

## **Draft Copperopolis Community Plan Text with Explanations**

**September 27, 2022**

### **Vision Statement**

Copperopolis will retain its small-town atmosphere highlighted by the greenbelt between Flowers Mountain and Copperopolis Mountain. People who visit Copperopolis will experience a beautiful rural countryside and a friendly town.

The community's rich agricultural and rangeland heritage will be maintained through the preservation of prominent natural resources and open space vistas. The next generation will be enriched through participation in groups like 4-H and Future Farmers of America. Lake Tulloch will flourish as a community attraction. Housing, commercial, and employment opportunities will be diverse and integrated with the natural resources and open space elements of the community.

Revitalization efforts will turn "historic" Copperopolis into a vibrant, attractive town center and tourist destination. The town center will host community events and provide opportunities to serve residents and tourists alike.

Motorized and non-motorized circulation in Copperopolis will provide safe and attractive access to all areas of the community. Residents, young and old, will take advantage of the community's pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle pathways that will tie into the community's business centers and recreational amenities.

*Source and/or Explanation: This Vision Statement is adapted from page 13 of the 2001 Vision Study, the 2005 Draft Community plan, and the 2013 Draft Community Plan for Copperopolis. Community Plans in the 2019 General Plan include such introductory statements.*

### **A) Land Use**

#### **1) Commercial development design.**

New commercial development will harmoniously incorporate historic design elements found in the Armory, the Old Corner Saloon, the Copperopolis Congregational Church, and the former McCarty General Store.

*Source and/or Explanation: This is adapted from Policy D1.1 of the 2005 Draft Plan and from Policy 4 in the 2013 Draft Plan.*

#### **2) Centrally locate commercial development**

Commercial development will be centralized, and strip development will be avoided.

*Source and/or Explanation: This is adapted from Policy CD7.2 of the 2005 Draft Plan and from Policy 5 in the 2013 Draft Plan. This avoids multiple driveways onto*

*thoroughfares like O'Byrnes Ferry Road, reduces trips, facilitates pedestrian and transit use, allows for shared parking facilities, and maintains attractive views.*

### **3) Home Businesses**

Clean and safe home offices and businesses will be allowed provided that they do not generate excessive noise, traffic, and parking in residential areas.

*Source and/or Explanation: This is a new policy to balance the current desire for home businesses with the objective of retaining the residential character of existing neighborhoods. Not every county has been successful in keeping this balance. Some are moving nuisance industries into neighborhoods, and are allowing multiple businesses and multiple signs at one home.*

### **4) Extension of obsolete Tentative Subdivision Maps**

Any tentative subdivision map under discretionary consideration for an extension of time will be conditioned to comply with the general plan in place at the time of the extension, or the extension will be denied. The additional conditions the applicant needs to meet shall be specified and added to the map. Consult Table 1 to identify key implementation measures in the 2019 General Plan Update to convert into conditions on the project. The County shall not require any additional condition that would result in an unconstitutional taking under the circumstances.

*Source and/or Explanation: This is a new policy to balance the intention of the 2019 General Plan to allow for large developments that will build out over a decade or more and the need to ensure that the neighborhoods being built are state of the art. This need was highlighted in 2020 with the approval of 1000 units of development in the former "Saddle Creek" Specific Plan without updating the project or the plan to conform to the 2019 general plan.*

### **5) Recognize two distinct phases of future development in Copperopolis.**

Recognize that the current phase of development in Copperopolis is limited by constraints to roads, bridges, water supply, and sewer treatment capacity. Full buildout of currently approved developments would overtax this infrastructure and these resources. It may take years of public investment to restore appropriate levels of service to this overtaxed infrastructure.

Additional discretionary development may be approved after 2022 but only after the publicly maintained infrastructure is able to accommodate existing, approved and additional development and not before those expansions are complete and operational. To the maximum extent allowed by the state and federal constitutions, the infrastructure expansions needed for additional development will be paid for by the additional development. The County shall not require any conditions on additional development that the County finds, based upon a preponderance of the evidence in the record, would result in an unconstitutional taking under the circumstances.

