

---

---

# EL DORADO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN



**TRAFFIC IMPACT MITIGATION FEE PROGRAM  
DRAFT SUPPLEMENT  
TO THE  
EL DORADO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2001082030

MARCH 2006

---

---

# EL DORADO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN



## **TRAFFIC IMPACT MITIGATION FEE PROGRAM DRAFT SUPPLEMENT TO THE EL DORADO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE No. 2001082030

PREPARED BY:  
EL DORADO COUNTY

WITH ASSISTANCE FROM:  
ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP & PLANNING, INC.

MARCH 2006

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction.....	1-1
1.1	Summary of Impacts.....	1-14
1.2	Purpose and Use of Supplement to the General Plan EIR.....	1-16
1.3	General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Background.....	1-17
1.3.1	2004 County General Plan and CEQA Review Process.....	1-17
1.3.2	General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element .....	1-18
	Transportation and Circulation Element .....	1-18
	General Plan Traffic and Circulation Impacts .....	1-19
	Traffic and Circulation Mitigation Measures .....	1-19
1.3.3	General Plan Roadway and Transportation Programs Funding Requirements..	1-20
1.3.4	Road Development and TIM Fee Programs.....	1-22
2	Proposed TIM Fee Program .....	2-1
2.1	Overview.....	2-1
2.2	Proposed TIM Fee Program.....	2-1
2.3	Traffic and Roadway Analyses Conducted for Proposed TIM Fee Program .....	2-2
2.3.1	General Plan Level of Service Requirements .....	2-2
2.3.2	Roadway Improvements Necessary to Achieve General Plan Requirements.....	2-3
	Improvements to County (Non-U.S. 50) Road Segments .....	2-4
	Improvements to U.S. 50.....	2-5
2.4	TIM Fee Program Options and Costs.....	2-7
3	Environmental Impacts.....	3-1
3.1	Overview of Impact Considerations.....	3-1
3.2	Traffic and Circulation Impacts .....	3-2
3.2.1	Thresholds of Significance.....	3-2
3.2.2	Summary of General Plan EIR Traffic and Circulation Impacts .....	3-3
3.2.3	TIM Fee Program and Impact 5.4-2 .....	3-4
3.3	Other Resources .....	3-6
4	References .....	4-1
5	Report Preparation .....	5-1

## LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A Proposed TIM Fee Program Rates

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Comparison of General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Roadway Levels of Service.....	1-3
Table 2	Summary Comparison of General Plan and TIM Fee Program Analyses and Conclusions .....	1-16
Table 3	Table TC-2 of 2004 El Dorado County General Plan, El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F .....	2-3
Table 4	Table TC-3 of 2004 El Dorado County General Plan, El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F (After December 31, 2008).....	2-3
Table 5	Differences in Roadway Improvements Identified in General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Analyses.....	2-6

# 1 INTRODUCTION

This document is a Draft Supplement to the El Dorado County General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (El Dorado County, 2003) and has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 15000 et seq.). The General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report is referenced herein as the General Plan EIR and is comprised of several documents prepared by the County during its CEQA review of the General Plan.

This Draft Supplement to the El Dorado County General Plan EIR (Draft Supplement) considers the adoption of a proposed Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Program in order to implement Measure TC-B of the El Dorado County General Plan.

This Draft Supplement was prepared in connection with the consideration and adoption of a proposed Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Program<sup>1</sup> in order to implement Measure TC-B of the El Dorado County General Plan. That policy states, in part, that the “traffic fees should be designed to achieve the adopted level of service standards and preserve the integrity of the circulation system.” The TIM Fee Program is an implementation measure called for by the General Plan and constitutes a subsequent activity contemplated by the General Plan EIR. The Supplement to the General Plan EIR provides environmental documentation for the TIM Fee Program and a Final Supplement certified by the County Board of Supervisors will become a component of the General Plan EIR.

The General Plan EIR included analysis of the traffic-generating impacts of the various General Plan alternatives and the traffic levels of service that were anticipated as a result of adoption of any of the General Plan alternatives. In order to analyze potential traffic impacts of the final version of the General Plan that was being considered for adoption by the Board of Supervisors, the consultant retained to perform the traffic analysis (Fehr & Peers) focused on the traffic level of service standards contained in the proposed General Plan and sized a roadway system to achieve those levels of service which formed the basis of the analysis. The analysis was performed at a level of detail appropriate for a general plan EIR. As a result of this analysis, the Final General Plan EIR contained information regarding the anticipated impacts of adoption of the General Plan on various roadway segments within the County.

As part of the development of the proposed TIM Fee program, the County retained the services of Dowling Associates, Inc. (Dowling) to provide more detailed traffic analysis and roadway design which is needed for the development of the TIM Fee program. That analysis is contained in *US 50 Strategic Corridor Operations Study – Ponderosa Road to Mather Field Road* (Dowling, 2006a) and the *El Dorado County Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Update 2005* (Dowling, 2006). Collectively, these reports are referred to as the TIM Fee Program analysis and are incorporated herein by this reference. One required element of a TIM Fee program is the determination of the cost of the proposed road system so that appropriate fees can be developed. This required a much more detailed analysis than was done for the General Plan EIR. The TIM Fee Program analysis prepared by Dowling had the same focus as the

---

<sup>1</sup> The TIM Fee Program consists of several elements. One is the development of a road improvement plan that forms the basis of the program. From that program, the actual TIM Fees are developed. The TIM Fees themselves constitute only the financing for various road improvements. The focus of the analysis in this Draft Supplement is the road plan that underlies the TIM Fee Program as opposed to the fees themselves, and any references herein to the TIM Fee Program includes the road plan developed as a part of that program.

General Plan EIR analysis prepared by Fehr & Peers – to design a road system capable of achieving the traffic level of service standards of the General Plan. However, the TIM Fee Program analysis allowed a more refined definition of the precise road specifications that would be needed than was possible with the General Plan EIR because of the more detailed work done such as consideration of specific traffic volumes and traffic movements along specified segments of roadways (in contrast to the General Plan EIR analysis which was based on traffic volumes), consideration of the effects of specific interchange and intersection improvements, and more precise construction detail. Therefore, certain roadway segment improvements recommended by Dowling as the basis for the TIM Fee program differ from those assumed by Fehr & Peers in the General Plan EIR.

Thus, in developing the proposed TIM Fee Program the County has refined certain elements of the traffic and circulation analysis and roadway system described in the General Plan EIR. The roadway system identified through the TIM Fee Program analysis meets the level of service standards contained within the General Plan policies. However, the analysis conducted in association with the development of the proposed TIM Fee Program determined that, with the roadway improvements identified in the TIM Fee Program analysis in place, traffic levels of service on a limited number of roadway segments are projected to vary from those presented in the General Plan EIR.

Both the General Plan EIR and the TIM Fee Program analysis considered traffic operations on 184 roadway segments within the County.<sup>2</sup> Of these, the General Plan EIR analysis identified 75 roadway segments that were projected to experience declines in levels of service that exceed the thresholds of significance used in the General Plan EIR review. Note that although 75 segments were projected to exceed level of service thresholds in the General Plan EIR analysis, certain documentation for the General Plan EIR and CEQA Findings erroneously referenced that 74 segments were projected to exceed the threshold. This miscount does not represent a change in the conclusions of the General Plan EIR.

The analysis conducted in developing the proposed TIM Fee Program determined that of the 184 segments analyzed, 94 segments are projected to exceed the General Plan EIR thresholds of significance. As compared to the General Plan EIR analysis, this results in an additional 19 segments that are projected to exceed the General Plan EIR thresholds of significance under the TIM Fee Program analysis. In all instances, the levels of service identified through the TIM Fee Program analysis are projected to achieve the level of service standards contained within the General Plan policies.

Table 1 provides a full listing of the roadway segments analyzed in the General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program studies. The table includes the levels of service in 2001 (which provide the basis for *existing conditions* in the analyses) and the projected 2025 levels of service determined through the two separate analyses, and identifies whether the segment would exceed the EIR significance thresholds. Note that in all cases under both of the analyses, the levels of service are projected to fully achieve General Plan level of service policies.

---

<sup>2</sup> These 184 segments are comprised of 156 non-U.S. 50 road segments, eight U.S. 50 segments east of the City of Placerville and twenty U.S. 50 segments west of the City of Placerville. The twenty U.S. 50 segments west of Placerville are comprised of ten sections of U.S. 50, with each included in the analyses with a separate eastbound and westbound segment.

<b>Table 1 Comparison of General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Roadway Levels of Service (table notes and definitions on page 1-13)</b>						
<b>Roadway</b>	<b>Segment</b>	<b>Existing Conditions 2001 (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>LOS per General Plan EIR Analysis (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>LOS per TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling, 2006)</b>	<b>Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on GP Analysis (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling 2006)</b>
Bass Lake Rd.	U.S. 50 to Country Club Dr.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Bass Lake Rd.	Country Club Dr. to Bass Lake	C	C	C <sup>1</sup>	N	N <sup>1</sup>
Bass Lake Rd.	Bass Lake to Green Valley Rd.	C	C	D	N <sup>4</sup>	Y <sup>4</sup>
Bass Lake Rd., New	Bass Lake Rd. to Green Valley Rd.	NA	C	C	N	N
Big Cut Rd.	Pleasant Valley Rd. to Placerville City Limits	A	A	B	N	N
Bucks Bar Rd.	Mt. Aukum Rd. to Cattle Creek Ln.	C	C	D	N <sup>4</sup>	Y <sup>4</sup>
Bucks Bar Rd.	Cattle Creek Ln. to Pleasant Valley Rd.	C	C	D	N <sup>4</sup>	Y <sup>4</sup>
Cambridge Rd.	U.S. 50 EB ramps to Country Club Dr.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Cambridge Rd.	Country Club Dr. to Oxford Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Cambridge Rd.	Oxford Rd. to Green Valley Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Cameron Park Dr.	Durock Rd. to Coach Ln.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Cameron Park Dr.	Coach Ln. to Palmer Dr.	D	D	D	Y	Y
Cameron Park Dr.	Palmer Dr. to Oxford Rd.	E	D	D	N	N
Cameron Park Dr.	Oxford Rd. to Green Valley Rd.	D	D	D	Y	Y
Carson Rd.	Placerville City Limits to Union Ridge Rd.	B	C	C	N	N
Carson Rd.	Union Ridge Rd. to U.S. 50	B	C	C	N	N
Carson Rd.	U.S. 50 to Barkley Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Carson Rd.	Barkley Rd. to Pony Express Trail	C	C	C	N	N
Cedar Ravine Rd.	Pleasant Valley Rd. to Quarry Rd.	B	B	C	N	N

<b>Table 1 (continued)</b> <b>Comparison of General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Roadway Levels of Service</b> (table notes and definitions on page 1-13)						
Roadway	Segment	Existing Conditions 2001 (F&P 2004)	LOS per General Plan EIR Analysis (F&P 2004)	LOS per TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling, 2006)	Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on GP Analysis (F&P 2004)	Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling 2006)
Cedar Ravine Rd.	Quarry Rd. to Placerville City Limits	C	C	C	N	N
Cold Springs Rd.	Placerville City Limits to Cool Water Cr.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Cold Springs Rd.	Cool Water Cr. to Gold Hill Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Cold Springs Rd.	Gold Hill Rd. to SR 49	B	C	C	N	N
Country Club Dr.	Bass Lake Rd. to Merrychase Dr.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Country Club Dr.	Merrychase Dr. to Cambridge Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Country Club Dr.	Cambridge Rd. to Royal Dr. (W)	C	D	D	Y	Y
Country Club Dr.	Royal Dr (W) to Cameron Park Dr.	C	C	C	N	N
Country Club Dr. Extension	Silva Valley Pkwy. to Bass Lake Rd.	NA	C	C	N	N
Durock Rd.	Cameron Park Dr. to Heinz Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Durock Rd.	Heinz Rd. to S. Shingle Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
El Dorado Hills Blvd.	U.S. 50 to Lassen Ln.	D	D	D	Y	Y
El Dorado Hills Blvd.	Lassen Ln. to Olson Ln.	C	C	C	N	N
El Dorado Hills Blvd.	Olson Ln. to St Andrews Dr.	C	C	C	N	N
El Dorado Hills Blvd.	St. Andrews Dr. to Francisco Dr.	D	C	D	N <sup>3</sup>	Y <sup>3</sup>
El Dorado Hills Blvd.	Francisco Dr. to Green Valley Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
El Dorado Rd.	Pleasant Valley Rd. to Mother Lode Dr.	B	C	C	N	N
El Dorado Rd.	Mother Lode Dr. to U.S. 50	C	D	D	Y	Y
El Dorado Rd.	U.S. 50 Interchange	C	C	C	N	N
El Dorado Rd.	U.S. 50 to Missouri Flat Rd.	C	C	C	N	N



