

To: Calaveras County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors

From: Tom Infusino, CPC Facilitator

RE: Community plan policies can reduce the significant impacts of the General Plan Update.

Date: 5/20/19

I. Recommendations

Please direct the Planning Department to include in the General Plan Update at least the community plan provisions that, if implemented, have a tendency to reduce significant impacts of the General Plan Update.

II. Background

The 1996 General Plan currently in effect includes the special plan for Rancho Calaveras, and the community plans from Valley Springs, San Andreas, Mokelumne Hill, Mountain Ranch, Murphys/Douglas Flat, Avery/Hathaway Pines, and Arnold.

At the beginning of the General Plan Update process, it was envisioned that the General Plan Update would include the Community Plans. (Mintier & Associated, General Plan Update Work Program, December 2006, p. 5)

During the General Plan Update, efforts were made to update the community plans for Valley Springs, San Andreas, Mokelumne Hill, and Mountain Ranch. In addition, community plans were drafted for Copperopolis, Railroad Flat/Glencoe, West Point, Poloma, and Sheep Ranch. These efforts included numerous public meetings to come to agreement on the terms of these plans.

The Copperopolis Community Plan, in process since 1992, was edited down to three pages in 2013. After two competing plans were completed for Valley Springs in 2010 (the COG facilitated Plan and the "Citizen Committee" Plan), the combined Valley Springs Community Plan, which is a hybrid of the two plans, was presented to the Planning Department and the Valley Springs Supervisor in 2016. In January 2017, the Planning Director submitted to the Planning Commission a pared down version of the blended plan (four and a half pages of text) suitable for inclusion in the Community Planning Element, but it has yet to be adopted.

In June of 2015, the Supervisors directed the Planning Department to include in the General Plan Update the Community Plans from Rancho Calaveras, San Andreas, and District 2. To date, the Planning Department has only included selected text and selected policies from these community plans in the 2016 Draft General Plan Update.

Since that time, the County completed a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the 2016 Draft General Plan Update. That DEIR identifies 26 impacts as significant and unavoidable. However, a closer look at the community plans indicates that these plans have many policies that either qualify as mitigation measures under CEQA, or that may tend to reduce the general plan's impacts if implemented. This raises both legal issues and policy issues for the Board of Supervisors.

To reject as infeasible a measure to mitigate a significant impact, a lead agency must have a valid finding that the proposed mitigation measure is infeasible. (*Masonite Corp. v. County of Mendocino* (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 230.) “Mitigation measures adopted when a project is approved may be changed or deleted if the agency states a legitimate reason for making the changes and the reason is supported by substantial evidence. (*Napa Citizens for Honest Government v. Napa County Bd. of Supervisors* (2001) [91 Cal.App.4th 342](#), 359.)” (From *Mani Brothers Real Estate Group v. City of Los Angeles* (2007) 153 Cal.App.4th 1385, 1403).

Thus, as a legal matter, whether removing existing mitigations measures from an existing general plan, or rejecting new mitigation measures proposed for the general plan update, the County must demonstrate, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that these measures are infeasible. The County must show that there is some technical, legal, or fiscal barrier that makes implementing these measures impossible. (CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15091.) With regard to those policies in the existing community plans, that have been reducing impacts in communities for decades, it will be very hard for the County to make a valid finding that somehow, all of a sudden, these policies have become infeasible.

As a policy matter, the Board has a choice.

On the one hand, the Board can spend the County’s time and money hiring experts to try to prove that these community plan policies, that have been mitigating impacts for decades, are somehow now infeasible. Then the Board can justify keeping them out of the General Plan Update. The Board can spend additional money on experts to try to prove that the impact mitigating policies in the updated and proposed community plans are also infeasible. Then the Board can justify keeping these impact mitigating policies out of the General Plan Update. **This is the path that has been prepared by the consultants and planning staff that have prepared in the DEIR and the Draft General Plan.** Before you Supervisors follow that path, ask yourselves, how many people came up to you during your campaign and said, “I want you to spend my tax dollars proving that there are no solutions to the problems in this County, and that we should abandon the current things we do to solve problems.” My guess is that very few people said that.