*Source and/or Explanation: The 2019 General Plan includes policies requiring new development to pay its fair share for providing public services and infrastructure, and precluding new development from reducing infrastructure levels of service. (PF 1.1, PF 1.3, PF 2.10, 4.1.) The policy above would have the County comply with the 2019 General Plan in Copperopolis first by restoring and maintaining levels of service for existing and approved development. Only after that is achieved will additional development be approved. When you find yourself in a hole, and you want to get out, the first thing you need to do is stop digging!*

## **6) Additions to the Copperopolis Community**

The Copperopolis Community boundaries are defined on the general plan land use map. New development proposed adjacent to or near to these community boundaries will first be considered for inclusion within these boundaries, so that the policies in this Community Plan apply to the proposed project. Nearby or adjacent projects must not be excluded from the Copperopolis Community to avoid the application of the Community Plan policies. Inclusion of land within the community boundary does not guarantee that a particular proposed project will be approved.

*Source and/or Explanation: This is a new policy to address the tight boundaries placed around Copperopolis in the 2019 General Plan. These boundaries are quite different than those used in 2005. The 2005 Draft Community Plan was designed to apply to the entire valley. The intent of this community plan is that it should apply to the land within the 2019 plan boundaries, and to subsequent urbanization approved adjacent to that. The 2019 GPU includes an implementation measure that specifies the criteria to be considered when changing the boundary of a Community Plan. (LU-2G) These criteria would still be used when evaluating a proposal to change a community boundary.*

## **B) Circulation and Public Facilities**

Within two years of plan approval and every five years thereafter, the Benefit Basin Plan and/or other road impact mitigation fees will be updated to identify two sets of transportation improvements and two sets of impact mitigation fees.

The first step is to identify the cost to fully fund the transportation improvements needed to meet level of service standards for development approved through 2022. The mitigation fees will be established to reflect the maximum constitutionally allowed mitigation fees for the developers' share of the improvements, and the minimum burden to be paid by local taxes, state, and federal funds. The fees will include the funding of pedestrian walkways, bicycle paths, riding trails, and electric vehicle charging facilities. These fees will be charged to previously approved projects at the building permit phase.

The second step is to identify the cost to fund the additional transportation improvements needed for buildout of the 2019 General Plan Update. The Benefit Basin and/or mitigation fees will

reflect the maximum constitutionally allowed mitigation fees for the developers' share of the improvements to minimize the burden paid by local taxes, state, and federal funds. Fees will include the funding of pedestrian walkways, bicycle paths, riding trails, and electric vehicle charging facilities. These fees will be charged to projects approved after 2022.

Within two years of plan approval and every five years thereafter, County Public Works will work **with** (not for or against) the residents and property owners in the Copperopolis Community to draft a plan for pedestrian walkways, bicycle paths, and riding trails, and for a means of financing and staffing the completion and maintenance of the system.

Within four years of community plan approval and every five years thereafter, County Public Works will work with the residents and property owners in the Copperopolis Community to survey road capacity, safety (including lighting), and intersection controls (including stop signs, lights, and striping) in order to identify priority transportation improvements in and around Copperopolis for completion by the County, the Council of Governments, or Caltrans. This list shall be shared in a timely manner with Caltrans and the Council of Governments to assist them in securing funding for these priority transportation needs.

*Source and/or Explanation: Traffic Circulation was a topic in the 2005 Draft Plan on pages 39 through 45. It was also noted at the end of the 2001 Vision Study. It was in Policy 10 of the 2013 Draft Plan. The desire for pedestrian walkways and trails was identified in Policy 7 of the 2013 Draft Plan.*

*Traffic Circulation has been one of the most controversial and confounding issues associated with development in Copperopolis.*

#### *A) Road Size*

*Policy 10 of the 2013 plan reflects the vision of Castle and Cooke to maintain two-lane roads. In 2005 and in 2013, County Public Works was been adamant that the size of the road will be determined by the needs of the traffic.*