<b>Table 1 (continued)</b> <b>Comparison of General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Roadway Levels of Service</b> <b>(table notes and definitions on page 1-13)</b>						
<b>Roadway</b>	<b>Segment</b>	<b>Existing Conditions 2001 (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>LOS per General Plan EIR Analysis (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>LOS per TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling, 2006)</b>	<b>Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on GP Analysis (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling 2006)</b>
El Dorado Rd.	Missouri Flat Rd. to Green Valley Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Fairplay Rd.	Mt Aukum Rd. to Omo Ranch Rd.	B	B	C	N	N
Forni Rd.	SR 49 to Enterprise Dr.	C	C	C	N	N
Forni Rd.	Enterprise Dr. to Missouri Flat Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Forni Rd.	Missouri Flat Rd. to Wamego Rd.	B	C	C	N	N
Forni Rd.	Wamego Rd. to Placerville City Limits	B	C	D	N <sup>4</sup>	Y <sup>4</sup>
Francisco Dr.	El Dorado Hills Blvd. to Green Valley Rd. <sup>5</sup>	C	C	C	N	N
Garden Valley Rd.	SR 193 to Marshall Rd.	B	B	C	N	N
Gold Hill Rd.	Lotus Rd. to Cold Springs Rd.	B	C	C	N	N
Gold Hill Rd.	Cold Springs Rd. to SR 49	A	A	A	N	N
Green Valley Rd.	County Line to Francisco Dr.	F	D	D	N	N
Green Valley Rd.	Francisco Dr. to Salmon Falls Rd.	D	C	C <sup>2</sup>	N	N <sup>2</sup>
Green Valley Rd.	Salmon Falls Rd. to Deer Valley Rd. (W)	D	D	D	Y	Y
Green Valley Rd.	Deer Valley Rd. (W) to Bass Lake Rd.	D	D	D	Y	Y
Green Valley Rd.	Bass Lake Rd. to Cameron Park Dr.	D	D	D	Y	Y
Green Valley Rd.	Cameron Park Dr. to Deer Valley Rd. (E)	C	D	D	Y	Y
Green Valley Rd.	Deer Valley Rd. (E) to Lotus Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Green Valley Rd.	Lotus Rd. to Greenstone Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Green Valley Rd.	Greenstone Rd. to Missouri Flat Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Green Valley Rd.	Missouri Flat Rd. to Placerville City	C	D	D	Y	Y

<b>Table 1 (continued)</b> <b>Comparison of General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Roadway Levels of Service</b> <b>(table notes and definitions on page 1-13)</b>						
<b>Roadway</b>	<b>Segment</b>	<b>Existing Conditions 2001 (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>LOS per General Plan EIR Analysis (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>LOS per TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling, 2006)</b>	<b>Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on GP Analysis (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling 2006)</b>
	Limits					
Greenstone Rd.	Mother Lode Dr. to U.S. 50	B	C	D	N <sup>4</sup>	Y <sup>4</sup>
Greenstone Rd.	U.S. 50 Interchange	C	C	C	N	N
Greenstone Rd.	U.S. 50 to Green Valley Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Latrobe Rd.	County Line to S. Shingle Rd.	B	C	C	N	N
Latrobe Rd.	S. Shingle Rd. to Wetsel Oviatt	C	C	C	N	N
Latrobe Rd.	Wetsel Oviatt to Investment Blvd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Latrobe Rd.	Investment Blvd. to Carson Creek	C	D	D	Y	Y
Latrobe Rd.	Carson Creek to White Rock Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Latrobe Rd.	White Rock Rd. to U.S. 50	C	D	D	Y	Y
Lotus Rd.	Green Valley Rd. to Springvale Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Lotus Rd.	Springvale Rd. to Thompson Hill Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Lotus Rd.	Thompson Hill Rd. to SR 49	C	C	C	N	N
Marshall Rd.	SR 49 to Mt Murphy Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Marshall Rd.	Mt Murphy Rd. to Black Oak Mine Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Meder Rd.	Cameron Park Dr. to Rosebud Dr.	C	C	D	N <sup>4</sup>	Y <sup>4</sup>
Meder Rd.	Rosebud Dr. to Ponderosa Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Missouri Flat Rd.	Green Valley Rd. to El Dorado Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Missouri Flat Rd.	El Dorado Rd. to Headington Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Missouri Flat Rd.	Headington Rd. to U.S. 50	D	D	D	Y	Y
Missouri Flat Rd.	U.S. 50 to Mother Lode Dr.	F	D	D	N	N

<b>Table 1 (continued)</b> <b>Comparison of General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Roadway Levels of Service</b> (table notes and definitions on page 1-13)						
Roadway	Segment	Existing Conditions 2001 (F&P 2004)	LOS per General Plan EIR Analysis (F&P 2004)	LOS per TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling, 2006)	Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on GP Analysis (F&P 2004)	Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling 2006)
Missouri Flat Rd.	Mother Lode Dr. to China Garden Rd.	D	D	D	Y	Y
Missouri Flat Rd.	China Garden Rd. to SR 49	D	D	D	N	N
Missouri Flat Rd. Connector	Missouri Flat Rd. to SR 49	NA	D	D	Y	Y
Missouri Flat Rd. Connector	SR 49 (new) to Pleasant Valley Rd.	NA	C	D	N <sup>3</sup>	Y <sup>3</sup>
Mormon Emigrant Trail	Sly Park Rd. to 2nd Dam	A	C	C	N	N
Mosquito Rd.	Placerville City Limits to Union Ridge Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Mosquito Rd.	Union Ridge Rd. to Rock Creek Rd.	A	C	C	N	N
Mother Lode Dr.	S. Shingle Rd. to French Creek Rd.	D	E	E	Y	Y
Mother Lode Dr.	French Creek Rd. to Greenstone Rd.	D	D	D	Y	Y
Mother Lode Dr.	Greenstone Rd. to Pleasant Valley Rd.	D	D	D	Y	Y
Mother Lode Dr.	Pleasant Valley Rd. to El Dorado Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Mother Lode Dr.	El Dorado Rd. to Missouri Flat Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Mt. Aukum Rd.	County Line to Omo Ranch Rd.	B	C	C	N	N
Mt. Aukum Rd.	Omo Ranch Rd. to Grizzly Flat Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Mt. Aukum Rd.	Grizzly Flat Rd. to Sly Park Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Newtown Rd.	Pleasant Valley Rd. to Snows Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Newtown Rd.	Snows Rd. to Weber Creek	C	C	C	N	N
Newtown Rd.	Weber Creek to Placerville City Limits	C	C	C	N	N

<b>Table 1 (continued)</b> <b>Comparison of General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Roadway Levels of Service</b> <b>(table notes and definitions on page 1-13)</b>						
<b>Roadway</b>	<b>Segment</b>	<b>Existing Conditions 2001 (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>LOS per General Plan EIR Analysis (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>LOS per TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling, 2006)</b>	<b>Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on GP Analysis (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling 2006)</b>
North Shingle Rd.	Ponderosa Rd. to Tennessee Dr.	C	D	D	Y	Y
North Shingle Rd.	Tennessee Dr. to Green Valley Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Omo Ranch Rd.	Mt Aukum Rd. to Fairplay Rd.	A	A	A	N	N
Pleasant Valley Rd.	Mother Lode Dr. to El Dorado Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Pleasant Valley Rd.	El Dorado Rd. to SR 49 (S)	C	D	D	Y	Y
Pleasant Valley Rd.	SR 49 (N) to Big Cut Rd.	D	D	D	Y	Y
Pleasant Valley Rd.	Big Cut Rd. to Cedar Ravine Rd.	D	D	D	Y	Y
Pleasant Valley Rd.	Cedar Ravine Rd. to Bucks Bar Rd.	D	D	D	Y	Y
Pleasant Valley Rd.	Bucks Bar Rd. to Newtown Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Pleasant Valley Rd.	Newton Rd. to Mt. Aukum Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Ponderosa Rd.	U.S. 50 to N. Shingle Rd.	D	D	D	Y	Y
Ponderosa Rd.	N. Shingle Rd. to Meder Rd.	D	D	D	Y	Y
Ponderosa Rd.	Meder Rd. to Green Valley Rd.	B	B	C	N	N
Pony Express Trail	Ridgeway Dr. to Sly Park Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Pony Express Trail	Ridgeway Dr. to Sly Park Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Salmon Falls Rd.	Green Valley Rd. to Lake Hills Dr.	C	D	D	Y	Y
Salmon Falls Rd.	Lake Hills Dr. to Manzanita Ln.	B	C	C	N	N
Salmon Falls Rd.	Manzanita Ln. to Rattlesnake Bar Rd.	B	C	C	N	N
Saratoga Way Extension	County Line to El Dorado Hills Blvd.	NA	D	D	Y	Y
Serrano Parkway	EDH Blvd to Silva Valley Pkwy	C	C	C	N	N

<b>Table 1 (continued)</b> <b>Comparison of General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Roadway Levels of Service</b> (table notes and definitions on page 1-13)						
Roadway	Segment	Existing Conditions 2001 (F&P 2004)	LOS per General Plan EIR Analysis (F&P 2004)	LOS per TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling, 2006)	Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on GP Analysis (F&P 2004)	Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling 2006)
Serrano Parkway Extension	Silva Valley Pkwy to Bass Lake Rd.	NA	C	C	N	N
Shingle Springs Dr.	Mother Lode Dr to U.S. 50	B	C	C	N	N
Shingle Springs Dr.	U.S. 50 Interchange	C	C	C	N	N
Silva Valley Pkwy.	Serrano Pkwy. to Harvard Way	C	C	C	N	N
Silva Valley Pkwy.	Harvard Way to Green Valley Rd.	C	C	D	N <sup>3</sup>	Y <sup>3</sup>
Silva Valley Pkwy. Extension	U.S. 50 to Serrano Pkwy.	NA	D	D	Y	Y
Sly Park Rd.	Mt Aukum Rd. to Clear Creek Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Sly Park Rd.	Clear Creek Rd. to Mormon Emigrant Trail	B	C	C	N	N
Sly Park Rd.	Mormon Emigrant Trail to Park Creek Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
Sly Park Rd.	Park Creek Rd. to U.S. 50	C	C	C	N	N
Sly Park Rd.	U.S. 50 to Pony Express Trail	C	C	C	N	N
Snows Rd.	Newtown Rd. to Carson Rd.	B	C	C	N	N
Sophia Pkwy.	County Line to Green Valley Rd.	NA	C	D	N <sup>3</sup>	Y <sup>3</sup>
South Shingle Rd.	Latrobe Rd. to Brandon Rd.	A	C	C	N	N
South Shingle Rd.	Brandon Rd. to Sunset Ln.	B	C	C	N	N
South Shingle Rd.	Sunset Ln. to Durock Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
South Shingle Rd.	Durock Rd. to U.S. 50	D	D	D	Y	Y
Suncast Ln. Extension	County Line to White Rock Rd.	NA	NA	C	NA	N

<b>Table 1 (continued)</b> <b>Comparison of General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Roadway Levels of Service</b> (table notes and definitions on page 1-13)						
Roadway	Segment	Existing Conditions 2001 (F&P 2004)	LOS per General Plan EIR Analysis (F&P 2004)	LOS per TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling, 2006)	Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on GP Analysis (F&P 2004)	Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling 2006)
Suncast Ln. Extension	White Rock Rd. to Latrobe Rd.	NA	NA	D	N <sup>3</sup>	Y <sup>3</sup>
White Rock Rd.	County Line to Manchester Dr.	C	D	D	Y	Y
White Rock Rd.	Manchester Dr. to Latrobe Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
White Rock Rd.	Latrobe Rd. to Silva Valley Pkwy.	B	D	D	Y	Y
SR 49	County Line to Sand Ridge Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
SR 49	Sand Ridge Rd. to Crystal Blvd.	C	C	C	N	N
SR 49	Crystal Blvd. to China Hill Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
SR 49	China Hill Rd. to Pleasant Valley Rd.	C	C	D	N <sup>4</sup>	Y <sup>4</sup>
SR 49	Pleasant Valley Rd. to Missouri Flat Rd.	D	D	E	Y	Y
SR 49	Missouri Flat Rd. to Pleasant Valley Rd.	D	C	C	N	N
SR 49	Pleasant Valley Rd. to Placerville City Limits	C	E	E	Y	Y
SR 49	Placerville City Limits to Gold Hill Rd.	C	C	C	N	N
SR 49	Gold Hill Rd. to SR 153	B	C	C	N	N
SR 49	SR 153 to Marshall Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
SR 49	Marshall Rd. to Rattlesnake Bar Rd.	B	D	D	Y	Y
SR 49	Rattlesnake Bar Rd. to SR 193	C	D	D	Y	Y
SR 49	SR 193 to County Line	D	D	D	Y	Y
SR 193	SR 49 to Greenwood Rd.	C	D	D	Y	Y
SR 193	Greenwood Rd. to Main St. (Georgetown)	C	C	C	N	N
SR 193	Main St. (Georgetown) to Shoo Fly Rd.	B	C	C	N	N