The Board has a better choice. Continue to include in the general plan those policies in the existing community plans that either qualify as CEQA mitigation measures, or that if implemented would have a tendency to reduce the impacts of the general plan update. Add to the general plan update the policies in proposed community plans that also qualify as CEQA mitigation measures, or that if implemented would have a tendency to reduce the impacts of the general plan update. We have previously submitted petitions from people throughout the County, and throughout the General Plan Update process, who supported including community plans, and/or supported mitigating general plan impacts. (See, Infusino, Community Planning Element Legal Flaws, Weaknesses, and Solutions, April 23, 2019; CP9, CP10, CP14.) Finally, we note that the community plans drafted by Paloma, Railroad Flat/Glencoe, and West Point, included a dozen land use principles. One of these principles is that, “Environmental and community mitigation measures should adequately address all impacts to community centers and outlying areas.” (See, Infusino, Community Planning Element Legal Flaws, Weaknesses, and

Solutions, April 23, 2019, CP17 Paloma Plan, CP18 Railroad Flat-Glencoe Plan, CP19 West Point Plan.) Ask yourselves, “Can I really afford to disappoint all these people by keeping the community plan mitigation policies out of the General Plan Update?”

In the past, staff has claimed that including such community plan policies will delay the General Plan Update, because staff has to ensure that each community plan policy is consistent with the General Plan Update. However, there has been no comparison of the time and expense it takes to prove all of these measures are infeasible, relative to the cost of determining that they are consistent with the General Plan Update.

Also, in the past the Planning Staff eliminated Community Plan policies claiming that they were duplicative of policies in the General Plan Update. However, this is not the case. Instead, and not surprisingly, the Community Plan policies tend to be much more site specific than those in the General Plan Update, and therefore properly implement the policies the General Plan Update.

III. Analysis of Facts

Below we list some of the 26 significant impacts that the General Plan Update DEIR claims are unavoidable. Below each impact we list the provisions four community plans (Arnold, Murphys & Douglas Flat, Avery-Hathaway Pines, and Valley Springs) that qualify as CEQA mitigation measures. There are currently **NO** community plan provisions from these communities included in the General Plan Update. Please include them in the Community Planning Element of the General Plan Update. Please complete a similar analysis for the remaining community plans, and put the mitigation measures thereby identified into the General Plan Update.

1) Significant Impact 4.1-2: Substantial degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the project site and/or the site’s surroundings.

Arnold Community Plan (1998)

Protect the scenic quality along Highway 4 - Prohibit billboards

GOAL I: Preserve and enhance the rural, forested environment of the Arnold Community Plan area.

Policy 1A: Protect the scenic quality of Highway 4 and major roads throughout the community of Arnold.

Implementation Measure 1A-1: Encourage off-Highway 4 commercial development within the community plan area.

Implementation Measure 1A-2: The placement of new, indirectly illuminated signs, displaying the name of off-Highway 4 businesses shall be allowed. Such signs would be akin to entrance signs, placed at the intersection of Highway 4 and roads leading to off-highway commercial areas. Such signs should be standardized, and made of natural materials. Design of this type of area business signs shall be approved by the Planning Department using the public hearing process.

Implementation Measure IA-3: New commercial billboards are prohibited within the Arnold Community Plan boundaries.

Implementation Measure IA-4: Strengthen compliance with the County Sign ordinance.

GOAL 4: Encourage commercial/industrial/multifamily design that is compatible with the rural character of Arnold.

Policy 4A: Provide public review of commercial/industrial/multifamily parcels.

Implementation Measure 4A-I: Add the PD combining zone on commercial properties adjacent to Highway 4 and in the "village area" as depicted on the land use map.

Policy 4B: Ensure that new commercial/industrial/multifamily development includes open space.

Implementation Measure 4B-1: All new commercial/industrial/multifamily development shall include at least 10% of its gross area landscaped. The landscaping shall include native materials as much as possible.

Implementation Measure 4B-2: All new commercial/industrial/multifamily development shall include areas for snow storage.

Policy 4C: Provide specific direction regarding certain land uses within Arnold.

Implementation Measure 4C-1: Create and add an MU (Mixed Use) combining zone that allows residential units as permitted uses when constructed as part of a commercial structure.

Implementation Measure 4C-2: Adult entertainment businesses, as defined in the Zoning Code, are prohibited from locating within 1000' of schools, churches, and residential neighborhoods.