*Sometimes a little rough math can help to give you some perspective. Copperopolis was planned to grow to 40,000 people under the 2005 Draft Plan. The Board of Supervisors wanted to add 20,000 more people to Copperopolis under the 2013 Draft Plan. 40,000 people equate to about 20,000 homes and about 180,000 vehicle trips per day. 20,000 people equate to about 10,000 homes and about 90,000 vehicle trips per day. (These numbers account for neither trips due to commercial development nor through trips by trucks and tourists)*

*While there is some variability depending on road specifications, a typical two-lane highway will degrade to level of service E in violation of County traffic congestion standards at about 20,000 trips per day. A 4-lane highway will degrade to level of service E at 35,000 trips per day. Also, depending on the road conditions (degraded pavement, blind turns, no shoulders, etc.), the road may become unsafe at even lower levels of traffic. Thus, it is extremely unlikely that a system composed of a few two-lane roads will*

*accommodate free following traffic should Copperopolis reach the levels of development sought under the previous plans.*

*Nevertheless, because of this controversy over road infrastructure and population aspirations, the County has not seriously addressed a feasible means of financing road construction in Copperopolis. At one point, the County had to give the State back the money to plan for a new bridge in Copperopolis because the County had not raised the matching funds for the grant. This is an example of how failing to deal with this issue has hamstrung progress in Copperopolis.*

#### *B) Road Funding*

*Road funding comes from many sources. Regional road improvements are funded primarily from state and federal sources with small local matches. Some of these matching funds are from the County's Regional Impact Mitigation (RIM) fees. (In 2012 RIM fee programs covered about 10% of the cost of regional road improvements in Calaveras County) Rim fee programs (like all mitigation fee programs in California) must be updated every five years so that the collected fees are spent or programmed to be spent, so that the nexus studies remain valid (so we don't charge developers too much), and so that the fees **may** be adjusted to keep up with construction cost inflation (if we don't want to charge developers too little). Construction cost inflation is no joke. It is calculated annually by the State of California. A road improvement that cost \$60,000 in 2002 would cost over \$200,000 in 2019.*

*Fees not properly maintained on this five-year schedule are not lawful and do not have to be paid by developers. All road costs not properly charged to developers then fall on existing residents either in the form of taxes or fees to pay for the needed road improvements, or (as is more often the case) in the form of degraded road safety and traffic congestions.*

*A benefit basin is another less often used funding mechanism. A major developer fronts the money for a major road improvement and is then compensated over time when neighboring projects develop using the same road. The Copperopolis Benefit Basin was established in 2002.*

#### *C) Policy rationale for the timing of mitigation fees.*

*The initial policy statement calls on the County to timely establish and maintain a mitigation fee program at least for Copperopolis. This would deal with the size of the needed roads, the costs of the needed roads, the level of development expected, and the fees charged of each unit of development. This in and of itself would be a great improvement, even if the County does not want to move to the split fee approach noted below.*

#### *D) Policy rationale for the split impact fee.*

*The next parts of the policy try to find a compromise between the two-lane road lovers and the larger road advocates. One of the reasons that developers do not want bigger roadways is that the larger roadways cost more. There are diseconomies of scale when it comes to building highways. The policy we propose would identify two different impact fees: one for existing projects and one for future projects approved after 2022. The existing projects would pay a fee based upon the road network they would need for their buildout (mostly two-laners). The new projects would pay the fee for the road network needed to buildout the 2019 General Plan (much bigger). This approach has been validated by recent California cases indicating that fees can vary among service recipients if the costs of providing the service differs. Many locales currently charge different traffic impact mitigation fees across regional boundaries due to the variable costs associated with building different sized roads. We are proposing charging variable fees based upon the time of project approval and the associated escalated costs of providing larger roads.*

*E) Policy rationale for the maximum mitigation fee.*

*The 2019 General Plan includes policies requiring new development to pay its fair share for providing public services and infrastructure, and precluding new development from reducing levels of service. (PF 1.1, PF 1.3, PF 2.10, 4.1.)*