<b>Table 1 (continued)</b> <b>Comparison of General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Roadway Levels of Service</b> <b>(table notes and definitions on page 1-13)</b>						
<b>Roadway</b>	<b>Segment</b>	<b>Existing Conditions 2001 (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>LOS per General Plan EIR Analysis (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>LOS per TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling, 2006)</b>	<b>Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on GP Analysis (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling 2006)</b>
SR 193	Shoo Fly Rd. to Placerville City Limits	C	C	C	N	N
U.S. 50 (westbound) - AM	County Line to El Dorado Hills Blvd./Latrobe Rd.	F	E	D	N	N
U.S. 50 (westbound) - PM		B	C	E	N <sup>6</sup>	Y <sup>6</sup>
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - AM		B	C	D	N <sup>6</sup>	Y <sup>6</sup>
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - PM		F	E	E	N	N
U.S. 50 (westbound) - AM	El Dorado Hills Blvd./Latrobe Rd. to Bass Lake Rd.	F	D	D	N	N
U.S. 50 (westbound) - PM		B	C	E	N <sup>6</sup>	Y <sup>6</sup>
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - AM		B	C	D	N <sup>6</sup>	Y <sup>6</sup>
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - PM		E	D	D	N	N
U.S. 50 (westbound) - AM	Bass Lake Rd. to Cambridge Rd.	D	D	C	Y	N
U.S. 50 (westbound) - PM		C	C	C	N	N
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - AM		B	C	C	N	N
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - PM		D	D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50 (westbound) - AM	Cambridge Rd. to Cameron Park Dr.	D	C	D	N <sup>6</sup>	Y <sup>6</sup>
U.S. 50 (westbound) - PM		C	C	E	N <sup>6</sup>	Y <sup>6</sup>
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - AM		B	C	C	N	N
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - PM		D	D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50 (westbound) - AM	Cameron Park Dr. to Ponderosa Rd.	D	C	D	N <sup>6</sup>	Y <sup>6</sup>
U.S. 50 (westbound) - PM		B	C	E	N <sup>6</sup>	Y <sup>6</sup>
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - AM		B	C	C	N	N

<b>Table 1 (continued)</b> <b>Comparison of General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Roadway Levels of Service</b> <b>(table notes and definitions on page 1-13)</b>						
<b>Roadway</b>	<b>Segment</b>	<b>Existing Conditions 2001 (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>LOS per General Plan EIR Analysis (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>LOS per TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling, 2006)</b>	<b>Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on GP Analysis (F&amp;P 2004)</b>	<b>Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling 2006)</b>
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - PM		D	C	E	N <sup>6</sup>	Y <sup>6</sup>
U.S. 50 (westbound) - AM	Ponderosa Rd. to Shingle Springs Dr.	B	D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50 (westbound) - PM		A	D	E	Y	Y
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - AM		B	D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - PM		C	D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50 (westbound) - AM		Shingle Springs Dr. to Greenstone Rd.	B	C	C	N
U.S. 50 (westbound) - PM	B		D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - AM	B		D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - PM	C		D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50 (westbound) - AM	Greenstone Rd. to El Dorado Rd.		B	C	C	N
U.S. 50 (westbound) - PM		B	D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - AM		B	D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - PM		C	D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50 (westbound) - AM	El Dorado Rd. to Missouri Flat Rd.	B	C	C	N	N
U.S. 50 (westbound) - PM		B	D	D	Y <sup>7</sup>	Y
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - AM		B	C	C	N	N
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - PM		C	D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50 (westbound) - AM	Missouri Flat Rd. to Placerville City Limits	C	C	C	N	N
U.S. 50 (westbound) - PM		C	D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - AM		B	D	D	Y	Y



**Table 1 (continued)**  
**Comparison of General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Roadway Levels of Service**  
**(table notes and definitions on page 1-13)**

Roadway	Segment	Existing Conditions 2001 (F&P 2004)	LOS per General Plan EIR Analysis (F&P 2004)	LOS per TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling, 2006)	Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on GP Analysis (F&P 2004)	Significant per GP EIR Thresholds based on TIM Fee Analysis (Dowling 2006)
U.S. 50 (eastbound) - PM		C	C	C	N	N
U.S. 50	Placerville City Limits to Newtown Rd.	B	B	B	N	N
U.S. 50	Newton Rd. to Carson Rd. (W)	D	D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50	Carson Rd. (W) to Carson Rd. (E)	C	D	D	Y	Y
U.S. 50	Carson Rd. (E) to Sawmill Rd.	B	C	C	N	N
U.S. 50	Sawmill Rd. to Sly Park Rd.	A	C	C	N	N
U.S. 50	Sly Park Rd. to Fresh Pond	D	B	B	N	N
U.S. 50	Fresh Pond to Ice House Rd.	B	B	B	N	N
U.S. 50	Ice House Rd. to Echo Lake	D	F	F	Y	Y

**Notes:**

NA - Not Applicable. Applies to roadway segments which either did not exist in 2001 and/or were not analyzed in General Plan EIR analysis.

F&P - Fehr & Peers. GP - General Plan.

N - Projected to not exceed General Plan EIR level of service thresholds.

Y - Projected to exceed General Plan EIR level of service thresholds. In all instances, both analyses project that General Plan level of service policies will be achieved.

1. Although not identified in the TIM Fee Program analysis (Dowling) as necessary to achieve General Plan level of service policies, the TIM Fee Program has included the improvements for these segments as identified in the General Plan EIR (i.e., four lanes instead of two lanes). As a result, level of service projections improve from the Dowling analysis LOS D to LOS C.

2. Although not identified in the TIM Fee Program analysis (Dowling) as necessary to achieve General Plan level of service policies, the TIM Fee Program has included the improvements for these segments as identified in the General Plan EIR (i.e., four lanes instead of two lanes). As a result, level of service projections improve from the Dowling analysis LOS E to LOS C.

3. Road segment projected to exceed the General Plan EIR level of service thresholds due to a reduction in the size of the improvements identified through TIM Fee Program analysis.

4. Road segment projected to exceed the General Plan EIR level of service thresholds due to a more refined TIM Fee Program analysis. No improvements were proposed in either the General Plan EIR analysis or the TIM Fee Program analysis.

5. The TIM Fee Program lists a reduction in the size of the improvements as compared to the improvements identified in the General Plan EIR analysis. The General Plan EIR level of service thresholds are not projected to be exceeded in either case.

6. U.S. 50 segment projected to exceed the General Plan EIR level of service thresholds with the improvements identified in the TIM Fee Program analysis due to a change in the improvements and/or as a result of the more refined TIM Fee Program analysis.

7. Not in Fehr & Peers July 7, 2004 memorandum Table 2 listing, but contained in Attachment B of that memorandum.

Although these changes in projected levels of service occur in limited instances and have been determined to be fully consistent with the requirements of the 2004 General Plan, the County has decided to supplement the information presented in the General Plan EIR documentation to provide a full and updated analysis of the traffic and circulation impacts of the General Plan that would occur if only those improvements identified through the TIM Fee Program are built. It should be noted that the adoption of the proposed TIM Fee Program would not preclude the County from additionally pursuing some or all of the improvements identified in the General Plan EIR analysis that were not identified through the TIM Fee Program analysis.

## 1.1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

The analysis conducted for the proposed TIM Fee Program considered potential differences between the impact conclusions of the General Plan EIR and those associated with the findings of the analysis of the proposed TIM Fee Program. The analysis identified an increase in the severity of one significant and unavoidable impact identified in the General Plan EIR (Impact 5.4-2). This impact is associated with variation in the projected traffic levels of service on certain roadway segments under the TIM Fee Program analysis when compared to the General Plan EIR analysis, as discussed above. However, all levels of service are projected to achieve General Plan policy requirements.<sup>3</sup> The following provides a summary of the analysis and conclusions discussed in more detail in Sections 2 and 3 of this document.

The proposed TIM Fee Program was developed using an iterative process which identified 1) projected roadway deficiencies over a 20-year period (through 2025) based on projected growth under the General Plan, 2) necessary roadway improvements through 2025 to achieve the levels of service required by General Plan policies, and 3) projected levels of service in 2025 for each of the roadways with the improvements in place.<sup>4</sup> The General Plan EIR traffic and circulation analysis used a similar iterative process at a more general level to identify needed roadway improvements and to determine the projected levels of service associated with those improvements. This process resulted in the exclusion of several roadway improvements identified in the General Plan EIR analysis. However, not all of the improvements identified in the General Plan EIR analysis are required to achieve the General Plan's level of service policies. The TIM Fee Program analysis sought to more specifically identify the roadway improvements required to achieve General Plan level of service policy requirements. The more detailed analysis conducted for the TIM Fee Program identified several roadway improvements that are not necessary to achieve General Plan policy requirements. The proposed TIM Fee Program is limited to those roadway improvements identified as necessary to achieve General Plan policy requirements, with certain additional improvements deemed necessary by the County as discussed in more detail in Section 2.3.2.

While both the General Plan and TIM Fee analyses determined that General Plan level of service policy requirements would be achieved through the roadway improvements identified in the respective analyses, each also determined that certain roadway segments would exceed the threshold used for the General Plan EIR to determine whether an increase in daily and peak hour traffic would be significant. Impact 5.4-2 of

---

<sup>3</sup> CEQA only requires a subsequent EIR or EIR supplement where an increase in a previously identified significant impact is substantial. The County has elected to prepare this supplement in order to maximize public involvement, regardless of whether the change may be considered insubstantial.

<sup>4</sup> TIM Fee Program analysis also identified projected 2015 levels of service and roadway improvement requirements needed by 2015 to achieve General Plan level of service policy requirements through 2015.

the General Plan EIR determined that the growth under the General Plan would result in a significant and unavoidable impact associated with an increase in daily and peak hour traffic. The General Plan EIR analysis determined that the impact identified as Impact 5.4-2 was significant based on a threshold of significance that held that a reduction of roadway levels of service to below LOS C on roadways presently operating at LOS C or better or the addition of 10 or more vehicles during a peak hour on roadways presently operating at LOS D, E or F constituted a significant impact.<sup>5</sup> Based on that criterion, the General Plan EIR analysis projected that 75 roadway segments would exceed the threshold and contribute to Impact 5.4-2.

The TIM Fee Program analysis identified improvements on 18 roadway segments<sup>6</sup> for which recommended improvements vary from those identified in the General Plan EIR analysis. (These variations are listed in Table 5 of Section 2.3.2 of this Draft Supplement.) As discussed in more detail in Section 3.2, the TIM Fee Program analysis determined that these changes would achieve General Plan policy level of service requirements for these roadway segments, but would result in lower levels of service on 14 of the 18 segments when compared to those projected in the General Plan analysis. Using the same thresholds of significance used for the General Plan EIR analysis, the TIM Fee Program analysis determined that 94 roadway segments (as opposed to the 75 identified in the General Plan analysis) would operate at levels of service that would trigger the threshold used to determine level of service impact significance and would therefore create an increased contribution to Impact 5.4-2. Each of the roadway segments considered in the analyses, level of service projections and threshold exceedance determinations are listed in Table 1, above. Table 2 provides a summary comparison of the conclusions of the analyses.

The General Plan EIR identified potential mitigation measures for Impact 5.4-2, which were adopted by the Board of Supervisors to the extent the Board determined those measures were feasible. One mitigation measure, discussed below, was considered but determined not to be feasible. No additional mitigation has been identified for the increased contribution to Impact 5.4-2 described in this supplemental EIR.

The evaluation conducted for this supplement has determined that the variation in impacts associated with the proposed TIM Fee Program (when compared to the impacts identified in the General Plan EIR) are solely associated with the level of service variations discussed above. A review of other resource issues addressed in the General Plan EIR determined that, with the exception of Impact 5.4-2, the proposed TIM Fee Program would not cause new, previously unidentified impacts or substantially contribute to impacts previously identified in the General Plan EIR.

---

<sup>5</sup> This threshold of significance is discussed in more detail in Section 3.2.1.

<sup>6</sup> The eighteen segments include fourteen U.S. 50 segments that distinguish between the eastbound and westbound directions on seven sections of U.S. 50. Five segments of non-U.S. 50 roads have different improvements, however, one of those (Suncastr Lane Extension) is not an existing road and was not included in the General Plan EIR.