Avery-Hathaway Pines Community Plan (1998)

Policy IB: Encourage residential cluster development to provide for open space.

Implementation Measure IB-1: Utilize the Planned Development (PO) combining district to allow flexibility in the lot size and setbacks normally required by the performance standards of the Single Family Residential (R1) zone. Allow a 10% density bonus for development that provides a 1:1 ratio of common area to private land. Allow a 25% density bonus for development that provides a 2:1 ratio of common area to private land.

Implementation Measure 1D-1: Use the following criteria for siting light industrial

uses and zoning in the Community Plan area.

- The subject property has direct access to a minor arterial or major collector; and
- The subject property is served by public water and sewer, or has proposed sources of water and sewage disposal approved by the County Building Department's Onsite Sewage Department or Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, as applicable; and
- Development of the subject property is compatible with neighboring land uses and zoning; and
- The requested zoning is MI, RM or M4.

Implementation Measure ID-2: Apply the Planned Development (PD) combining zone to all industrial property within the community plan area.

Implementation Measure ID-3: Resource production uses shall mitigate potential aesthetic impacts to adjacent uses. Such impacts shall be considered in the design of the project.

Implementation Measure IDA: Require landscaping and/or fencing which blends with the natural environment to screen industrial development.

Implementation Measure 2A-1: Apply the Planned Development (PD) combining district to all commercially zoned parcels within the community plan area, to allow review for compatibility with the rural character of Avery.

Implementation Measure 2A-2: Utilize the following criteria as a guideline when reviewing applications for commercial development:

- The architectural design of the project is compatible with the historic character of the Avery Hotel and rural character of the area.
- Landscaping shall be used to reduce the visual impact of all structures, including solid fences. Where possible, native trees should be preserved and natural vegetation should dominate. Where existing vegetation is inadequate, the use of native plant materials is encouraged.
- When calculating landscape coverage required as part of the 10% landscaping for commercial projects, use of undisturbed lands where existing vegetation is to be retained and enhanced is to be included in the total of landscape area being provided. In reviewing the landscape plan, consideration shall be given to public safety and security.
- Lighting visible from the exterior of the building shall be limited to that necessary for security, safety, and identification.

Policy 3A: Restrict development along Highway 4 to preserve its scenic rural/forested appearance, except for designated centers of commercial development.

Implementation Measure 9A-I: Require that new single family residential

subdivisions involving subject property five acres or more in size to provide a 100' above ground structure development setback from the edge of the road right of way as a buffer from Highway 4 and all Major Collectors roads within the community plan area. Within this setback area, retention of native vegetation or planting of vegetation compatible with the native vegetation is required. Due to topography, soils, fire safety, or other factors, variances can be considered.

Murphys & Douglas Flat Community Plan (1988)

1e Policy, 1F Implementation

5d-Policy, 5e-Implementation

6g-Implementation

19c-Policy, 19d-Implementation

20-Goal, 20a-Policy

24-Goal, 24a-Policy, 24d-Implementation

Valley Springs Community Plan (2010 – COG)

LU-1.2 Protect natural site features to make developments visually compatible with their environment.

Implementation Program 12

LU-1.7 Establish minimum building setbacks that provide space in front of buildings for on-site trails, stormwater retention basins, and/or oak tree preservation, and protect views of the surrounding foothills.

Implementation Program 1

LU-1.8 Cluster commercial development around shared parking to preserve expansive views in the Commercial district.

Implementation Program 12

LU-1.11 Extend the grid street system found in the historic Valley Springs settlement.

Implementation Program 20

LU-1.12 Establish building height limits to preserve the small-town character.

Implementation Program 1

LU-1.13 Plan for civic space to allow for community events and informal gathering, including use

as a farmers' market.

Implementation Programs 1, 30

LU-1.14 Plan for space for a community center/senior center building located in or adjacent to the Town Center district near other amenities and bicycle and pedestrian paths to support walkability.

Implementation Programs 1, 28, 30

HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT

NR-1.1 Prohibit development on steep hillsides to the north and west of the historic Valley Springs settlement to protect natural resources and scenic views that frame the area.