*Local governments can calculate fair share fees to charge the maximum fair share or any fee less than the maximum. As noted above, when insufficient fees are collected the result is usually the degradation of the level of service of the road system. Our policy directs the County to charge the maximum fee allowed by the state and federal constitutions and their restrictions on excessive fees. This is a way to conform to the requirements of the 2019 General Plan.*

*F) Policy rationale for the paths and trails.*

*The desire for pedestrian walkways and trails was identified in Policy 7 of the 2013 Draft Plan. Since traffic impact mitigation will include non-motorized transportation to reduce vehicle trips, those paths and trails are included in the fee. The policy calls on Public Works to help the community develop a system of paths and trails. This could be part of a mobility plan funded by Caltrans as was done in other communities in Calaveras County.*

*G) Policy rationale for the regular survey for road improvements.*

*As noted above, regional road improvements are mostly funded by state and federal money accessed through the Council of Governments. In the past, a community plan on the Highway 4 Corridor in Calaveras County could identify a list of top priority road improvements for funding through COG (E.g., Murphys Community Plan). Those community plans were rescinded when the 2019 General Plan was approved. Few residents participate in COG's efforts to identify road improvement priorities. Many communities are planned to grow so slowly that their residents have no need to identify*

*such priorities. However, because Copperopolis is planned to grow fast and large, Copperopolis needs those priorities regularly and timely identified. The policy we include would allow the County to update priority road improvements for Copperopolis along the same timeline as the update of the Regional Transportation Plan by COG. Then these road improvements could be included in proposals for state and federal funding.*

Assist CSAs and CSDs and private individuals to locate funding to maintain safe roadways.

*This policy was added because it is sometimes difficult to for organizations and individuals to secure funding to maintain safe roadways.*

### **C) Housing**

Any new or extended subdivision map that includes four or more single-family residential lots shall be conditioned to address affordable housing in the following ways:

-Single-family homes shall not be used for short-term rentals without approval of a special use permit by the County. In addition, special use permits will only be issued if it is found, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that the conversion of the unit in combination with all other such units in the County is not adversely limiting the housing stock.

-At least 25% of the units will be and remain 1200 square feet or less, be a single story, and meet ADA accessibility standards.

*Source and/or Explanation: This is a new policy to address current housing needs in the Copperopolis area that are not being addressed through implementation of the countywide Housing Element and that may be addressed without state or federal subsidies. The current housing market provides plenty of large high-end homes. The Housing Element addresses seeking state and federal subsidies for housing. These policies are intended to address a couple of gap issues not currently addressed by the market or the Housing Element.*

### **D) Conservation & Open Space**

#### **1) Scenic Value of Viewsheds:**

Slopes and ridgelines will be protected by clustering construction in other parts of the development.

*Source and/or Explanation: This is adapted from Policy 1 in the 2013 Draft Plan. This topic was also addressed on page 23 of the 2001 Vision Study. To avoid confusion, we note that the slopes and ridgelines protected by clustering do not usually become public property, nor is public access to these areas usually allowed.*

#### **2) Biological Resources - Conserve open space, ridgelines, oak woodland, and rangeland:**

The County will complete a Natural Communities Conservation Plan prior to the approval of additional development of special status species habitat.

*Source and/or Explanation: The 2005 Community Plan addressed Biological Resources on pages 31 through 36. However, there have been many subsequent events that triggered this update of the earlier policy. In 2006 US Fish and Wildlife indicated to Calaveras County that project-by-project mitigation for special status species was not going to be sufficient. The County began to prepare a Habitat Conservation Plan for a small group of three endangered species, but never finished the plan. Dozens of development applications were held up as a result. It was also an issue in the 2012 denial of the Sawmill Lakes project in Copperopolis.*

*A Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) is a more robust and long-term solution, as it covers the habitat needed by all the special status species in the area (three dozen county-wide), not just a few that are currently endangered. It also protects the County's economy from the threat of endangered species litigation in federal court by the Center for Biological Diversity.*

### **3) Agricultural Land**

When designing a development on agricultural lands including rangelands, the first mitigation priority should be clustering construction in order to preserve functional agricultural lands with a perpetual conservation easement.