<b>Table 2 Summary Comparison of General Plan and TIM Fee Program Analyses and Conclusions</b>		
<b>Factor</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Analysis</b>	<b>TIM Fee Program Analysis</b>
Total Number of Segments Analyzed <sup>1</sup>	184	184
<i>Number of U.S. 50 Segments Analyzed<sup>1</sup></i>	28	28
<i>Number of Non-U.S. 50 Segments Analyzed</i>	156	156
Total Number of Segments Projected to Exceed EIR LOS Thresholds	75	94
<i>Number of U.S. 50 Segments Projected to Exceed EIR LOS Significance Thresholds</i>	16	23
<i>Number of Non-U.S. 50 Segments Projected to Exceed EIR LOS Significance Thresholds</i>	59	71
Total Number of Additional Segments Projected to Exceed the EIR Significance Thresholds <sup>2</sup>	NA	19
<i>Number of Additional U.S. 50 Segments Projected to Exceed EIR LOS Significance Thresholds<sup>2</sup></i>	NA	7
<i>Number of Additional Non-U.S. 50 Segments Projected to Exceed EIR LOS Significance Thresholds<sup>2</sup></i>	NA	12
Number of Segments Projected to have improved LOS <sup>2</sup>	NA	1
<b>Notes:</b>		
1. Includes 10 sections west of Placerville with individual segments differing on each in either eastbound or westbound direction.		
2. As compared to General Plan EIR Analysis.		

## **1.2 PURPOSE AND USE OF SUPPLEMENT TO THE GENERAL PLAN EIR**

As discussed above, the County has decided to prepare a Supplement to the General Plan EIR to document variations in the levels of service projected in association with the implementation of the proposed TIM Fee Program. Pursuant to the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Sections 15163(c) and 15087, this Draft Supplement to the General Plan EIR is being made available for public and agency review and comment. (See the Notice of Availability at the front of this document for the document review period and comment submittal information.)

All public and agency comments received on this Draft Supplement will be considered by the County and will be included in a TIM Fee Program Final Supplement to the General Plan EIR. The Final Supplement to the General Plan EIR will include the County's responses to each comment received and will contain any revisions to this draft that are deemed necessary by the County.

The Final Supplement to the General Plan EIR will be used by the County Board of Supervisors, the CEQA lead agency for this General Plan and TIM Fee Program considerations, in making decisions concerning the adoption of the proposed TIM Fee Program.

## **1.3 GENERAL PLAN EIR AND TIM FEE PROGRAM BACKGROUND**

### **1.3.1 2004 County General Plan and CEQA Review Process**

The El Dorado County Board of Supervisors (Board) adopted the current General Plan on July 19, 2004 after completing a detailed CEQA review of several General Plan alternatives. The El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR evaluated four General Plan alternatives in detail (referenced as “equal weight” alternatives) and considered eight additional general plan alternatives at a lesser (comparative) level of detail. The Draft EIR was made available for public review and comment for a 76-day period between May 1 and July 15, 2003. The four “equal weight” alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR consisted of the following:

- Alternative #1, No Project (Writ Constrained)
- Alternative #2, Roadway Constrained Six-Lane “Plus”
- Alternative #3, Environmentally Constrained
- Alternative #4, 1996 General Plan

Based on public and agency comments received on the Draft General Plan alternatives and the Draft EIR, the County prepared revisions to the Draft EIR and responses to comments. The Final EIR, which included revisions to the Draft EIR and individual responses to all written comments received on the Draft EIR, was released on January 14, 2004.

The General Plan that was ultimately adopted by the Board on July 19, 2004 was based on the 1996 General Plan Alternative (Alternative #4) with modifications to include most of the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR and to incorporate several components (including all of the transportation and circulation policies, although not the Circulation Map) of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Alternative #3) as modified by the Planning Commission. The adopted General Plan incorporated, with certain modifications, 68 of the 71 mitigation measures proposed in the EIR to avoid or reduce the severity of the significant environmental impacts identified in the EIR. The modifications made to the 1996 General Plan alternative and to the mitigation measures proposed in the EIR were reviewed prior to the adoption of the final General Plan to determine if the changes would result in any impact not identified in the EIR or result in a substantial increase in the severity of a significant environmental impact identified in the EIR. All of the changes made to Alternative #4 in the adopted General Plan, both individually and when considered cumulatively, were determined to be within the scope of the environmental analysis performed in the EIR.

The Final EIR for the project includes the following items:

1. Draft EIR (SCH #2001082030), three volumes, dated May 2003;
2. Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR and Draft General Plan, six volumes, dated January 2004;

3. Environmental Assessment of General Plan Policy Modifications, dated June 2004; and
4. Environmental Assessment of Revisions to Mitigation Measures, dated June 2004.

Each of these documents, the 2004 General Plan and several additional documents prepared in conjunction with the preparation and adoption of the General Plan and certification of the EIR are available for review at the Placerville Office of the County Development Services Department at:

2850 Fairlane Court, Building "C"  
Placerville, CA 95667

The documents are also available for viewing or downloading from the County's website at:

<http://www.co.el-dorado.ca.us/planning/GeneralPlanDocuments.html>

### **1.3.2 General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element**

As discussed in more detail in Sections 2 and 3 of this document, the proposed TIM Fee Program would implement policies of the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element. This section provides an overview of the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element and the traffic and circulation impacts identified in the General Plan EIR analysis to provide a context for the additional information and assessment presented in Sections 2 and 3.

#### **Transportation and Circulation Element**

The Transportation and Circulation Element of the 2004 General Plan provides a framework for decisions in El Dorado County concerning the countywide transportation system. The County's transportation system includes facilities for various transportation modes, including roads, transit, non-motorized, rail, and aviation. This element provides for coordination with the incorporated cities within the county, the El Dorado County Transportation Commission, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, and state and federal agencies that fund and manage the County's transportation facilities. The Transportation and Circulation Element establishes the standards that guide development of the transportation system, including access to the road and highway system required by new development and provides a unified functionally integrated, countywide system that is correlated with the General Plan Land Use Element.

The Transportation and Circulation element is divided into four major parts: an introduction containing information concerning the County transportation system and relevant planning considerations, information on the Circulation Map, goals and policies for transportation and circulation, and an implementation program which includes specific implementation measures, responsible parties, and the timing necessary to accomplish the goals and policies of the element. The Circulation Map (**Figure TC-1** of the General Plan) depicts the proposed circulation system to support existing, approved, and planned development in unincorporated El Dorado County through the year 2025. The circulation system is

shown using a set of roadway width classifications developed to guide the County's long-range transportation planning and programming.<sup>7</sup>

### **General Plan Traffic and Circulation Impacts**

The EIR and supporting assessments conducted for the General Plan identified four impacts that would occur to traffic and circulation as a result of the adoption of the General Plan. Generally, each of the impacts was common to each of the four "equal weight" alternatives; however, the specific magnitude of the impacts varied depending on the alternative.

Subject to certain limited exceptions<sup>8</sup>, the level of service standard for all roadways in the adopted General Plan is LOS E in Community Regions and LOS D in rural areas. In contrast, the 1996 General Plan Alternative had required that certain roadways maintain LOS C or better. The 1996 General Plan Alternative level of service policies would have required the widening of a greater number of roadway segments, resulting in an increase in infrastructure costs as well as secondary environmental impacts associated with such widening.

To determine the road system needed to meet the level of service standards of the final proposed General Plan as a result of modifications made during the public process, additional traffic modeling and analysis was performed by the traffic engineering firm, Fehr & Peers (2004) and is included in General Plan EIR documentation as an attachment to the previously referenced Environmental Assessment of Policy Modifications (EDAW, 2004). The conclusions of this analysis and certain roadway modification recommendations were incorporated into the General Plan EIR and General Plan Circulation Map, respectively.

The results of the analysis determined that the adopted General Plan was expected to result in 75 roadway segments that would, by 2025, experience a decline in traffic levels of service below the significance threshold used for the EIR analysis (see **Section 3.2.1** for additional discussion of thresholds of significance). The impact (Impact 5.4-2) remained significant and unavoidable and was included in the Board's CEQA *Statement of Overriding Considerations* for certification of the General Plan EIR.

### **Traffic and Circulation Mitigation Measures**

During the General Plan EIR review, several mitigation strategies for avoiding or minimizing the impacts of the General Plan alternatives were identified. The mitigation measures that were determined to be feasible and necessary to mitigate significant impacts to acceptable levels were ultimately incorporated into the General Plan as specific policies or implementation measures. As such, the General Plan is "self-mitigating", and the adopted measures will be implemented directly through the implementation of various policies and implementation measures of the General Plan. Mitigation measures associated with traffic and circulation impacts identified in the General Plan Draft EIR, and as amended by the Final EIR

---

<sup>7</sup> Roads that do not contribute to regional circulation are generally not shown on the Circulation Map. Such roads may, however, be locally significant and may therefore be reflected in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or within the Circulation Elements of the cities of Placerville and/or South Lake Tahoe.

<sup>8</sup> Limited exceptions to these requirements are made in the General Plan for specific roadway segments which are allowed to operate at LOS F, as specified in General Plan Policies TC-Xa and TC-Xc.

and adopted by the Board, were incorporated into the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element. As discussed, even with the implementation of the adopted mitigation measures, certain traffic and circulation impacts could not be reduced to less-than-significant levels and were identified as significant and unavoidable in the General Plan EIR and by the Board in its CEQA *Findings of Fact* and *Statement of Overriding Considerations* for the General Plan EIR.

During the General Plan EIR process, the County considered but rejected a mitigation measure that would establish a policy requiring all roads in the County to be maintained at LOS C or better and would have modified the circulation diagram to reflect a roadway system that would achieve LOS C on all roadways. The Board determined that this mitigation measure would be infeasible as it would require substantial road building and widening throughout the County, which would result in physical and environmental impacts, including greater impacts to visual, biological, and cultural resources, and degradation of the County's rural character and would result in substantial underutilization of roadway capacity.

### 1.3.3 General Plan Roadway and Transportation Programs Funding Requirements

Measure TC-B of the County General Plan requires that the County mitigate impacts to County roadways by adopting impact fees. This implementation measure helps to achieve several policies of the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element. To provide a context for the discussion of the proposed TIM Fee Program, Measure TC-B and a listing of General Plan policies associated with roadway funding requirements are listed below:

**Measure TC-B:** Revise and adopt traffic impact fee program(s) for unincorporated areas of the county and adopt additional funding mechanisms necessary to ensure that improvements contained in the fee programs are fully funded and capable of being implemented concurrently with new development as defined by Policy TC-Xf. The traffic fees should be designed to achieve the adopted level of service standards and preserve the integrity of the circulation system. The fee program(s) shall be updated annually with revised growth forecasts and construction cost estimates to ensure the programs continue to meet the requirements contained in the policies of this General Plan. [Policies TC-Xa, TC-Xb, and TC-Xg]

**Policy TC-1l:** The County shall actively seek all possible financial assistance, including grant funds available from regional, state, and federal agencies, for street and highway purposes when compatible with General Plan policies and long-term local funding capabilities.

**Policy TC-1m:** The County shall ensure that road funds allocated directly or otherwise available to the County shall be programmed and expended in ways that maximize the use of federal and other matching funds, including maintenance of effort requirements.

**Policy TC-1n:** The County shall generally base expenditure of discretionary road funds for road uses on the following sequence of priorities:

- A. Maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and operation of the existing County-maintained road system;
- B. Safety improvements where physical modifications or capital improvements would reduce the number and/or severity of accidents; and



- C. Capital improvements to expand capacity or reduce congestion on roadways at or below County level of service standards, and to expand the roadway network, consistent with other policies of this General Plan.

**Policy TC-Xa(3):** Developer-paid traffic impact fees shall fully pay for building all necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development upon any highways, arterial roads and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county.<sup>9</sup>

**Policy TC-Xa(4):** County tax revenues shall not be used in any way to pay for building road capacity improvements to offset traffic impacts from new development projects. Exceptions are allowed if county voters first give their approval.

**TC-Xc(3):** Developer-paid traffic impact fees shall pay for the portion of road capacity improvements, which would not be paid for through other County revenue sources, necessary to offset and mitigate the traffic impacts reasonably attributable to new development upon any highways, arterial roads and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county.<sup>10</sup>

**TC-Xc(4):** County tax revenues shall not be used in any way to pay for building road capacity improvements to offset traffic impacts from new development projects. Exceptions are allowed if County voters first give their approval.