Implementation Programs 2, 17

FLOOD ZONE OVERLAY

NR-1.2 Prohibit development within the Cosgrove Creek floodplain to protect natural resources, expansive views, and public health and safety.

Implementation Programs 3, 17

NIGHT SKY PROTECTION

NR-1.3 Protect the dark night sky by controlling light pollution (glare, light trespass, and sky glow).

Implementation Programs 7, 17

7) Significant Impact 4.4-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Avery-Hathaway Pines Community Plan (1998)

Policy 9B: Protect wetland and riparian habitat.

Implementation Measure 9B-I: Require that development projects will not remove, diminish or reduce the quality of wetlands or riparian zones unless potential loss is mitigated in consultation with the Department of Fish and Game

Implementation Measure 10A-I: Zone property located within an area identified being a wildlife corridor on Map XX to allow a density that will not have a negative impact on wildlife migration patterns.

Valley Springs Community Plan (2010 – COG)

RIPARIAN BUFFER

NR-1.4 Protect the water quality and habitat value of the planning area's rivers and streams with riparian buffer zones.

Implementation Programs 4, 17

OAK TREE HABITAT PROTECTION

NR-1.5 Protect oak trees, oak woodlands, and wildlife habitat.

Implementation Programs 12, 17

9) Significant Impact 4.4-4: Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) and/or on waters of the State defined pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, or the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, indirect affects, or other means of impact.

Avery-Hathaway Pines Community Plan (1998)

Policy 8B: Ensure water resources including lakes, streams, wetlands and ground water are protected.

Implementation Measure 8B-1: Establish a stream buffer zone from future development on 100' on either side of major streams as identified in the community plan and 50 from intermittent/seasonal streams or wetlands.

Murphys & Douglas Flat Community Plan (1988)

16a-Policy, 16b-Implementation, 16c-Implementation,

17d-Policy, 17e-Implementation

13) Significant Impact 4.7-7: Development associated with the Draft General Plan would expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

20) Significant Impact 4.12-2: Development associated with the General Plan would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically

altered fire protection facilities, and/or the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection facilities.

Avery-Hathaway Pines Community Plan (1998)

Implementation Measure 11A-1: The County shall cooperate with the efforts of the responsible wildland fire agency conducting prescribed burns for fire hazard reduction within the community plan or outlying areas.

Implementation Measure I1B-2: Divisions of land of five parcels or more shall require a Wildland Fire Vulnerability Analysis (refer to text and charts beginning page 39) be completed by the applicant. Should a given project area have an analysis indicating a Very High or High wildland fire vulnerability rating, a Fire Management Plan shall be required in accordance with the Fire and Life Safety Ordinance. In addition, the Fire Management Plan must address planned fuel modification and design, and the relationship of improvements to the non-modified wildland area.

Implementation Measure I1B-3: Notify the Ebbetts Pass Fire District and California Department of Forestry of all proposed development in the community plan area and incorporate their comments into the project conditions of development.

Implementation Measure I1BA: Review proposed residential development adjacent to Forest Service lands for an appropriate open space buffer or alternate mitigation measures.

Arnold Community Plan (1998)

Implementation Measure 19A-1: All future development and buildings shall comply with the requirements of the current Ebbetts Pass Fire Ordinance and the County Fire and Life Safety Ordinance. The most stringent code and/or ordinance shall take precedence.

Implementation Measure 19A-2: New subdivisions shall provide fuel breaks to help protect structures in the event of wildland fire.

Provide recycling, composting, and collection of yard and household waste

Murphys & Douglas Flat Community Plan (1988)

9d-Implementation

10b-Implementation

Valley Springs Community Plan (2010 – COG)

WILD FIRE PREVENTION

HS-1.1 Adopt a wildfire prevention strategy that includes site design and public education techniques.

Implementation Programs 10, 17

22) Significant Impact 4.12-5: Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed.

Arnold Community Plan 1998

Implementation Measure 18B-8: EPFD shall work with the water service agencies to develop specific proposals to upgrade the water delivery systems.

Murphys & Douglas Flat Community Plan (1988)

2a-Policy, 2c-Implementation

28a-Policy

Valley Springs Community Plan (2010 – COG)

WATER SENSITIVE DESIGN

W-1.1 Incorporate water sensitive design techniques for new construction in the Town Center, Commercial, and Community Residential districts.