Prior to approving the development of agricultural land in Copperopolis, the County will amend the General Plan to include an open space map that identifies high-priority agricultural lands for long-term conservation within the County in conformity with state law. This is to help focus efforts to mitigate the impacts from development of agricultural lands.

Prior to the approval of the development of agricultural land in Copperopolis, the County will establish an impact mitigation fee program to purchase conservation easements on high priority agricultural lands.

When considering whether or not to approve discretionary permits on agricultural lands within five miles of the edge of Copperopolis, the County will minimize wildfire ignitions by limiting permitted activities, and the County will not concentrate people in hard to evacuate areas.

*Source and/or Explanation: Maintaining agricultural lands is part of Policy 2 in the 2013 Draft Plan. Public safety was among the goals listed on page 5 of the 2005 Draft Plan.*

*To avoid confusion, we note that agricultural lands protected by clustering do not usually become public property, nor is public access to these areas usually allowed.*

*The County neglected to include in the 2019 General Plan a map of priority agricultural land for long term conservation. The County also has not yet completed the 2019 General Plan implementation measure to establish a program to mitigate the conversion of agricultural land to developed uses. That is why these policies are here. They are needed in Copperopolis now.*

*The last provision balances the desire of the County in the 2019 General Plan to facilitate expanded agricultural tourism, with the current need to limit fire ignitions in places that are hard to access by firefighters and hard to evacuate people from. Many small and common agritourism activities are allowed by right under the County Zoning Code. Only the larger or uncommon events trigger the need for discretionary permits. The policy above would ensure that fire safety is addressed when the County considers issuing a permit for these large or uncommon events. There is currently a need to avoid large and fast spreading wildfires adjacent to Copperopolis (like the Tubbs Fire), and a need to avoid having people consumed by fire during traffic-jammed evacuations (like in the Paradise Fire).*

Despite and superseding any contrary language in the Calaveras County Code, no new outdoor commercial cannabis grows will be allowed within the Copperopolis Community Plan boundaries.

*This policy was added to address outdoor cannabis grows. It balances the need for agricultural land for cannabis grows with the desire of the community to avoid such grows in the developed community. The community plan boundary is tight around existing developed areas. There remain many large agricultural parcels outside that boundary where outdoor cannabis grows will still be allowed by the County Code.*

#### **4) Oak Woodlands**

Design developments to avoid felling or disturbing mature oak trees and oak stands.

Provide for the long-term maintenance of conserved oak woodlands.

*Source and/or Explanation: Policy 2 of the 2013 Draft Plan discussed preserving oak woodlands.*

*The County currently has a voluntary oak woodland management plan. After the approval of that management plan, the County was supposed to complete an oak ordinance, but over the last decade the County has not gotten around to it. The 2019 General Plan includes an implementation measure to identify standards for replacing oaks cut down for development. That standard has not yet been adopted.*

*This policy addresses the initial step to avoid cutting the trees down in the first place.*

#### **5) Designing with Nature.**

Design projects to protect highly valued components of natural systems (the oak woodland, the riparian habitat, and the conserved rangeland) by clustering the developed uses (homes and businesses) on land with lower resource values and in a way that interferes least with the functioning natural systems. Link clustered developments with pedestrian paths and riding trails in addition to roads.

*Source and/or Explanation: Policy 2 of the 2013 Draft Plan mentioned creating a harmonious relationship between the developed environment and its natural surroundings. Page 23 of the 2001 Vision Study spoke of preserving natural features. Policy 7 in the 2013 Draft Plan spoke of non-motorized trails and pathways.*

*Rather than designing a destructive project and trying to reduce the harm with some mitigation window dressing after the fact, one designs the project around the oak woodland, the riparian habitat, and the conserved rangeland. In Copperopolis, one could envision a functioning NCCP including conserved riparian areas, oak woodlands and rangelands, with clustered developments linked by pedestrian paths and riding trails (in addition to roads). To avoid confusion, we note that the oak woodlands, rangelands, and habitat conserved by clustering do not usually become public property, nor is public access to these areas usually allowed.*

### **6) Public Access to Lake Tulloch**

Collaborate with Tri-Dam to promote equitable public access to Lake Tulloch for motorized and non-motorized uses.