**Policy TC-Xf:** Prior to occupancy for development that worsens (defined as a project that triggers Policy TC-Xe [A] or [B] or [C]) traffic on the County road system, the developer shall do one of the following: (1) construct all road improvements necessary to regional and local roads needed to maintain or attain Level of Service standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element; or (2) ensure adequate funding is identified and available for the necessary road improvements and those projects are programmed. The determination of compliance with this requirement shall be based on existing traffic plus traffic generated from the project and from other reasonably foreseeable projects.

**Policy TC-Xg:** Each development project shall dedicate right-of-way and construct or fund improvements necessary to mitigate the effects of traffic from the project. The County shall require an analysis of impacts of traffic from the development project, including impacts from truck traffic, and require dedication of needed right-of-way and construction of road facilities as a condition of the development. For road improvements that provide significant benefit to other development, the County may allow a project to fund its fair share of improvement costs through traffic impact fees or receive reimbursement from impact fees for construction of improvements beyond the project's fair share. The amount and timing of reimbursements shall be determined by the County.

**Policy TC-Xh:** All subdivisions shall be conditioned to pay the traffic impact fees in effect at the time a building permit is issued for any parcel created by the subdivision. Until such time as

---

<sup>9</sup> Policy TC-Xa is to remain in effect through December 31, 2008 unless extended by the voters prior to that time. Policy TC-Xc will take effect upon the expiration of Policy TC-Xa.

<sup>10</sup> Policy TC-Xc is to take effect upon the expiration of Policy TC-Xa.

updated traffic impact fees are adopted pursuant to this General Plan, any subdivisions will be required to either (1) execute an agreement agreeing to pay the higher fees, even after building permits have been issued or (2) have a notice of restriction placed on the final map prohibiting the issuance of building permits until the updated traffic impact fees are adopted.

### **1.3.4 Road Development and TIM Fee Programs**

Development within El Dorado County and the associated increase in vehicle trips and miles traveled contribute to the need for on-going improvements to the County roadway system. The Board has long recognized the need for new development to help fund roadway and bridge improvements necessary to serve that new development and, as discussed above, requires through Measure TC-B of the 2004 General Plan, the adoption of funding mechanisms as necessary to ensure that improvements are fully funded and capable of being implemented.

Since 1984 the Board has required various development fees for roadway funding. These fees have gone into four separate fee programs: the El Dorado Hills/Salmon Falls Road Impact Fee (RIF); the Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) fee; the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fees for the State System Capacity and Interchanges; and the Interim Highway 50 Corridor Variable Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program.

As part of the process to implement the 2004 General Plan, during the summer of 2004 the Board initiated a process to revise and update the County road development fee program. The purpose of the fee update process was to simplify, integrate and update the various fee programs in place at that time and to ensure that the fees conform to the policies of the 2004 General Plan. The County Department of Transportation (DOT) led several interrelated studies to determine more detailed traffic projections, specific roadway improvement needs and projected costs, existing funding and funding sources, and a proposed TIM Fee rate specific to eight fee zones and various types of new development.

During this process, the County determined that several issues associated with adoption of the TIM Fee Program required additional consideration including: 1) the specific roadway requirements necessary to achieve General Plan level of service requirements and to conduct traffic studies to ensure that level of service requirements would be achieved; 2) additional and refined methods of accounting for vehicle trips with origins and/or destinations outside of unincorporated areas of El Dorado County; 3) accounting for a 20-year roadway improvement horizon; 4) the allocation of funding requirements among the several types of projects to which TIM fees would apply; and 5) the proposed TIM Fee Program's relationship to the General Plan EIR and any additional CEQA review requirements.

As a result of the recognition that additional refinement was necessary to adopt a final TIM Fee Program and in recognition of the need to proceed with implementation of Measure TC-B, the Board determined that it was necessary to adopt an *interim* TIM Fee Program. As such, the Board adopted Interim 2004 General Plan TIM Fees on September 20, 2005 (Resolution No. 292-2005) and directed DOT staff to proceed with developing a permanent TIM Fee Program. The interim TIM fee program is currently in effect and provides for the implementation of Measure TC-B until such time as a permanent TIM Fee Program is adopted by the Board.

## 2 PROPOSED TIM FEE PROGRAM

### 2.1 OVERVIEW

El Dorado County has developed a proposed TIM Fee Program to implement Measure TC-B of the General Plan. The proposed TIM Fee Program would replace the *interim* TIM Fee Program adopted by the County Board of Supervisors in September 2005 and would establish current TIM Fee rates as well as provide a process for periodically updating TIM Fee rates.

### 2.2 PROPOSED TIM FEE PROGRAM

The proposed TIM Fee Program establishes eight fee zones that encompass the unincorporated portions of El Dorado County, excluding that portion of the County which is within the Lake Tahoe Basin.<sup>11</sup> Within each fee zone, 12 development categories are established and fees applicable to each category are identified. **Appendix A** lists the various development types and rates by fee zone that accompany the proposed TIM Fee Program. Several factors were considered in the development of the proposed TIM Fee Program rates, and various analyses were conducted to establish factors such as growth and traffic projections; roadway improvement requirements and estimated costs; existing sources of roadway funding revenue and potential alternative funding sources; and methodologies for determining basic cost allocation associated with vehicle trip origin and destination locations and cost allocation associated with various land use/development types.

The proposed TIM Fee Program is intended to provide TIM Fee funding for those County roadway improvements necessary to achieve General Plan level of service standards for a projected 20-year period (through analysis year 2025). Under the proposed TIM Fee Program, the County would annually update the roadway improvement cost estimates and would update/amend the fee rates each year to account for changes in estimated roadway improvement project costs. The County would also, on a five-year basis, reassess each of the various parameters used in determining the proposed TIM Fee Program rates and would propose any necessary modifications to the TIM Fee Program at that time. This five-year reevaluation would include updating traffic projections and determining the adequacy of identified roadway improvements in achieving General Plan levels of service. When necessary as a result of changes in levels of service projections, the County will conduct the necessary CEQA review and documentation prior to the adoption of TIM Fee Program modifications.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> The proposed TIM Fee Program does not apply to roadway segments within either the City of Placerville or within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

<sup>12</sup> Annual TIM Fee rate adjustments that are not accompanied by changes in projected levels of service and/or modifications to the list of roadway improvements would not be subject to CEQA review.

## 2.3 TRAFFIC AND ROADWAY ANALYSES CONDUCTED FOR PROPOSED TIM FEE PROGRAM

The proposed TIM Fee Program included a detailed analysis of the specific roadway improvements that are necessary to achieve the levels of service requirements of the 2004 General Plan. The applicable General Plan policies and the conclusions of the analysis are discussed below.

### 2.3.1 General Plan Level of Service Requirements

The General Plan level of service policies are<sup>13</sup>:

**Policy TC-Xa:** The following policies shall remain in effect until December 31, 2008 unless extended by the voters prior to that time:

1. Traffic from residential development projects of five or more units or parcels of land shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county.
2. The County shall not add any additional segments of U.S. Highway 50, or any other highways and roads, to the County's list of roads (shown in Table TC-2<sup>14</sup>) that are allowed to operate at Level of Service F without first getting the voters' approval.

**Policy TC-Xc:** The following policies shall take effect upon the expiration of the policies in Policy TC-Xa:

1. Traffic from residential development projects shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county except as specified in Table TC-3<sup>15</sup>.
2. Additional segments of U.S. Highway 50 and other highways and roads may be added to Table TC-3 only upon approval of a majority of the Board of Supervisors.

**Policy TC-Xd:** Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions except as specified in Table TC-2 or, after December 31, 2008, Table TC-3. The volume to capacity ratio of the roadway segments listed in Tables TC-2 and TC-3 as applicable shall not exceed the ratio specified in that table. Level of

---

<sup>13</sup> The General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element established Goal TC-X which is intended to reflect the intent of El Dorado County voters in adopting Measure Y by (1) applying the Measure Y policies through 2008, (2) providing for the possible readoption of those policies in 2008, and (3) providing alternative policies that will take effect in 2009 if the Measure Y policies are not extended. The policies listed here include those which became effective upon adoption of the General Plan and those which would take effect in 2009 in the event that Policy TC-Xa is not readopted in 2008.

<sup>14</sup> Table TC-2 is included in this Draft Supplement to the General Plan EIR as Table 3.

<sup>15</sup> Table TC-3 is included in this Draft Supplement to the General Plan EIR as Table 4.

Service will be as defined in the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council) and calculated using the methodologies contained in that manual. Analysis periods shall be based on the professional judgment of the Department of Transportation which shall consider periods including, but not limited to, Weekday Average Daily Traffic (ADT), AM Peak Hour, and PM Peak hour traffic volumes.

<b>Table 3</b> <b>Table TC-2 of 2004 El Dorado County General Plan</b> <b>El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F<sup>1</sup></b> <b>(Through December 31, 2008)</b>		
Road Segment(s)		Max. V/C <sup>2</sup>
Cambridge Road	Country Club Drive to Oxford Road	1.07
Cameron Park Drive	Robin Lane to Coach Lane	1.11
Missouri Flat Road	U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive	1.12
	Mother Lode Drive to China Garden Road	1.20
Pleasant Valley Road	El Dorado Road to State Route 49	1.28
U.S. Highway 50	Canal Street to junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street)	1.25
	Junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street) to Coloma Street	1.59
	Coloma Street to Bedford Avenue	1.61
	Bedford Avenue to beginning of freeway	1.73
	Beginning of freeway to Washington overhead	1.16
State Route 49	Ice House Road to Echo Lake	1.16
	Pacific/Sacramento Street to new four-lane section	1.31
	U.S. Highway 50 to State Route 193	1.32
	State Route 193 to county line	1.51
<b>Notes:</b> 1. Roads improved to their maximum width given right-of-way and physical limitations. 2. Volume to Capacity ratio.		

<b>Table 4</b> <b>Table TC-3 of 2004 El Dorado County General Plan</b> <b>El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F<sup>1</sup></b> <b>(After December 31, 2008)</b>		
Road Segment(s)		Max. V/C <sup>2</sup>
U.S. Highway 50	Canal Street to junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street)	1.23
	Bedford Avenue to beginning of freeway	1.13
	Beginning of freeway to Washington overhead	1.13
	Ice House Road to Echo Lake	1.03
<b>Notes:</b> 1. Roads improved to their maximum width given right-of-way and physical limitations. 2. Volume to Capacity ratio.		

### 2.3.2 Roadway Improvements Necessary to Achieve General Plan Requirements

During the development of the proposed TIM Fee Program, the County retained transportation planning and engineering firm, Dowling Associates, Inc. (Dowling) to perform traffic and roadway studies necessary for

refining the TIM Fee Program. Prior to these studies (referenced herein as the TIM Fee Program analysis), the most recent County-wide analysis that identified necessary improvements through the year 2025 was conducted by Fehr & Peers in July 2004. The Fehr & Peers analysis (which was incorporated to the General Plan EIR and is included wherever the General Plan EIR is referenced) was conducted to determine projected levels of service under the modified General Plan alternative and identify roadway improvements that would meet the General Plan level of service policies and other objectives.

For the development of the proposed TIM Fee Program, Dowling conducted traffic and roadway requirement studies and documented the findings and recommendations of these studies in the *US 50 Strategic Corridor Operations Study – Ponderosa Road to Mather Field Road* (Dowling, 2006a) and the *El Dorado County Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Update 2005* (Dowling, 2006). The respective purposes of these studies were to more precisely determine the specific improvements to U.S. 50 needed over the next 20 years to achieve General Plan level of service requirements.

These studies resulted in both the confirmation that certain previously identified improvements would be necessary to achieve the General Plan requirements and, in some instances, identified refinements in the roadway improvement requirements. Most of the improvements identified in the TIM Fee Program analysis are the same as those identified in the General Plan EIR analysis; however, in several instances the TIM Fee Program analysis identifies different improvement requirements and recommendations than those identified in the General Plan analysis. These differences are discussed for County roads<sup>16</sup> and U.S. 50 segments in the following sections.

### **Improvements to County (Non-U.S. 50) Road Segments**

Both the General Plan EIR analysis (Fehr & Peers, 2004) and the TIM Fee Program analysis (Dowling, 2006) examined a total of 156 County roadway segments to determine the improvements necessary to achieve General Plan level of service policies. For all County roads, the TIM Fee Program analysis used the traffic volumes generated for the General Plan EIR analysis, although the TIM Fee Program analysis utilized a reduced rounding factor (rounding to the nearest one as opposed to the nearest ten), resulting in refined traffic volume projections. Both the General Plan and TIM Fee Program studies utilized equivalent criteria for determining levels of service. However, the TIM Fee Program analysis allowed for smaller increments of improvements (i.e., widening) on certain roads.

