR (2003) the majority of the County’s important mineral resource deposits (MRZ-2) are concentrated in the western third of the County. [Figure 16](#) illustrates these important mineral resource deposits while [Figure 17](#) illustrates mining sites located within this portion of the County.

There are also mines located in and around the City of Placerville that are operated predominately as a tourist attraction.

**Mineral Extraction**

Historically, there have been numerous mining operations throughout El Dorado County. However, presently there are 16 regulated mines in the County that have been assigned a California Mine ID number by the State Office of Mine Reclamation. Of these, eight mines are active, five have been reclaimed, two are idle, and one has been closed per County order to cease and desist mining operations. None are located within the City limits of Placerville.

**Mineral Regulations and Programs**

**The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA).** The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA of 1975 requires classification of land into Mineral Resources Zones (MRZs), according to the known or inferred mineral potential of that area. SMARA is set forth in the California Public Resources Code (PRC), Division 2, Chapter 9, Sections 2710, et seq.

**Responses to Checklist Questions**

**Response X a):** Some improvements identified in the RTP are located in the vicinity of land that is designated as a mineral resource district in the El Dorado County General Plan. The City of Placerville does not contain any land designated for mineral extraction. Implementation of the improvements identified in the RTP would not cause land use changes or conversion of any mineral extraction operations into a different use. The impact on land classified as mineral resource districts is considered *less than significant*.

**Response X b):** There are currently 16 mineral resource recovery sites in El Dorado County, and none within the City limits of Placerville. The proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of any of these sites. Implementation of the proposed project will therefore have *no impact* with regards to this topic and no mitigation is required.

## **Sources Referenced**

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan*.

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR*.

City of Placerville Planning Department 1989. *City of Placerville General Plan Policy Document. Placerville, CA.*

**XI. NOISE – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	X			
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	X			
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?	X			
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?	X			
e) For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?	X			
f) For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?	X			

**Responses to Checklist Questions**

**Responses XI a), b), c), d), e), f):** Based on existing and projected noise levels along roadways and airports, and associated with construction projects, it has been determined that the potential impacts from noise caused by the proposed project will require a detailed analysis in the environmental impact report. As such, the lead agency will examine each of the six environmental issues listed in the checklist above in the environmental impact report and will decide whether the proposed project has the potential to have a significant impact from noise. At this point a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made, rather all are considered *potentially significant* until a detailed analysis is prepared in the environmental impact report.

The environmental impact report will include a study that will evaluate existing noise levels, future noise levels, adjacent noise sources, and the noise related impacts. A noise engineer will review background noise level measurements and short-term noise level measurements that were recently generated during environmental review within the region. The intent of using the noise level measurements will be to quantify existing background noise levels for comparison to the predicted future cumulative noise levels created with future development. The noise engineer will identify the future traffic noise levels on certain roadways within the region. The analysis will focus on increases in traffic noise levels due to traffic improvements at noise-sensitive land uses.

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Will the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	X			
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

**Background Discussion**

**POPULATION ESTIMATES AND PROJECTIONS**

The population estimates and projections on the western slope of El Dorado County were prepared by SACOG for the RTP. It is estimated that there are 147,045 people residing in western El Dorado County, which includes 10,072 people in the City of Placerville. By the year 2025, it is estimated that El Dorado County will have 197,875 people, including 15,193 people in the City of Placerville.

**HOUSING ESTIMATES AND PROJECTIONS**

The housing projections on the western slope of El Dorado County were prepared by SACOG for the RTP. It is estimated that there are 56,111 housing units in western El Dorado County, which includes 4,292 housing units in the City of Placerville. By the year 2025, it is estimated that El Dorado County will have 78,990 units, including 6,404 units in the City of Placerville.

**HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS**

Residential use in most rural areas is low-density residential use, with structures ranging in age from over a century to newly constructed homes. Common types of rural residential development include “ranchettes,” typically found in areas with relatively mild topography, and cabins or second residences located at higher elevations that provide seasonal access to remote areas; this latter category of housing includes many of the vacation homes that are prevalent throughout the County. The housing stock in Placerville consists of relatively older homes because of the built-out nature of the area. According to the City of Placerville General Plan, there is an increasing number of multi-family residential houses, but approximately 65 percent of the City’s housing is low density residential.

The western reaches of the County are developing rapidly with several master-planned communities and other large-scale, higher-density, residential developments. These developments typically offer newer, upscale production homes that attract new residents who commute to Sacramento and the Bay Area.