Implementation Programs 8, 17

23) Significant Impact 4.12-6: Would implementation of the Draft General Plan result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments, and that project wastewater would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board or the capacity of existing conveyance infrastructure.

Murphys & Douglas Flat Community Plan (1988)

2a-Policy, 2c-Implementation

Valley Springs Community Plan (2010 – COG)

SEPTIC SYSTEM STANDARDS

PS-1.1 Prohibit residential development within the Community Residential district until public services are provided.

Implementation Program 18

25) Significant Impact 4.12-10: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered recreation facilities, and/or the need for new or physically altered recreation facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain performance objectives for recreation facilities.

Arnold Community Plan 1998

Implementation Measure 17A-I: Require new subdivisions to provide for common areas for recreational opportunities, and provide a funding mechanism for maintenance.

Valley Springs Community Plan (2010 – COG)

PS-2.1 Identify an appropriate site for a community center that would allow activities for all age groups, including meeting and gathering space for residents, organized activities for school children, and senior services.

Implementation Program 28

26) Significant Impact 4.13-2: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of Caltrans maintained roadways under the Market-Level 2035 growth scenario or the General Plan Buildout (Growth Beyond 2035).

Arnold Community Plan 1998

Provide alternate routes of travel (other than Highway 4) through town

Develop off Highway parking

Recommended Circulation and Safety Improvements:

1. Realign and improve the intersection of Lakemont Drive and Highway 4. (see Figure 1)
2. Reconstruct Meadowview Road from Fir Drive to Country Club Drive. (see Figure 1)
3. Construct three lane routes on Highway 4 from Upper Meadowview Road to an area west of the southern intersection of Highway 4 and the Arnold Bypass. (see Figure 2)
4. Reconstruction of the Blagen Road /Highway 4 intersection and reconstruction of Blagen Road from Highway 4 to White Pines Lake. (see Figure 2)
5. Pave Dunbar Road. (see Figure)
6. Minimize direct access to Highway 4 for newly developed commercial areas.

Recommended New Road Connections:

This plan is specifically excluding any connection from Pine Drive to Lakemont Drive.

1. New road from the present terminus of Manuel Road to the intersection of Fairway Drive and Crystal Way in Meadowmont: The general alignment would follow the existing one lane dirt road to allow some residents of Meadowmont to reach the central business area without using Highway 4. (see Figure 3)
2. New access to Meadowview Road, south of Fir Drive. (see Figure 4)
3. Extend Fir Drive to Camanche. (see Figure 4)
4. New road from Highway 4 to Moran Road at the southern end of the community: Currently this road is proposed as part of the Ridgecrest development. (see Figure 5)
5. Secondary connection from Blue Lake Springs Units 14, 15, and 16 to Moran Road or included as part of any development adjacent to the boundaries of the Arnold Community Plan.
6. New road from Cedar Center to Sequoia Street to Fir Street.

Implementation Measure 9A-3 Include provisions for pedestrian and bicycle pathways as part of the design of a project.

Avery-Hathaway Pines Community Plan (1988)

Implementation Measure 5D-1: Require that subdivisions involving 5 or more parcels incorporate pedestrian paths into the design of the development on at least one side of the road.

Recommended Circulation and Safety Improvements*:

- 1) Construct a continuous left turn lane on Highway 4 from Commercial Way to Tanwood Mobilehome Park (See Figures I and V).

- 2) The intersection of Highway 4 and lower Moran Road should restrict left turn movement onto Highway 4 from Moran Road, unless mitigated by realignment of Moran Road (See Figure V).
 - 3) Realign Avery Sheep Ranch Road to intersect Highway 4 at a 90 degree angle (See Figure I) .
 - 3) Reduce the speed limit through Hathaway Pines and Avery to 35 mph.
 - 4) Install a school crossing light at the intersection of Highway 4 and Sheep Ranch Road with 25 mph speed limit to be operated during specified school hours similar to that for Michaelson School.
 - 5) Improve the sight distance at the intersection of Hunter Dam Road and Highway 4 (See Figure III).
 - 6) Improve the level of service of Segale Road from Mill Creek to Hunter Dam (See Figure I).
 - 7) Improve the level of service of Valley View Road from Sheep Ranch Road to Lakemont Drive, (See Figure IV).
 - 8) Improve the level of service of Moran Road from Highway 4 to Blue Lake Springs (See Figure 1).
 - 9) The level of service of Love Creek Road from the intersection of Moran Road to the end of Love Creek Road, is considered adequate and only those improvements necessary to connect serious safety problems are required for the land use designations and zoning (See Figure VI, VII).
 - 10) Improve the level of service of Doud's Landing Road, for fire emergency access purposes (See Figure VI).
 11. Provide secondary access routes for existing subdivisions for fire emergency access purposes.
- * Order of list does not indicate prioritization of items.