In addition, the Fehr & Peers analysis performed for the General Plan EIR identified a roadway system that, while eliminating certain roadway improvements included in the 1996 General Plan Alternative that were not needed to achieve General Plan level of service policies, still included more improvements than were necessary to meet those policies. These roadway segments are listed below:

- Silva Valley Parkway – Harvard Way to Green Valley Road
- El Dorado Hills Boulevard – St. Andrews to Francisco
- Francisco Drive – El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Green Valley Road
- Missouri Flat Road Connector – New Highway 49 to Pleasant Valley Road

---

<sup>16</sup> For the purposes of this report, the term “County roads” is used to reference roads within the County circulation network excluding U.S. 50.

- Sophia Parkway – County Line to Green Valley Road
- Bass Lake Road – Country Club to Bass Lake
- Green Valley Road – Francisco Drive to Salmon Falls Road

The Dowling study for the TIM Fee Program analysis sought to identify only those improvements required to achieve levels of service specified in the General Plan. Utilizing this approach, the TIM Fee Program study concluded that roadway improvements necessary for each of these roadway segments could be less extensive than those identified in the General Plan CEQA analysis and still achieve General Plan level of service policy requirements. As a result of these reduced roadway improvements, levels of service on six of these seven segments were projected to be lower as compared to the General Plan EIR analysis.<sup>17</sup>

County staff subsequently determined that that the full level of improvements identified in the General Plan EIR analysis for two of these six segments (i.e., Bass Lake Road from Country Club Drive to Bass Lake and Green Valley Road from Francisco Drive to Salmon Falls Road) should be included in the TIM Fee Program costs/funding allocations and these improvements were incorporated.

Aside from the seven segments discussed above, the TIM Fee Program determined that an improvement not previously identified in the General Plan EIR analysis is necessary to achieve General Plan level of service requirements on the segment of Green Valley Road between the east end of Deer Valley Road and Lotus Road. This additional improvement has been included in the TIM Fee Program. In addition, the proposed TIM Fee Program includes a cost component to account for a future Suncast Lane Extension as called for in General Plan Policy TC-1u.

The County road segments with variations in improvements identified through the General Plan analysis and the TIM Fee Program analysis are listed in Table 5. Table 1 includes a listing of projected levels of service under each roadway improvement scenario. As discussed and noted in Table 1, the TIM Fee Program and subsequent County determinations result in a projection of four of these roadways operating as worsened levels of service as compared to the General Plan analysis and EIR.

### **Improvements to U.S. 50**

The TIM Fee Program analysis of U.S. 50 improvement requirements (Dowling, 2006a) considered U.S. 50 from Mather Field Road (in Sacramento County) to Ponderosa Road. Within the El Dorado County portion of the study, improvements to U.S. 50 that are necessary to achieve General Plan level of service policies were identified. Some of these improvements require less extensive modifications to U.S. 50 than the improvements identified in the General Plan analysis (Fehr & Peers, 2004), and for one section of U.S. 50 more extensive modifications are identified. Table 5 includes a comparison of U.S. 50 improvements identified in the General Plan analysis and in the TIM Fee Program analysis.

---

<sup>17</sup> Although it was determined that levels of service would be lower on these six segments under the reduced roadway improvements as compared to the General Plan CEQA analysis projections, the levels of service would still achieve General Plan level of service requirements.

**Table 5  
Differences in Roadway Improvements Identified in  
General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program Analyses**

<b>Roadway - Segment</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Analysis (Fehr &amp; Peers, 2004)</b>	<b>Proposed TIM Fee Program Analysis (Dowling, 2006)</b>
El Dorado Hills Blvd. - St. Andrews Dr. to Francisco Dr.	4-Lane Arterial, Divided	No Improvement (existing 2-Lane Arterial)
Missouri Flat Rd. Connector - SR 49 (new) to Pleasant Valley Rd.	4-Lane Arterial, Divided	2-Lane Arterial
Silva Valley Pkwy. - Harvard Way to Green Valley Rd.	4-Lane Arterial, Divided	No Improvement (existing 2-Lane Arterial)
Sophia Pkwy. - County Line to Green Valley Rd.	4-Lane Arterial, Divided	2-Lane Arterial
Suncast Lane Extension - White Rock Rd. to Latrobe Rd.	Unknown	2-Lane Arterial
Green Valley Rd. – Deer Valley Rd. (east) to Lotus Rd.	No Improvement	Widen by approximately 6 feet
U.S. Highway 50 - County Line to El Dorado Hills Blvd./Latrobe Rd.	8 Lanes Total - 6 Mixed Flow Lanes and 2 HOV Lanes	8 Lanes Total - 4 Mixed Flow Lanes, 2 HOV Lanes, 1 Auxiliary Lane, 1 Truck Lane
U.S. Highway 50 - El Dorado Hills Blvd. /Latrobe Rd. to Silva Valley Pkwy.	8 Lanes Total - 6 Mixed Flow Lanes and 2 HOV Lanes	10 Lanes Total - 4 Mixed Flow Lanes, 2 HOV Lanes, 3 Auxiliary Lanes, 1 Truck Lane
U.S. Highway 50 - Silva Valley Pkwy. to Bass Lake Rd.	8 Lanes Total - 6 Mixed Flow Lanes and 2 HOV Lanes	8 Lanes Total - 4 Mixed Flow Lanes, 2 HOV Lanes, 1 Auxiliary Lane, 1 Truck Lane
U.S. Highway 50 - Bass Lake Rd. to Cambridge Rd.	8 Lanes Total - 6 Mixed Flow Lanes and 2 HOV Lanes	8 Lanes Total - 4 Mixed Flow Lanes, 2 HOV Lanes, 1 Auxiliary Lane, 1 Truck Lane
U.S. Highway 50 - Cambridge Rd. to Cameron Park Dr.	8 Lanes Total - 6 Mixed Flow Lanes and 2 HOV Lanes	6 Lanes Total - 4 Mixed Flow Lanes, 2 HOV Lanes
U.S. Highway 50 - Cameron Park Dr. to Ponderosa Rd.	8 Lanes Total - 6 Mixed Flow Lanes and 2 HOV Lanes <sup>1</sup>	5 Lanes Total - 4 Mixed Flow Lanes, 1 Auxiliary Lane
U.S. Highway 50 - Ponderosa Rd. to Shingle Springs Dr.	6 Lanes Total - 4 Mixed Flow Lanes and 2 Auxiliary Lanes	4 Lanes Total - 4 Mixed Flow Lanes
1. Although the General Plan Circulation Map identifies six lanes for this section of U.S. 50, the General Plan EIR identified eight lanes.		



## 2.4 TIM FEE PROGRAM OPTIONS AND COSTS

A variant to the proposed TIM Fee Program would be for the County to implement a TIM Fee Program based on funding necessary to achieve the full roadway improvements identified in the General Plan analysis.<sup>18</sup> Table 5 summarizes the differences in roadway improvements identified in the two analyses.

The proposed TIM Fee Program is based on an estimated total roadway improvements cost of approximately \$840 million, approximately \$555 million of which would be collected through the proposed TIM Fee Program. The total roadway improvements cost for a TIM Fee Program based on achieving the full roadway improvements identified in the General Plan EIR analysis is estimated to be approximately \$970 million, approximately \$685 million of which would be collected through TIM Fees if a program were developed using similar funding allocations. The full General Plan EIR analysis roadway improvements are estimated to cost approximately 15 percent more than the roadway improvements identified through the proposed TIM Fee Program and would require an approximately 23-percent increase in TIM Fee rates to fund this option<sup>19</sup>. TIM Fee Program rates under such a program would require a similar average proportional increase (i.e., approximately 23 percent); however, individual rate increases would vary depending on fee zone and land development/use category.

---

<sup>18</sup> Several factors contribute to the elements of the proposed TIM Fee Program. Factors such as fee allocation among various land use development types and methods of accounting for trip origins and/or destinations outside of unincorporated portions of the County are policy decisions which would influence the specific rates necessary under the program, but which would not affect the roadway improvements. Therefore, these policy choices are not included in this CEQA analysis.

<sup>19</sup> Because funds available through other sources (e.g., federal funding) and the amount of existing roadway improvement funds would be approximately the same under both options, the cost of additional improvements funded through the TIM Fee Program would result in an increased proportion of funding required through TIM Fees.



## 3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

### 3.1 OVERVIEW OF IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS

**Section 3** of this Draft Supplement to the General Plan EIR discusses differences in the potential environmental effects associated with the proposed TIM Fee Program as compared to those identified in the 2004 General Plan EIR. As discussed in **Section 1.2.1**, the 2004 General Plan CEQA review required the preparation of a Draft and Final EIR and supplemental documentation associated with determining impacts associated with the adopted 2004 General Plan.

The Board's adoption of the General Plan and certification of the General Plan EIR required a *Statement of Overriding Considerations* for a total of 40 potentially adverse impacts which could not be mitigated to a less than significant level. In its *Statement of Overriding Considerations* (Exhibit A of Resolution 234-2004) the Board determined that the unavoidable impacts of the General Plan are acceptable in light of certain economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations identified in the Board's findings and that the benefits of the adoption/implementation of the General Plan outweigh the significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impacts. The County considered but rejected a mitigation measure that would establish LOS C as the lowest acceptable level of service for all roads in the County, and would modify the circulation diagram to reflect a roadway system that would achieve LOS C under 2025 conditions. The Board found that this mitigation measure is infeasible. It would require substantial road building and widening throughout the County, which would result in physical and environmental impacts, including impacts to visual, biological, and cultural resources, and degradation of the County's rural character. Sizing roadways to accommodate peak hour traffic at LOS C would result in substantial underutilization of roadway capacity. In addition, the Board found that construction of a roadway system to achieve LOS C would be subject to substantial financial and physical constraints.

In considering the proposed TIM Fee Program, the County determined that the program would result in changes in the degree of certain impacts identified in the General Plan EIR. Although the TIM Fee Program would not result in any new impacts not identified in the General Plan EIR, the County has determined that the program would, in certain limited instances, result in a change in the degree of severity of impacts identified in General Plan EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a) requires, in relevant part, that when an EIR has been certified and the lead agency subsequently determines that a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects will occur, the lead agency must prepare a subsequent EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15163 further provides that a supplement to the previous EIR may be prepared, instead of a subsequent EIR, when "only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised."

The proposed TIM Fee Program would not modify the General Plan and would, in fact, serve to implement specific elements of the General Plan. However, based on the results of the more detailed analysis prepared in connection with the Program, and refinements to the roadway improvements proposed as part of the Program, the County decided to prepare a Supplement to the General Plan EIR to document potential changes in impacts associated with implementation of the Program improvements. The evaluation conducted for this supplement determined that the only impacts associated with the proposed TIM Fee Program that may substantially differ from the impacts identified in the General Plan EIR are certain level of service variations on a limited number of specific roadway segments within the County. Section 3.2 discusses these specific impact variations associated with traffic and circulation. Section 3.3 provides a summary of the review conducted for other resource topics which confirmed that

no impact variations would occur as compared to the impacts identified for the resource topics in the General Plan EIR.

## 3.2 TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION IMPACTS

Four traffic and circulation impacts were identified in the General Plan EIR. Three of these, after incorporation of mitigation measures identified in the General Plan Final EIR, were identified as significant and unavoidable. This section discusses the thresholds used for determining impact significance, summarizes the four traffic and circulation impacts identified in the General Plan EIR, and concludes with a detailed discussion of the proposed TIM Fee Program's contribution to Impact 5.4-2.

### 3.2.1 Thresholds of Significance

Specific criteria were established in the General Plan EIR to determine thresholds at which impacts would be deemed significant. These thresholds of significance were also used for the review conducted for this Draft Supplement to the General Plan EIR. The thresholds state that the General Plan would result in a significant impact if development would:

1. Conflict with policies contained in the General Plan alternatives;
2. Degrade LOS based on the following criteria for significance:
  - a) LOS reaching D or worse, if existing LOS is A, B, or C; and
  - b) Any measurable increase in traffic (defined as at least 10 vehicles in a peak hour), if existing LOS is D, E, or F; or
3. Conflict with policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., transit service, carpooling, bicycling, walking).

The first threshold is used to identify potential inconsistencies between the level of service policies proposed for each alternative and the projected levels of service that would occur as a result of growth under the General Plan. The second threshold related to degradation below LOS C is independent of the level of service policies contained in the General Plan alternatives. Instead, the threshold was selected based on the level of service commonly used to describe acceptable conditions according to national traffic engineering guidelines. According to the *Transportation Planning Handbook* (Institute of Transportation Engineers 1992a), the *Traffic Engineering Handbook* (Institute of Transportation Engineers 1992b), and the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board 2000), LOS C or D is commonly used to define acceptable conditions for planning and design studies. For areas like El Dorado County with low-density residential development, the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) recommends LOS C as the design threshold; general observations have demonstrated that these areas demand slightly better levels of service and are more sensitive to increases in traffic volumes. LOS C as a significance threshold is also recommended in the *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies* (Caltrans 2001).

