

Thomas P. Infusino  
P.O. Box 792  
Pine Grove, CA 95665  
(209) 295-8866  
tomi@volcano.net

6/27/13

Brenda Gillarde, General Plan Coordinator  
Calaveras County Planning Department  
San Andreas, CA

(transmitted by email,  
please confirm receipt)

**RE: Population Projections Identified at the Board of Supervisors meeting of May14, 2013.**

Dear Ms. Gillarde:

My name is Tom Infusino, and I am writing on behalf of the Calaveras Planning Coalition. The Coalition would like to put your mind at ease regarding the growth projections stated by the Planning Department during the Board of Supervisors workshop on May 14, 2013. We accept the estimated growth of 30,000 people as the County's reasonable estimate of the high-end scenario for identifying potential general plan update impacts through 2035. While economic predictions and development surges are impossible to predict, we understand why the County believes it is reasonable to plan for such a high-end growth increase. We would also like you to be aware of what we perceive as the positive implications of those projections. In addition, we want you to be aware of what we perceive as the risks associated with those projections. Finally, we suggest ways to manage those risks.

Below we begin by setting the background for the discussion. We continue by identifying the ways that a general plan update can have impacts. We then note the roles that different development numbers play in environmental impact reports. We proceed by looking at the pros and cons of the growth estimate chosen by the County. In that analysis we note our hopes and expectations for avoiding the adverse risks of the growth estimates.

We want you to know that the Board's growth projections are not an easy pill for us to swallow. Given that the California Department of Finance figures that the County's population has been on a steady decline for the last five years, is currently at its lowest level since 2005, and is not likely to add more than 10,240 people by 2035, we find the County's growth projections more

than a bit puzzling. (See California Department of Finance, *County Population Estimates and Components of Change by Year – July 1, 2000 – 2010*; and *State and County Population Projections – Race/Ethnicity and 5-Year Age Groups 2010-2060*.) Given current fiscal constraints, we do not believe that it is likely that this rate of growth can be sustained while maintaining existing public service levels. Similarly, we do not believe that it is likely that the concentration of growth in Copperopolis will be cost-effective or beneficial. We can think of plenty of additional ways to trash these estimates. It would be much easier for us to blow a gasket over them.

However, that is not what we have done. Instead, in the spirit of cooperation, we have made a sincere attempt to find a way to live with these projections, and to continue to support the County's General Plan Update. We look forward to your taking our comments into consideration and working out the best possible plan for the County.

## **I. Background**

On May 14, 2013, Planning Department staff brought a new general plan update schedule to the Board of Supervisors for their direction. During that workshop, the Board of Supervisors gave direction to the Planning Department regarding growth estimates for use in the General Plan Update and EIR. The direction was that Copperopolis is estimated to grow by 20,000 people and that the rest of the County is estimated to grow by 10,000 people between 2014 and 2035. The Planning Department said that any concerns regarding those numbers needed to be conveyed soon, so as not to delay delivery or increase the cost of the General Plan Update.

This is usually the sort of thing that would be discussed in the scoping comments scheduled for September and October of this year. Thus, the County should be prepared to respond to those comments from responsible and trustee agencies, should they question the County's growth projections. However, to alleviate your concerns regarding delays and cost overruns, we at the CPC are providing our input on your growth projections now.

## **II) How does a General Plan Update affect impacts on the environment?**

### **A) A General Plan Update may have limited effects on the impacts of prior approved development.**

Generally speaking, the impacts of new development are reduced by the mitigation measures adopted and the conditions of approval put in place when a subdivision is approved. Thus, new policies in a new general plan will usually have little applicability to prior approved subdivisions. However, there are a few instances in which a new general plan may have some limited chance to reduce the impacts of some new construction on previously approved lots.

Sometimes, prior development approvals specifically include open-ended conditions of approval that allow the conditions to change over time. In these instances, a new general plan can have an

effect on the prior approved subdivision. For example, if the condition of approval said, “Pay all impact fees in place at the time of building permit application,” then the party who goes to build the house must pay any new or increased impact mitigation fees created under the new general plan in order to get their building permit.

Sometimes, conditions of approval require compliance with zoning and building codes in place in the future. For example, a condition of approval might say said, “Follow the standards in the zoning code at the time of building permit application.” If at the time of building permit application, pursuant to the general plan update, minimum streamside setbacks were in the zoning ordinance, then they would apply to the previously approved yet un-built project.

**B) A General Plan Update may have a huge effect on the impacts of subsequently approved subdivisions.**

A general plan can locate new development in the most sensitive places resulting in the most egregious impacts. For example, a general plan update could provide for the most intense new development in the winter range of the Railroad Flat deer herd. On the other hand, a general plan may locate the most intense development in the location where it does the least harm to the environment. Also, all of the mandatory provisions of the new general plan that reduce impacts will apply to all new development approved under the plan. Thus, some of the most profound effects of the general plan update will be a result of subsequently approved development.

From the above two analyses we can conclude two things. First, that the most profound effects of a general plan come from the development approved after the plan is approved. Second, that the full force of those impacts is not felt until that development is constructed. Thus, from an impact perspective, what matters is not only the building that happens during the plan horizon (through 2035), but also the building that happens from all the development approved under the plan.

**C) A General Plan Update should identify necessary infrastructure that will have its own impacts.**

The Circulation Element of the General Plan must identify the necessary infrastructure to serve development under the plan. It may also provide for infrastructure expansions beyond those needed through the plan horizon of 2035. This includes road expansions, pipeline expansions, pipeline extensions, and power-line extensions. There are two types of impacts associated with these infrastructure expansions.