Recommended New Road Connections*:

- 1) Connecting road between Commercial Way and Canyon View Drive (See Figure I).
 - 2) New road connecting Sunrise Point and existing private road at Crescent Cove (See Figure II).
 - 3) New road from Highway 4 to Moran Road to the north of the Avery Hotel Road.
 - 4) New road from Moran to Segale Road behind the Avery Transfer Station.
- Order of list does not indicate prioritization of items.

Murphys & Douglas Flat Community Plan (1988)

32a-Policy: The County will ensure that proposed development projects contribute their fair share to development of potential vehicle connector routes in the Murphys/Douglas Flat Community Plan area through enactment of Implementation Measures 32a(1) through 32a(3).

32a(1)-Implementation Measure: In order to provide adequate traffic circulation within the Murphys/Douglas Flat Community Plan area, "Potential Roadway Alignments" have been identified for connector roads, bicycle routes and pedestrian routes that need to be added to the current circulation facilities to relieve existing congestion, address safety issues and provide additional future capacity. These "Potential Roadway Alignments" are shown in the **Murphys Circulation, Pedestrian Bicycling and Parking Study, Figure 7 "Potential Roadway Alignments"**; and **Figure 20 "Recommended Traffic Circulation Plan"**. These illustrations show current possibilities and are a guideline for the future. Other alignments (i.e. a connector between Six Mile Road Connector and Alger Street Connector #2) not shown which provide environmentally and technically equivalent access can be considered as consistent with this Implementation Measure. *The locations shown are not intended to show actual rights-of-way. Those alignments will be determined based upon future rights-of-way studies.*

32a(2)-Implementation Measure: All proposed development in the vicinity of "Potential Roadway Alignments" shall be reviewed to determine if the proposed development will have an impact on traffic circulation within the Murphys/Douglas Flat Community Plan Area. Any impact from the proposed

development shall be mitigated through participation in the development of the facilities.

- 32a(3)-Implementation Measure: In order to address future roadway needs, staff will explore and present to the Board of Supervisors the economic and practical possibilities of developing "Basin Fees" to address the future road capacity needs within the Murphys/Douglas Flat Community Plan Area. If established, any impact from proposed development shall be mitigated through direct improvements or participation in the basin fee program.
- 32b-Policy: The County will ensure that proposed development projects contribute their fair share to development of potential pedestrian routes in the Murphys/Douglas Flat Community Plan area through enactment of implementation measures 32b(1) through 32b(4).
- 32b(1)-Implementation Measure: In order to provide adequate traffic circulation within the Murphys/Douglas Flat Community Plan area, "Potential Pedestrian Paths" have been identified for pedestrian routes that need to be added to the current circulation facilities to relieve existing congestion, address safety issues and provide additional future capacity. These "Potential Pedestrian Paths" are shown in the **Murphys Circulation, Pedestrian Bicycling and Parking Study, Figure 14 "Murphys Potential Pedestrian Paths"; Figure 24 "Recommended Regional Bike/Pedestrian Circulation Plan"; and Figure 25 "Recommended Murphys Village Area Bike/Pedestrian Plan"**. Other alternatives not shown which provide environmentally and technically equivalent pedestrian facilities can be considered as consistent with this Implementation Measure.
- 32b(2)-Implementation Measure: All proposed development in the vicinity of "Potential Pedestrian Paths" shall be reviewed to determine if the proposed development will have an impact on pedestrian traffic circulation within the Murphys/Douglas Flat Community Plan Area. Any impact from the proposed development shall be mitigated through participation in the development of the Pedestrian Path facilities.
- 32b(3)-Implementation Measure: Class I pathways will be provided in all situations requiring the development of pathways, whenever physically possible.
- 32b(4)-Implementation Measure: All paths shall be designed as looped facilities and interconnected with other existing or planned paths, except where prohibited by terrain, existing improvements or when designed as a path to reach a specific destination.
- 32c-Policy: The County will ensure that proposed development projects contribute their fair share to development of potential bicycle routes in the Murphys/Douglas Flat Community Plan area through enactment of implementation measures 32b(1) and 33c(2).