### ***Responses to Checklist Questions***

***Response XII a):*** Growth inducement is statutorily required to be analyzed in EIRs when EIRs are prepared for projects. The EIR will provide an analysis of the potential growth inducing impacts caused by the proposed project. At this point the impact conclusion for this environmental topic is ***potentially significant*** until public comments are received and a detailed analysis is prepared in the environmental impact report.

***Response XII b), c):*** The improvements identified in the RTP have the potential to result in the displacement of a small number of residences in the event that right-of-way acquisition is required. There are not currently any plans for acquisition of property, as improvement drawings have not been engineered or approved. If any residences must be acquired due to physical design constraints, the displacement of any housing would not result in the construction of a significant amount of replacement housing elsewhere. Implementation of the RTP itself would result in a ***less-than-significant*** impact with regards to this topic and no mitigation is required.

### ***Sources Referenced***

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan*.

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR*.

City of Placerville Planning Department 1989. *City of Placerville General Plan Policy Document. Placerville, CA.*

California Department of Finance

U.S. Census 2000

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Will the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?				X
b) Police protection?				X
c) Schools?				X
d) Parks?				X
e) Other public facilities?				X

**Background Discussion**

**FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL RESPONSE**

The California Department of Forestry (CDF) is responsible for fire protection in the State Responsibility Areas (SRAs). The Amador-El Dorado Administrative Unit of CDF provides fire protection and emergency medical services to the 413,000 acres of SRA land in the County. CDF operates from five fire stations in the County, located near the communities of Camino, El Dorado, Pilot Hill, Garden Valley, and River Pines.

In addition to CDF, 13 local fire protection districts serve the County. [Figure 18](#) shows the location of the county-wide fire districts. These districts including the following:

- Cameron Park Fire Department
- Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District
- El Dorado County Fire Protection District
- El Dorado Hills Fire Department
- Garden Valley Fire Protection District
- Georgetown Fire Protection District
- Lake Valley Fire Protection District
- Latrobe Fire Protection District
- Mosquito Fire Protection District
- Pioneer Fire Protection District
- Rescue Fire Protection District

The fire protection districts that serve rural areas are staffed primarily by volunteer firefighters. There are mutual aid agreements between most of the agencies to ensure that adequate manpower and equipment can be provided when a fire occurs. The fire protection districts are responsible for responding to structural fires and wildland fires, as well as providing emergency medical services within their assigned areas. Response times for the local fire protection districts

can range from one minute in urbanized zones to more than 20 minutes in rugged mountain areas.

### ***Police Protection***

The El Dorado County Sheriff's Office (EDSO) provides service to the unincorporated areas of the County with a staff of 383 people, including 185 sworn officers. EDSO operates four offices (El Dorado Hills, Georgetown, Placerville, and Pollock Pines) on the west slope. [Figure 19](#) shows the location of the Department zones, main office, satellite offices, and the County jail.

EDSO operates a County jail facility in the City of Placerville. As of May 2003, the Placerville Jail housed 160 inmates and has capacity for a total of 240 inmates.

A variety of special programs are operated by EDSO, including the Special Emergency Response Team (SERT), Crisis Negotiation Team, Boat Patrol, and an extensive neighborhood watch program partly composed of a senior citizen volunteer program called the Sheriff's Team of Active Retirees (STAR). The Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) program is fully active with four assigned officers. In addition, EDSO coordinates a search and rescue team composed of more than 800 staff and volunteers with specialties in tracking, nordic skiing, rock climbing, etc. EDSO's Office of Emergency Services is a member of the County's Disaster Council, which also includes the County Board of Supervisors, local fire districts, the County Department of Public Health, and County Environmental Management Department. The Disaster Council is the advisory body for the County's response strategy to major disasters, including acts of terrorism on targets with the County.

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

The City of Placerville has their own independent police force and facilities, and they provide secondary response services to EDSO for incidents that occur in the unincorporated areas of the County that are near the City limits. The Placerville Police Department (PPD) provides the following services: Police Patrol Division, Community Oriented Policing and Problem Solving, Police K-9's, Special Events, Court Appearances, Traffic Enforcement, Investigations, Dispatch, Records, Support Services, and Administration.

The City has been divided into fourteen areas and an officer and sergeant has been assigned one of these geographical areas with the understanding that they are the "Community Policing Officer" in that particular area. The PPD conducts foot beats making contact with citizens in both residential and commercial areas.