This policy is added to address the need for additional public access to Lake Tulloch.

### **E) Public Safety**

During or before 2030, the County will establish, staff, and equip a sheriff's sub-station at Lake Tulloch to promptly respond to law enforcement needs on the lake and in the Copperopolis Community. In the meantime, efforts will be made to ensure that deputies are on patrol in the Lake Tulloch area during the peak tourism season, major events, weekends, and holidays.

The County will cooperate with the local fire district and the fire safe council to:

- establish and maintain a functional system of fuel breaks around Copperopolis.
- notify homeowners of opportunities to make home improvements to harden their homes against wildfire.
- identify, maintain, and sign roads essential for evacuation, and inform residents of their evacuation routes.
- establish effective means of providing the community with notice of emergencies (sirens, reverse-911, etc.)
- hold emergency evacuation drills in every even numbered year.

*Source and/or Explanation: Public safety was a goal listed on page 5 of the 2005 Draft Plan. Public facilities and services were addressed on pages 46 through 51 of the 2005 Draft Plan, and recreation was addressed on pages 52 through 54.*

*In 2005 there was a great deal of concern about public safety on Lake Tulloch, especially on crowded summer weekends and holidays. More recently there is a heightened concern about fire safety in the area.*

## **F) General Plan Implementation in Copperopolis**

In Copperopolis, discretionary project approvals will implement the following general plan measures and their underlying goals and policies, in accord with updated County codes and standards, or on a case-by-case basis to the degree that doing so is feasible.

Table 1 – Measures to Implement in New Construction in Copperopolis

LU-2B Mixed Use Zoning  
 LU-2E Innovative Techniques (Clustering)  
 LU-2F Future Specific Plans  
 LU-2G Community Areas  
 LU-3C Cooperation with Special Districts and Agencies  
 LU-4A Design Guidelines  
 LU-4B Light and Glare  
 LU-4C Landscaping (to conserve water)  
 LU-4D Historic Commercial/Mixed Use Zoning  
 LU-4F Signage  
 LU-4G Parking  
 LU-4H Dissimilar Land Uses  
 C-1A Complete Streets  
 C-1B Greenhouse Gases  
 C-1C Transportation Alternative Impact Fees  
 C-1D Circulation Access Plans  
 C-2A Roadway Classification System  
 C-2D RIM and Benefit Basin Fee Update  
 C-3A Ridesharing Programs  
 C-3C Transit Stops  
 C-4A Private Air Strips  
 C-5A Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans  
 RP-1A County Code Amendments (Resource Production Land setbacks)  
 RP-1B Findings for Approval (For development adjacent to RP Lands)  
 RP-1C Public Facilities on Resource Production Land  
 RP-1D Evaluation of Impacts for RP Land Conversions  
 RP-1E Farmland Mapping (Conversion mitigation)  
 RP-1F Mitigation of Impacts of RP Land Conversion  
 RP-2B Right-to-Farm Ordinance  
 RP-2F Agricultural Advisory Committee  
 RP-4A County Code (Mining)  
 RP-4D Mining Advisory Committee  
 RP-4E Abandoned/Historic Mines  
 RP-4F Water Impacts from Mining Operations  
 RP-4H Reclamation