This approach was used in the General Plan EIR traffic analysis to allow for an informative comparison of the alternatives given that level of service policies varied among the alternatives. By using a consistent level of service threshold to evaluate each alternative, the impact evaluation highlighted the differences

between the alternatives that might otherwise have been masked by the different level of service policies of each alternative. This same threshold is used in this Supplement to the General Plan EIR to provide a consistent threshold for evaluating variations in impacts associated with the proposed TIM Fee Program as compared to the General Plan EIR.

### **3.2.2 Summary of General Plan EIR Traffic and Circulation Impacts**

Each of the four traffic and circulation impacts identified in the General Plan EIR are discussed below with a summary of the County's determination of whether the proposed TIM Fee Program would vary the significance of the impact as identified in the General Plan analysis. The General Plan EIR identified several General Plan alternatives and various specific policy variations intended to avoid or minimize these impacts. Ultimately, the Board determined that with the incorporation of certain policies to the final General Plan, Impact 5.4-1 could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. The remaining three transportation and circulation impacts were ultimately determined to be significant and unavoidable. Of these traffic and circulation impacts, the County has determined through the TIM Fee Program analysis that one, Impact 5.4-2, would be of increased severity as compared to the determination in the General Plan EIR analysis. No changes in the severity of the other traffic and circulation impacts are anticipated to occur.

**Impact 5.4-1: Potential Inconsistencies with LOS Policies.** Each of the four alternatives considered in the General Plan EIR included level of service standards. These standards varied among the alternatives (e.g., the 1996 General Plan Alternative required retention of LOS C on many rural roads, whereas the Roadway Constrained Alternative allowed LOS E throughout the County). The General Plan EIR identified that growth that would occur under each of the General Plan alternatives could result in a failure to achieve General Plan level of service policies on certain roadways. The General Plan Draft EIR proposed four alternative mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts related to potential inconsistencies with level of service policies, and a fifth measure was proposed in the Final EIR Response to Comments document.

To ensure that new discretionary and ministerial development do not result in traffic on El Dorado Hills Boulevard, Latrobe Road, and White Rock Road in excess of that allowed by applicable LOS standards, the Board added Policy TC-1y to the General Plan which places an employee cap on the El Dorado Hills Business Park. In its *CEQA Findings of Fact* the Board determined that with the inclusion of the employee cap imposed by Policy TC-1y, the adopted General Plan would not result in any exceedances of applicable LOS standards and that Impact 5.4-1 would be reduced to less than significant.

**Impact 5.4-2: Increase in Daily and Peak Hour Traffic.** In addition to evaluating levels of service for consistency with the General Plan level of service requirements, the General Plan analysis also determined whether impacts on specific roadway segments would exceed the level of service threshold used for the General Plan EIR analysis. This threshold allowed readers of the EIR to more easily understand the impacts of the various growth projections on the County's roadways since it demonstrated the number of roadway segments on which levels of service were projected to deteriorate to LOS D or lower under each alternative. The analysis conducted for the final General Plan (Fehr & Peers, 2004) determined that the threshold would be exceeded on a total of 75 roadway segments.

The analysis conducted for the proposed TIM Fee Program (Dowling, 2006/2006a) determined that an additional 19 roadway segments are projected to exceed this threshold of significance. This increase in the number of roadway segments exceeding the levels of service significance thresholds of the General

Plan EIR results in a contribution to a previously identified significant and unavoidable impact. This impact is discussed in greater detail later in this section. **Table 1** in Section 1 of this Draft Supplement lists each of the roadway segments evaluated and the projected levels of service through both the General Plan EIR analysis and the TIM Fee Program analysis.

**Impact 5.4-3: Short-term Unacceptable LOS Conditions Related to Generation of New Traffic in Advance of Transportation Improvements.** The General Plan contains concurrency policies (see Goal TC-X and associated policies in the County General Plan) which preclude certain development from proceeding until needed roadway improvements have been made or financed. However, several of the roadway improvements identified in the General Plan circulation diagram are necessary to address existing roadway capacity deficiencies caused by existing or approved development. Further, the General Plan EIR identified that the deficiencies may be exacerbated by increased traffic generated from development within and outside of the County that is not subject to the concurrency requirement. Mitigation strategies were identified for this impact within the General Plan EIR which included modification to concurrency and tax revenue policies and transportation financing, as well as the implementation of specific land use measures. However, even with the implementation of certain elements of the identified mitigation, this impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable.

This impact has relevance to the proposed TIM Fee Program inasmuch as the TIM Fee Program would serve to provide roadway funding associated with new development in a manner which would avoid exacerbation of this impact. Further, the TIM Fee Program provides a funding source which would contribute to roadway improvements, some of which would serve to address existing roadway level of service deficiencies. The implementation of the proposed TIM Fee Program would therefore not worsen this significant and unavoidable impact.

**Impact 5.4-4: Insufficient Transit Capacity.** The General Plan EIR identifies existing commuter bus capacity problems associated with insufficient park-and-ride facilities. Population and employment growth under the General Plan would increase demand for transit service and exacerbate existing transit capacity issues. The General Plan includes Measure TC-L which requires the County to develop a funding mechanism requiring new development to pay for additional park-and-ride lots. However it was determined that this measure, identified as mitigation in the General Plan EIR, would not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and the impact was therefore considered significant and unavoidable in the General Plan EIR.

This impact has relevance to the proposed TIM Fee Program inasmuch as the TIM Fee Program includes an element of funding to contribute to park-and-ride facility development. The implementation of the proposed TIM Fee Program would therefore not worsen this significant and unavoidable impact.

### **3.2.3 TIM Fee Program and Impact 5.4-2**

As discussed above, as a result of the refined analysis and roadway improvements identified in developing the proposed TIM Fee Program, the specific determinations associated with General Plan EIR Impact 5.4-2, as determined through the TIM Fee Program analysis, will vary from those presented in the General Plan analysis. Traffic and circulation impacts associated with the TIM Fee Program occur as a result of variations in the levels of service identified for specific roadway segments as compared to those

identified in the General Plan analysis<sup>20</sup>. Both the General Plan analysis and the TIM Fee Program analysis evaluated a total of 184 roadway segments within the County comprising approximately 1,214 miles of roadway. Table 1 in Section 1 of this Draft Supplement lists each of the roadway segments evaluated and the projected levels of service through both the General Plan EIR analysis and the TIM Fee Program analysis and Table 2 in Section 1.1 provides a summary comparison of the conclusions of the two analyses.

The analysis of Impact 5.4-2 determined that a level of service impact was significant if the peak-hour level of service on a given roadway segment would decline to LOS D or worse if existing level of service is LOS C or better, or if conditions would measurably decline if existing level of service is LOS D or worse (see specific thresholds in Section 3.2.1, above). Using this threshold of significance, the final General Plan analysis identified the specific roadway segments projected to operate below the criteria threshold. The General Plan analysis quantified Impact 5.4-2 and found that 75 roadway segments would not achieve LOS C or better and would therefore contribute to the significance of Impact 5.4-2.

The analysis conducted in developing the proposed TIM Fee Program determined that of the 184 segments analyzed, 94 segments are projected to exceed the General Plan EIR thresholds of significance. As compared to the General Plan EIR analysis, this results in an additional 19 segments that are projected to exceed the General Plan EIR threshold under the TIM Fee Program analysis. In all instances, the levels of service identified through the TIM Fee Program analysis are projected to achieve the level of service standards contained within the General Plan policies.

Seven of the 19 additional segments projected to exceed the General Plan EIR thresholds of significance are a result of the refined analysis that was conducted for the TIM Fee Program for narrow roads (i.e., those of 24 feet or narrower in width). Improvements to these roads were not included within the TIM Fee Program because the analysis determined that the levels of service of each would meet the requirements of General Plan policies. These roads are as follows:

1. Bass Lake Road – Bass Lake to Green Valley Road
2. Bucks Bar Road – Mount Aukum Road to Cattle Creek Lane
3. Bucks Bar Road – Cattle Creek Lane to Pleasant Valley Road
4. Forni Road – Wamago Road to Placerville City limits
5. Greenstone Road – Mother Lode Drive to U.S. 50
6. Meder Road – Cameron Park Drive to Rosebud Drive
7. SR 49 – China Hill Road to Pleasant Valley Road

Four of the 19 additional segments projected to exceed the General Plan EIR thresholds of significance are County road segments for which the TIM Fee Program analysis determined that to meet General Plan level of service policy requirements these segments did not need to be improved to the extent identified in the General Plan EIR analysis. These roads are as follows:

1. El Dorado Hills Blvd. - St. Andrews Drive to Francisco Drive

---

<sup>20</sup> These changes in levels of service occur as a result of variations in actual roadway improvements as well as refined analysis methods and input data.

2. Missouri Flat Rd. Connector - SR 49 (new) to Pleasant Valley Road
3. Silva Valley Pkwy. - Harvard Way to Green Valley Road
4. Sophia Pkwy. - County Line to Green Valley Road

One of the 19 segments projected to exceed the General Plan EIR thresholds of significance is the Suncastr Lane Extension. The Suncastr Lane Extension is not an existing road and it was not analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The TIM Fee Program analysis included the Suncastr Lane Extension in response to General Plan Policy TC-1u<sup>21</sup>. The TIM Fee Program analysis projected 2025 levels of service for a Suncastr Lane Extension segment between White Rock Road and Latrobe Road at LOS D and it has therefore been identified as exceeding the General Plan EIR thresholds of significance.

Seven of the 19 segments projected to exceed the General Plan EIR thresholds of significance are segments of U.S. 50 and are as follows:

1. County line to El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road – westbound
2. County line to El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road – eastbound
3. El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road to Bass Lake Road – westbound
4. El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road to Bass Lake Road – eastbound
5. Cambridge Road to Cameron Park Drive – westbound
6. Cameron Park Drive to Ponderosa Road – westbound
7. Cameron Park Drive to Ponderosa Road – eastbound

The contribution of these 19 additional roadway segments projected to exceed the General Plan EIR thresholds of significance would increase the severity of Impact 5.4-2 as identified in the General Plan EIR analysis (i.e., from the General Plan EIR analysis projection of 75 level of service exceedances to the TIM Fee Program analysis projection of 94 level of service exceedances). In all instances, General Plan level of service standards would be achieved. The General Plan incorporated all mitigation measures for reducing the severity of Impact 5.4-2 that were determined by the Board to be feasible. No additional mitigation has been identified for the increase in the severity of Impact 5.4-2 identified under the TIM Fee Program analysis.

### **3.3 OTHER RESOURCES**

The Board's certification of the 2004 General Plan EIR identified 40 significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the General Plan, including regional cumulative impacts of the General Plan. The four specific traffic and circulation-related impacts and the variation to one of these impacts, Impact 5.4-2, that has been identified as a result of evaluation of the proposed TIM Fee Program are discussed in Section 3.2, above. With the potential exception of Impact 5.4-2, discussed above, the proposed TIM Fee Program would not result in any new significant impacts or any increases in the severity of impacts identified within the General Plan EIR.

---

<sup>21</sup> Policy TC-1u states: The County shall amend the circulation diagram to include a new arterial roadway from the west side of the El Dorado Hills Business Park to U.S. 50.



The General Plan EIR and related CEQA Findings of Fact identified several significant impacts associated with growth under the General Plan. Among these were physical impacts to which the expansion/improvement of roadways would contribute, including: degradation of existing visual character (Impact 5.3-2); exposure of noise-sensitive land uses to short-term (construction) noise (Impact 5.10-1); exposure to ground transportation noises (Impact 5.10-2); construction emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NOx), reactive organic gases (ROG) and particulate matter (PM) (Impact 5.11-1); loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat (Impact 5.12-1) and potential impacts on special-status species (Impact 5.12-2); and removal, degradation, and fragmentation of sensitive habitats (Impact 5.12-4).

The proposed TIM Fee Program would not change the amount, location or intensity of development or the manner in which development would occur within El Dorado County as compared to that analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Implementation of the TIM Fee Program would result in a slight change in the physical impacts associated with roadway construction. As discussed in Section 2.3, the roadway improvements used for the development of the proposed TIM Fee Program are the same as those identified in the General Plan EIR, with the exception of those listed in Table 5. Under the proposed TIM Fee Program, improvements to all but two of these roadway segments would be less extensive than the improvements identified in the General Plan.<sup>22</sup> As such, physical impacts associated with the ultimate development of these roadways would be less extensive than the impacts that would have occurred from improvements to these roadways as identified in the General Plan EIR.