The Investigations Division, most commonly referred to as the Detective Bureau, is staffed with one officer (detective) and one sergeant (detective sergeant). The detective's primary function consists of investigating cases from the initial reporting phase, completed by the patrol division,

to a state of completion which could consist of an arrest and filing with the District Attorney's Office. Their areas of expertise includes evidence/crime scene processing, interview and interrogation techniques as well as courtroom testimony.

The Police Department's Dispatch, Records and Support Services Division consists of several non-sworn employees and volunteers (SHIELD and Cadets). In addition to answering and dispatching all the 9-1-1 calls within the City limits, this division processes and files all of the crime reports and traffic citations insuring a timely filing with the courts, District Attorney's office and Probation Department. The records personnel are the staff members that assist citizens responding to the department's front counter with questions or problems. Also included in this division is the Code Enforcement Officer. This individual's primary responsibility includes the enforcement of the City's parking regulations.

The PPD's Administrative Division consists of the Police Chief, the Police Commander and the Administrative Secretary. The primary function of this division is managing the administrative responsibilities of the PPD, which includes personnel, training, budgeting, policy decisions and legal issues.

The California Highway Patrol provides secondary response to all other areas outside the City of Placerville. EDSO provides secondary response to crime incidents within the City of Placerville.

Generally, the total number of crime incidents in El Dorado County has shown a relatively stable trend (neither increasing nor decreasing) from 1990 to 2002. The number of crime incidents showed a peak between 1993 and 1995 and a decrease from 1998 to 2001. Overall, given that population increased in the County between 1990 and 2002, the number of crimes per resident in the County has generally decreased. In 1990 there were 31 major crime incidents per 1,000 residents, peaking at 33 incidents per 1,000 in 1994 and dropping to as low as 17 incidents per 1,000 in 1999. In 2002 the rate was 22 incidents per 1,000 residents.

### **Schools**

There are 15 school districts in the County, including the City of Placerville. [Figure 20](#) shows the location of the school districts located within the County. These districts including the following:

- Black Oak Mine Unified School District (K-12)
- Buckeye Union Elementary School District
- Camino Union School District
- El Dorado Union High School District
- Gold Oak Union School District
- Gold Trail Union School District
- Indian Diggins School District
- Lake Tahoe Unified School District
- Latrobe Elementary School District
- Mother Lode Union Elementary School District
- Pioneer Union Elementary School District

- Placerville Union School District
- Pollock Pines Elementary School District
- Rescue Union School District
- Silver Fork School District

Fourteen of these school districts are located on the west slope, including one high school district, one K-12 school district, and 12 small- to moderate-sized K-8 school districts that “feed” into the El Dorado Union High School District. There are 62 schools and related public education facilities, such as special-education schools and juvenile centers, countywide. They accommodated 29,072 students during the 2003-2004 school year. The countywide public school enrollment has fluctuated over the last 11 school years from a low of 27,683 students in the 1993-1994 school years to a high of 29,147 students in the 2002-2003 school years.

### **Parks**

The responsibility of local park planning and development generally falls under the jurisdiction of Cities, local community service districts (CSDs), or other local parks and recreation districts, which serve distinct subareas of the County. The City of Placerville, El Dorado Hills CSD, Cameron Park CSD, and Georgetown Divide Recreation District are all public agencies that provide recreational opportunities and facilities within the County. As an independent, public utility provider, the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) also provides recreation opportunities in the County. Parks and open space areas within Western El Dorado County, including the City of Placerville, are described by recreation district in [Table 19](#). [Figure 21](#) shows the location of the park recreation facilities located within the unincorporated County and [Figure 22](#) shows the location of the park recreation facilities located within the City of Placerville.

**Table 19**  
**Parks and Open Space in Western El Dorado County**

District / Agency	Developed Parkland		Undeveloped Parkland / Open Space	
	# of Parks	Total Acreage	# of Parks	Total Acreage
El Dorado Hills CSD	13	86.03	13	108.63
Cameron Park CSD	9	56.2	4	46.2
Georgetown Divide Recreation District	4	18.5	1	1.5
El Dorado County	3	45.5	3 (Proposed)	n/a
El Dorado Irrigation District	1	30	-	-
City of Placerville	5	97.5	-	-
<b>Total</b>	35	333.73	18	156.33

### **Other Public Facilities**

The existing County Library System on the western slope consists of five library buildings: a main library in Placerville, one large community branch in Cameron Park, two small branches in Georgetown and Pollock Pines, a shared library in El Dorado Hills at the high school, and a bookmobile. The countywide library space is expected to be 66,800 square feet after the completion of the new El Dorado Hills branch library.