32c(1)-Implementation Measure: In order to provide adequate traffic circulation within the Murphys/Douglas Flat Community Plan area, "Potential Bicycle Paths" have been identified for Bicycle routes that need to be added to the current circulation facilities to relieve existing congestion, address safety issues and provide additional future capacity. These "Potential Bicycle Paths" are shown in the **Murphys Circulation, Pedestrian Bicycling and Parking Study; Figure 15 "Murphys Potential Bicycle Paths"; Figure 24 "Recommended Regional Bike/Pedestrian Circulation Plan"; Figure 25 "Recommended Murphys Village Area Bike/Pedestrian Plan; and Figure 26 "Recommended Regional Bikeway Improvements".** Other alternatives (i.e. a class I bike facility on Six Mile Connector to Douglas Flat) not shown which provide environmentally and technically equivalent bicycle facilities can be considered as consistent with this Implementation Measure.

32c(2)-Implementation Measure: All proposed development in the vicinity of "Potential Bicycle Paths" shall be reviewed to determine if the proposed development will have an impact on bicycle traffic circulation within the Murphys/Douglas Flat Community Plan Area. Any impact from the proposed development shall be mitigated through participation in the development of the Bicycle Path facilities.

33-Goal: Provide adequate parking to accommodate the development of commercial areas of Murphys

33a-Policy: The County shall maintain the existing in-lieu parking fee applicable to commercial development in Murphys and will promote the establishment of additional parking through enactment of implementation measures 33a(1) through 33a(5).

33a(1)-Implementation Measure: In order to provide adequate parking within the Murphys Downtown Commercial Area, "Recommended Parking Areas" have been identified for Parking Areas that need to be added to the current circulation facilities to relieve existing congestion, address safety issues and provide additional future capacity. These "Recommended Parking Areas" are shown in the **Murphys Circulation, Pedestrian Bicycling and Parking Study; Figure 23 "Recommended Parking Plan".**

33a(2)-Implementation Measure: In order to provide for the future parking needs within the Murphys Downtown Commercial area, the current parking fee program shall be continued. All proposed commercial development in the Murphys Downtown Commercial area shall be reviewed to determine if the proposed development will have an impact on parking within the Murphys Downtown Commercial Area. Any impact from the proposed development shall be mitigated through participation in the development of the Parking facilities.

33a(3)-Implementation Measure: Collect in-lieu parking fees for new development in the Murphys Downtown Commercial Area if parking cannot be provided on site.

7b-Implementation, 7c-Implementation,

30b- Implementation

31a-Policy

Valley Springs Community Plan (2010 – COG)

CIRC-1.1 Pursue construction of a SR 12 or other alternate route that would shift highway traffic from the center of historic Valley Springs to a newly constructed road south of the existing SR 12.

Implementation Program 13, 14

CIRC-1.3 Incorporate traffic calming devices on roadways in the Town Center, Commercial, and Community Residential districts to slow traffic speeds in areas with high pedestrian activity.

Implementation Program 17

CIRC-2.1 Require new development to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Implementation Programs 12, 16

CIRC-2.2 Develop a community-wide trail system that connects uses within the planning area to each other and to the Hogan Reservoir and Mokelumne Coast to Crest trail systems.

Implementation Programs 12, 15

CIRC-3.1 Ensure new subdivisions can connect to existing and/or future subdivisions using through streets, pedestrian and bicycle trails, and live end cul-de-sacs.

Implementation Programs 17, 19

CIRC-3.2 Provide multiple points of access in new developments to discourage concentration of traffic at a few intersections.

Implementation Program 19

CIRC-3.3 Promote walkable block lengths in the Town Center and Commercial districts and set standards for residential block lengths.

Implementation Program 21