COS-1A Open Space Zoning Ordinance  
COS-3A Post –Construction Stormwater Management Measures  
COS-3B Grading, Drainage and Erosion Control  
COS-3C Stream and Wetland Setback Guidelines  
COS-4B Mitigation Options for Biological Resources  
COS-4C Habitat Conservation Plan for Amphibians  
COS-4D Oak Woodlands  
COS-4E Wildlife Corridors  
COS-4H Impacts to Biological Resources  
COS-4I Biological Impact Evaluation  
COS-4J Landscaping Ordinance  
COS-4K Invasive Species Control  
COS-4L Streams and Wetlands  
COS-4M Upland Habitat  
COS-4N Riparian Corridors  
COS-4O Wildlife Corridor Road Crossing  
COS-4P Bat Roosting  
COS-5C GHG Reduction Plan  
COS-5D Green Waste Collection  
COS-5E Incentives for Alternative Energy  
COS-5H Air Quality Guidelines  
COS-5I Air Quality Buffers  
COS-5J Asbestos Emissions  
COS-5K Odors  
COS-5M Interim GHG Reduction Measures  
COS-5N Wood Burning Appliances  
COS-6A Flexible Development Standards  
COS-6B Hillside and Hilltop Construction Standards  
COS-7A Recreation Facilities  
COS-7B Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities  
COS-7C Access to Public Waterways  
COS-7D Coordinated Recreation and Parks Planning  
COS-7E Local and Regional Trail System  
COS-7I Parks and Recreation Funding  
COS-8F Treatment of Archaeological Resources  
COS-8G Historic Resources (Cultural Resources)  
COS-8H Preservation of Historic Resources  
N-1A County Noise Ordinance  
N-1B Noise Reduction Strategies  
N-1E Acoustic Analysis  
S-1A Local Hazard Mitigation Plan  
S-1B Level of Service (for emergency response)  
S-1C Evacuation Routes, Sites, and Centers  
S-1H Underground Utilities  
S-2B Project-Specific Run-off Standards  
S-2D Dam Failure Inundation Zones

- S-3A Calaveras Code Consistency with State Fire Safety Standards
- S-3B Local Fire Safety Standards
- S-3C Comprehensive Fire Safety Standards
- S-3G Cooperative Fire Prevention and Response Planning Efforts (identify new evac. routes)
- S-3H Fire Protection District Funding
- S-3L Consider effects of Wildfire Protection
- S-3Q Dead and Dying Trees
- S-3R High Occupancy Uses (evacuation plans)
- S-3S Fuel Management New Development
- S-3W Calfire and Fire District Review (of proposed projects)
- S-4B Grading and Erosion Control
- S-4C Geological Hazard Risks
- S-4D Development on slopes 20% of greater
- S-4E Historical Mine Hazards
- S-5B Developing and Remediating Contaminated Sites
- S-5F Land Use Compatibility (with hazardous materials)
- PF-1A Level of Service Thresholds
- PF-1B Maintenance of Levels of Service
- PF-1C Public Facility Impact Fee
- PF-1E Capital Facilities Plan
- PF-1G Cooperate with Public Service Providers (project review)
- PF-2C Public Water and Sewer Availability
- PF-2E Prolonged Project Delay
- PF-2H Facilitate Water Conservation (gray water use)
- PF-3A Alternative Energy
- PF-3B Alternative Fuel Vehicles (charging stations)
- PF-3F Alternative Energy Incentives (solar)
- PF-4A & 4B, Establish, Monitor, and Meet Sheriff Staffing Level of Service
- PF-4C Fund Emergency Services (impact fees)
- PF-6A Safety Design
- CP-1B Community Plan Review (for project consistency)
- CP-1C Community Input (on projects)

*Source and/or Explanation: This new policy balances the County's deferral of adopting countywide development standards with the need of new projects in Copperopolis to build safe and modern neighborhoods.*

*The 2019 General Plan identified a number of key issues related to modern development, but it deferred indefinitely implementing the measures to address the issues countywide. In 2013, the Board of Supervisors indicated that the objective of the General Plan was to accommodate an additional 20,000 people in Copperopolis. Existing approved developments along with the updated land use designation map in the 2019 General Plan take affirmative steps toward accommodating thousands of additional residents in Copperopolis. There may be many other communities in Calaveras County that are planned to grow so slowly that they are in no immediate need of clear guidance for development of safe and modern neighborhoods. However, because Copperopolis is*

*planned for massive growth, that growth must be guided to serve a safe and modern community.*

*This policy makes sure that these development issues are addressed when projects are proposed in Copperopolis either by compliance with the County's updated standards, or on a case-by-case basis when such standards have not yet been adopted. This policy also helps to protect the County and project applicants from legal challenges that proposed projects are not consistent with the 2019 General Plan.*