## **Responses to Checklist Questions**

**Responses XIII a), b), c), d), e):** The improvements identified in the RTP include a variety of transportation improvements that will not result in an increased need for any public services or facilities. The transportation improvements are expected to improve travel conditions throughout the County and City of Placerville, which would improve travel conditions to existing public facilities such as recreation, schools, and libraries, and is expected to improve the travel conditions for public services such as police and fire protection during responses. These are considered beneficial impacts. Implementation of the proposed project will therefore have ***no adverse impact*** on public services or facilities and no mitigation is required.

## **Sources Referenced**

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan*.

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR*.

City of Placerville Planning Department 1989. *City of Placerville General Plan Policy Document. Placerville, CA.*

**XIV. RECREATION – Will the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

**Background Discussion**

**RECREATION ON FEDERAL LANDS**

Federal recreational lands in the County include primarily land owned by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

USFS lands on the western slope include the Eldorado National Forest and Tahoe National Forest. The USFS provides developed facilities (e.g., campgrounds), owns land upon which private entities may operate recreational facilities (e.g., snowsports resorts), and allows for dispersed recreation (e.g., hiking, backpacking, fishing).

BLM lands on the western slope include a number of large tracts of forested lands in the American and Cosumnes River canyons. The BLM manages its lands primarily for dispersed recreational opportunities, such as whitewater boating and hiking.

**RECREATION ON STATE LANDS**

The California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) is the primary state recreation provider on the western slope. DPR owns and/or manages a number of recreational areas in the County, including Folsom Lake State Recreation Area and Folsom Reservoir, Auburn State Recreation Area, Marshall Gold discovery State Historic Park, and others. Recreational areas managed by DPR typically provide developed facilities (e.g., campgrounds) and dispersed recreation opportunities (e.g., hiking, boating).

**Responses to Checklist Questions**

**Responses XIV a), b):** The improvements identified in the RTP include a variety of transportation improvements that will not result in an increased need for any recreational facilities. The transportation improvements are expected to improve travel conditions throughout the County and the City of Placerville, which would improve travel conditions to existing recreation facilities. These are considered beneficial impacts. Implementation of the proposed

project will therefore have *no adverse impact* on recreational facilities and no mitigation is required.

**Sources Referenced**

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan*.

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR*.

City of Placerville Planning Department 1989. *City of Placerville General Plan Policy Document. Placerville, CA.*

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	X			
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads and highways?	X			
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location those results in substantial safety risks?	X			
d) Substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	X			
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	X			
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	X			
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	X			

**Responses to Checklist Questions**

**Responses XV a), b), c), d), e), f), g):** Based on existing and projected traffic volume levels along roadways, it has been determined that the potential traffic impacts caused by the proposed project will require a detailed analysis in the environmental impact report. As such, the lead agency will examine each of the seven environmental issues listed in the checklist above in the environmental impact report and will decide whether the proposed project has the potential to have a significant impact from traffic. At this point a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made, rather all are considered *potentially significant* until a detailed analysis is prepared in the environmental impact report.

**XVI. UTILITIES - Will the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition of the provider's existing commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

**Background Discussion**

This section describes the existing stormwater drainage, water supply, waste water treatment, solid waste, power supply, and communication systems serving the west slope of El Dorado County, including the City of Placerville.

**STORM DRAINAGE**

The west slope of El Dorado County contains three major watersheds, each of which drain into one of these major rivers: the Middle Fork American River, the South Fork American River, or the Cosumnes River. These watersheds are further divided into smaller drainage basins that feed the tributaries of these three major rivers. Developed drainage infrastructure exists in many of the drainage basins, particularly in the following nine drainage basins:

- Coloma Canyon between Greenwood and Garden Valley (7.5 square miles)
- Finnon Reservoir drainage (4 square miles)

- Weber Creek from the Pollock Pines area to the American River, including the Cold Springs, Dry Creek, and Spring Creek tributaries (40 square miles)
- Deer Creek from Cameron Park to the Sacramento County line (72 square miles)
- Big Canyon Creek from El Dorado to the Cosumnes River, including the Slate, Little Indian, and French Creek tributaries (36 square miles)
- Middle Fork of the Cosumnes River within the Somerset/Fairplay vicinity (23 square miles)
- Cedar Creek from Omo Ranch to the Cosumnes River (37 square miles)
- Jenkinson Reservoir drainage (18 square miles)
- New York Creek (2.6 square miles)
- Allegheny Creek (1.9 square miles)

### ***Storm Drainage Regulations and Programs***

**National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.** The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program was established by the Clean Water Act of 1972 to regulate municipal and industrial discharges to surface waters of the U.S. The discharge of wastewater to surface waters is prohibited unless an NPDES permit allowing that discharge has been issued. Starting in 1990, Phase I of the EPA's stormwater program required NPDES permits for stormwater runoff from certain facilities and activities.