Two roadway improvements have been identified through the proposed TIM Fee Program analysis that would result in an increase in the roadway width and related physical impacts as compared to the roadway improvement assumptions upon which the General Plan EIR analysis was based. The proposed TIM Fee Program analysis identifies the widening of the approximately 1.5-mile segment of Green Valley Road between the east end of Deer Valley Road and Lotus Road as an upgraded two-lane road, whereas the General Plan EIR analysis identified no improvements to this segment. The proposed TIM Fee Program analysis identified the need for widening this segment from its current 18-foot average width to an average width of 24 feet. TIM Fee Program analysis also identifies three needed auxiliary lanes for the approximately 0.8-mile segment of U.S. 50 between El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road and the proposed location of a new Silva Valley Road Interchange, for a total of 10 lanes for this segment. The General Plan EIR analysis did not include the auxiliary lanes and assumed a total of eight lanes.

The impacts of individual roadway improvements were beyond the scope of the General Plan EIR and will be analyzed in detail prior to the approval of individual improvement projects. However, as noted above, the General Plan EIR did identify and discuss the range of physical impacts associated with roadway widening at a level of detail appropriate for a General Plan. The two roadway improvements identified through the TIM Fee Program analysis that were not identified in the General Plan EIR analysis could incrementally contribute to the significant physical impacts identified in the General Plan EIR associated with roadway development as listed above, but would not result in a substantial change in severity of these impacts when considered in light of the totality of impacts associated with development and roadway improvements throughout the County.

In addition to the construction-related emissions (Impact 5.11-1) discussed above, the General Plan EIR also identifies three air quality impacts that have a relationship to air pollutant emissions from motor vehicle operations on roads within the County. These impacts include: long-term operational (regional)

---

<sup>22</sup> These two segments do not include the Suncastr Lane Extension because the improvements to this segment were not defined in the General Plan EIR.

emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> (Impact 5.11.2), toxic air emissions (Impact 5.11-3); and local mobile-source emissions of carbon monoxide (CO) (Impact 5.11-4). Each of these impacts was determined in the General Plan EIR to be significant and unavoidable. Although the methodologies used in the General Plan EIR and TIM Fee Program analyses varied and utilized different traffic volume forecasts for U.S. 50, the proposed TIM Fee Program would not have the effect of either increasing the number of vehicle trips or increasing the distance traveled within the County. As such, no substantial variation in regional emissions or toxic air emissions would be anticipated to occur as compared to those identified in the General Plan EIR (Impact 5.11-2 and 5.11-3).

Local mobile-source CO emissions (as addressed in General Plan EIR Impact 5.11-4) near roadway intersections are a direct function of traffic volume, speed and delay. Worsened levels of service can contribute to increased traffic delays and a level of congestion at intersections that could result in an increase in local mobile-source emissions of carbon monoxide. The TIM Fee Program analysis projects that, compared to the General Plan EIR analysis, only two additional roadway segments would decline to LOS E, and no additional roadway segments would decline to LOS F. In addition, none of the TIM Fee Program improvements that differ from those in the General Plan EIR analysis would affect the specific intersections analyzed as CO hot spots in the General Plan EIR. It is not anticipated that the improvement differences in the TIM Fee Program will affect intersection congestion in a manner that would substantially increase the severity of the significant CO impact identified in the General Plan EIR.

The specific impacts of any future roadway improvement will be dependent upon the final project design and right-of-way requirements for the improvement. Because final design elements were not determined for each roadway improvement identified in the General Plan EIR, the impact assessment in the General Plan EIR and this TIM Fee Program Supplement to the General Plan EIR is at a level of detail appropriate for CEQA review of the TIM Fee Program and for the implementation of General Plan Measure TC-B through the proposed TIM Fee Program. With the exception of the level of service impacts discussed in this document, it can be reasonably anticipated that because the proposed TIM Fee Program identifies less extensive roadway improvements overall than the General Plan EIR, no new significant impacts or substantial increases in the severity of previously identified impacts associated with roadway improvements would occur as a result of the proposed TIM Fee Program roadway improvements. Each roadway improvement project undertaken by the County will be subject to a separate, project-specific CEQA review that will identify the effects of the specific roadway design when fully developed and proposed for construction.

## 4 REFERENCES

- Dowling, 2006. El Dorado County Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Update 2005. February 14, 2006. Dowling Associates, Inc. Sacramento, CA.
- Dowling, 2006a. US 50 Strategic Corridor Operations Study – Ponderosa Road to Mather Field Road. January 31, 2006. Dowling Associates, Inc. Sacramento, CA.
- EDAW, 2004. Environmental Assessment of General Plan Policy Modifications as Part of the Final Environmental Impact Report. EDAW. July, 2004.
- El Dorado County, 2003. El Dorado County General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report. Certified July 19, 2004. SCH# 2001082030.
- El Dorado County, 2004. 2004 El Dorado County General Plan: A Plan for Managed Growth and Open Roads; A Plan for Quality Neighborhoods and Traffic Relief. Adopted July 19, 2004. El Dorado County Planning Department. Placerville, CA.
- Fehr & Peers, 2004. Ronald T. Milam, Fehr & Peers, Technical Memorandum re: Modified 1996 General Plan Alternative Modeling. July 7, 2004. (Exhibit 2 of Attachment 3 to EDAW, 2004.)



## 5 REPORT PREPARATION

### El Dorado County

Richard Shepard	Director of Transportation
Jim Ware	Deputy Director of Transportation
Craig McKibbin	Senior Traffic Civil Engineer
Lou Green	County Counsel
Paula Frantz	Deputy County Counsel
Peter Maurer	Deputy Director of Development Services

### Environmental Stewardship & Planning, Inc. (ESP)

Steve Peterson	Principal-in-Charge
Bob Delp	Project Manager
Amanda Rose	Editing/Production
Shelley King	Word Processing



APPENDIX A  
PROPOSED TIM FEE PROGRAM RATES





**Fee Zone Number 1**

	<b>Highway 50 Component</b>	<b>Local Road Component</b>	<b>Fee Total</b>
<b>SFD (Unit)</b>	1,600	13,500	15,100
<b>MFD (Unit)</b>	1,050	8,700	9,750
<b>High-Trip Commercial (Sq. Foot)</b>	1.20	7.50	8.70
<b>General Commercial (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.54	3.50	4.04
<b>Office (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.14	0.89	1.03
<b>Industrial (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.09	0.57	0.66
<b>Warehouse (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.04	0.28	0.32
<b>Church (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.04	0.28	0.32
<b>Gas Station (pump)</b>	550	3,550	4,100
<b>Golf Course (hole)</b>	445	2,900	3,345
<b>Campground (campsite)</b>	180	1,150	1,330
<b>Bed &amp; Breakfast (rented room)</b>	89	570	659

**Fee Zone Number 2**

	<b>Highway 50 Component</b>	<b>Local Road Component</b>	<b>Fee Total</b>
<b>SFD (Unit)</b>	4,550	24,000	28,550
<b>MFD (Unit)</b>	3,000	15,500	18,500
<b>High-Trip Commercial (Sq. Foot)</b>	4.55	24.00	28.55
<b>General Commercial (Sq. Foot)</b>	2.15	11.50	13.65
<b>Office (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.54	2.85	3.39
<b>Industrial (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.34	1.80	2.14
<b>Warehouse (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.17	0.90	1.07
<b>Church (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.17	0.90	1.07
<b>Gas Station (pump)</b>	2,050	10,500	12,550
<b>Golf Course (hole)</b>	1,750	9,100	10,850
<b>Campground (campsite)</b>	660	3,450	4,110
<b>Bed &amp; Breakfast (rented room)</b>	330	1,750	2,080

### Fee Zone Number 3

	Highway 50 Component	Local Road Component	Fee Total
SFD (Unit)	4,550	24,000	28,550
MFD (Unit)	3,000	15,500	18,500
High-Trip Commercial (Sq. Foot)	4.55	24.00	28.55
General Commercial (Sq. Foot)	2.15	11.50	13.65
Office (Sq. Foot)	0.54	2.85	3.39
Industrial (Sq. Foot)	0.34	1.80	2.14
Warehouse (Sq. Foot)	0.17	0.90	1.07
Church (Sq. Foot)	0.17	0.90	1.07
Gas Station (pump)	2,050	10,500	12,550
Golf Course (hole)	1,750	9,100	10,850
Campground (campsite)	660	3,450	4,110
Bed & Breakfast (rented room)	330	1,750	2,080

**Fee Zone Number 4**

	<b>Highway 50 Component</b>	<b>Local Road Component</b>	<b>Fee Total</b>
<b>SFD (Unit)</b>	1,150	12,500	13,650
<b>MFD (Unit)</b>	735	8,000	8,735
<b>High-Trip Commercial (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.41	6.05	6.46
<b>General Commercial (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.19	2.85	3.04
<b>Office (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.05	0.72	0.77
<b>Industrial (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.03	0.46	0.49
<b>Warehouse (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.02	0.23	0.25
<b>Church (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.02	0.23	0.25
<b>Gas Station (pump)</b>	190	2,850	3,040
<b>Golf Course (hole)</b>	160	2,350	2,510
<b>Campground (campsite)</b>	61	905	966
<b>Bed &amp; Breakfast (rented room)</b>	31	455	486

### Fee Zone Number 5

	Highway 50 Component	Local Road Component	Fee Total
SFD (Unit)	1,600	11,500	13,100
MFD (Unit)	1,050	7,250	8,300
High-Trip Commercial (Sq. Foot)	1.15	4.45	5.60
General Commercial (Sq. Foot)	0.53	2.10	2.63
Office (Sq. Foot)	0.14	0.53	0.67
Industrial (Sq. Foot)	0.09	0.33	0.42
Warehouse (Sq. Foot)	0.04	0.17	0.21
Church (Sq. Foot)	0.04	0.17	0.21
Gas Station (pump)	535	2,100	2,635
Golf Course (hole)	440	1,700	2,140
Campground (campsite)	175	665	840
Bed & Breakfast (rented room)	86	335	421

**Fee Zone Number 6**

	<b>Highway 50 Component</b>	<b>Local Road Component</b>	<b>Fee Total</b>
<b>SFD (Unit)</b>	1,250	25,500	26,750
<b>MFD (Unit)</b>	800	17,000	17,800
<b>High-Trip Commercial (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.58	25.00	25.58
<b>General Commercial (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.27	11.50	11.77
<b>Office (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.07	2.95	3.02
<b>Industrial (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.04	1.90	1.94
<b>Warehouse (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.02	0.93	0.95
<b>Church (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.02	0.93	0.95
<b>Gas Station (pump)</b>	270	11,500	11,770
<b>Golf Course (hole)</b>	220	9,400	9,620
<b>Campground (campsite)</b>	86	3,700	3,786
<b>Bed &amp; Breakfast (rented room)</b>	43	1,850	1,893

**Fee Zone Number 7**

	<b>Highway 50 Component</b>	<b>Local Road Component</b>	<b>Fee Total</b>
<b>SFD (Unit)</b>	1,650	13,500	15,150
<b>MFD (Unit)</b>	1,100	8,600	9,700
<b>High-Trip Commercial (Sq. Foot)</b>	1.25	7.30	8.55
<b>General Commercial (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.58	3.40	3.98
<b>Office (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.15	0.87	1.02
<b>Industrial (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.09	0.55	0.64
<b>Warehouse (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.05	0.28	0.33
<b>Church (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.05	0.28	0.33
<b>Gas Station (pump)</b>	585	3,400	3,985
<b>Golf Course (hole)</b>	480	2,800	3,280
<b>Campground (campsite)</b>	190	1,100	1,290
<b>Bed &amp; Breakfast (rented room)</b>	94	550	644

**Fee Zone Number 8**

	<b>Highway 50 Component</b>	<b>Local Road Component</b>	<b>Fee Total</b>
<b>SFD (Unit)</b>	2,450	24,000	26,450
<b>MFD (Unit)</b>	1,600	15,500	17,100
<b>High-Trip Commercial (Sq. Foot)</b>	2.60	32.50	35.10
<b>General Commercial (Sq. Foot)</b>	1.25	15.50	16.75
<b>Office (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.32	3.90	4.22
<b>Industrial (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.20	2.50	2.70
<b>Warehouse (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.10	1.25	1.35
<b>Church (Sq. Foot)</b>	0.10	1.25	1.35
<b>Gas Station (pump)</b>	1,200	15,000	16,200
<b>Golf Course (hole)</b>	1,050	12,500	13,550
<b>Campground (campsite)</b>	420	5,200	5,620
<b>Bed &amp; Breakfast (rented room)</b>	210	2,600	2,810