**El Dorado County Department of Transportation Drainage Program.** The County Department of Transportation has an ongoing drainage program with a goal of developing a Capital Improvement Program and funding mechanism for the construction of essential drainage infrastructure and to repair and/or replace inadequate drainage facilities throughout the County. The first phase of the drainage program, development of standard procedures for drainage system designs, was completed with the adoption of the *County of El Dorado Drainage Manual* in 1995. The second phase will involve updating FEMA mapping of four specific drainage basins in the County. The third phase is the development of funding mechanisms to address drainage problems in the study areas.

**County of El Dorado Design and Improvement Standards Manual.** The County's Design and Improvement Standards Manual was adopted in 1990 and provides required erosion and sediment control measures that are applicable to subdivisions, roadways, and other types of developments.

**County of El Dorado Drainage Manual.** The *County of El Dorado Drainage Manual* provides standard procedures for future designs of drainage improvements. The Drainage Manual supersedes the stormwater drainage system design standards in the County's *Design Improvements Standards Manual*. The Drainage Manual requires that a hydrologic and hydraulic analysis be submitted for all proposed drainage facilities.

**County of El Dorado Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP).** The County of El Dorado Storm Water Management Plan, adopted in 2004 and subsequently approved by the SWRCB, addresses storm water pollution control related to project planning, design, construction and maintenance activities throughout the unincorporated area of Western El Dorado County (that portion of El Dorado County within the jurisdiction of the Central Valley Regional Water

Quality Control Board, excluding the Tahoe Basin). In addition, the SWMP describes “the minimum procedures and practices the County uses to reduce the discharge of pollutants in effluent from storm drainage systems owned or operated by the County.”

## **WATER SUPPLY, WASTE WATER TREATMENT, SOLID WASTE, POWER, AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The City of Placerville has an elaborate network of public utilities and services, such as water, wastewater treatment, and storm drainage. It has been a goal of the City to maintain an adequate level of services for all public utilities and services provided by the City. The City of Placerville General Plan identifies numerous policies that further the City’s utility and service goals.

Utility infrastructure also exists in various parts of the County. The proposed project does not require the use of utilities or infrastructure and would not result in the expansion of utilities or infrastructure. There is no need to provide additional background on this topic because it is not relevant to the proposed project.

### **Responses to Checklist Questions**

**Responses XVI a), b), d), e), f), g):** The improvements identified in the RTP include a variety of transportation improvements that will not result in an increased need for any utilities. Implementation of the proposed project will therefore have *no impact* on public services or facilities and no mitigation is required.

**Response XVI c):** Each roadway transportation improvement identified in the RTP would result in additional impervious services and increased stormwater runoff. Each improvement would be engineered with storm drainage infrastructure (i.e. culverts, pipes, detention/retention ponds, biofilters, etc.) to control runoff and prevent erosion and sedimentation. Each improvement would require a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan that would be submitted to the Regional Water Quality Control Board for review and approval prior to issuance of a General Permit for storm water discharge. The RTP does not provide detailed engineering and drainage plans for any of the potential improvements because they will be completed at a project specific level at a later date once they are funded and up for approval. The RTP by itself has *no impact* on storm drainage; however, each improvement plan for potential future improvement projects would need to be reviewed to determine if there is a potential for an adverse impact on storm drainage facilities.

### **Sources Referenced**

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan*.

County of El Dorado and EDAW 2004, *El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR*.

City of Placerville Planning Department 1989. *City of Placerville General Plan Policy Document*. Placerville, CA.

County of El Dorado 2004. *County of El Dorado Storm Water Management Plan*.

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	X			
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	X			
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	X			

**Responses to Checklist Questions**

**Responses XVII a), b), c):** Based on the documented biological resources, and cultural resources, based on the existing and projected air quality, noise and traffic conditions, and based on the connection between circulation and land uses, it has been determined that the potential for the RTP to: degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal; eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory; create cumulatively considerable impacts; or adversely effect human beings will require more detailed analysis in an environmental impact report. As such, the lead agency will examine each of these environmental issues in the environmental impact report and will decide whether the proposed project has the potential to have a significant impact on these environmental issues. At this point a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made, rather all are considered *potentially significant* until a detailed analysis is prepared in the environmental impact report.