**1) Direct impacts of additional infrastructure.**

Highway projects, bridges, solid waste dumps, pipelines, dams, and government buildings will have direct impacts of their own.

**2) Indirect (secondary and growth inducing) impacts of additional infrastructure.**

The secondary impacts of infrastructure are the impacts of the development that it serves. If the infrastructure facilitated new development in an area not previously slated for development, then the infrastructure is said to have growth inducing impacts.

Thus, in addition to slightly affecting prior approved development, and substantially altering the environment with subsequently approved development, a general plan update can have environmental impacts associated with the infrastructure it plans.

### **III) What are the relevant growth numbers and how do they influence impacts.**

#### **A) Department of Finance Population Growth Estimates.**

The DOF estimates statewide growth based upon demographic data trends and distributes it across the counties and the cities. These estimates have no connection to the availability of services to accommodate the estimated level of population growth. The estimates are updated annually. The most accurate numbers come out right after a census. The projections are most accurate for the 5 – 15 year timeframe. They are less accurate for the 20-40 year timeframes.

Thus, these numbers are helpful for planning short-term regional housing needs, community service needs, school needs, and some near term capital improvement plans. These estimates are very useful for making short-term strategies to meet the needs of the next small increment of growth. This is a type of planning that the County and its service providers need to start doing right after the General Plan Update is complete.

In an EIR for a General Plan, these DOF numbers are often used to try to estimate impacts at different points in time during the general plan implementation (e.g. 2025, 2035.)

For example, based upon the DOF estimates made earlier in the general plan update process, the County did estimate a 2035 population of 68,294. That would be 23,684 additional people between 2005 and 2035. (Calaveras County, Alternatives Report, February 2010, pp. 7 to 8.) Using various multipliers, one can use that population growth estimate to generate countywide impact estimates like potable water demand, needed sewage treatment capacity, vehicle trips generated and road sizes needed, etc.

Also, the DOF estimates can be used to identify the relative needs of different sectors of the growing population. For example, from 2013 to 2035, the DOF estimates only a 3.3% increase in school aged children (from 7505 to 7751) but a 60% increase in people 65 years of age or older (from 10,655 to 17,121). In fact, people 65 years of age or older will account for 63% of all newcomers. (See DOF, *State and County Population Projections – Race/Ethnicity and 5-Year Age Groups 2010 – 2060.*) These estimates can help the EIR identify the need for additional classrooms, affordable housing, assisted living facilities, hospital beds, transportation options, and other services critical to the human environment.

## **B) The estimated number of projects likely to be approved.**

Much more difficult to estimate are the number of units and square feet of development projects likely to be approved under the general plan. As noted above, the General Plan Update will have its most profound effects through these subsequently approved projects. However, historically in Calaveras County, there is no close correlation between the number of units approved for development and the number of building permits demanded. Over the decade prior to the general plan update, the Board of Supervisors consistently approved far more units than were being built. As a result, there is a huge inventory of undeveloped but approved residential and commercial projects. If this trend were to continue, the General Plan Update would have profound impacts long after 2035.

## **C) Buildout of the General Plan**

A general plan EIR must look at cumulative impacts. Those are the result of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development. The safest way to evaluate this is to look at the full buildout of the general plan, in the regional context with other communities. Thus, the safest approach for the County is to complete an evaluation of the cumulative impacts of the General Plan Update at full buildout, in the regional context with other communities, including the City of Angels. This is especially critical when looking at regional impacts like traffic, water supply, air quality, and wildlife habitat. Wise jurisdictions have taken this approach. (See, County of El Dorado, General Plan EIR, 2004; City of San Diego, General Plan PEIR, 2007; Sutter County.)

By far the strongest language used in CEQA cases is that requiring the analysis of cumulative impacts. The courts have repeatedly emphasized that the importance of a CEQA EIR is that it allows the government to look beyond the single project and the near term, and to assess the long-term implications of the government's action. "Assessment of a project's cumulative impact on the environment is a critical aspect of the EIR. [3]" "One of the most important environmental lessons evident from past experience is that environmental damage often occurs incrementally from a variety of small sources. These sources appear insignificant, assuming threatening dimensions only when considered in light of the other sources with which they interact." (*Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 720 [270 Cal.Rptr. 650], quoting Selmi, *The Judicial Development of the California Environmental Quality Act* (1984) 18 U.C. Davis L.Rev. 197, 244, fn. omitted.)" (*Los Angeles Unified School Dist. v. City of Los Angeles* (1997) 58 Cal.App.4th 1019, 1025 – 1026.) "To ignore the prospective cumulative harm under such circumstances could be to risk ecological disaster." (*Whitman v. Board of Supervisors* (2d Dist 1979) 88 Cal.App.3d 397, 408 [151 Cal.Rptr. 866, quoting *Natural Resources Defense Council v. Callaway* (2d. Cir. 1975) 524 F.3d 79, 88.)

Nowhere is this aspect of an EIR more critical than in a long-term plan. If the effects of the long-term plan are not addressed in the plan's EIR, where will they be addressed? "Without a mechanism for addressing the cumulative effects of individual projects, there could never be any awareness of or control over the speed and manner of downtown development. Without such control, piecemeal development would inevitably cause havoc in virtually every aspect of the urban environment."

*San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth v. City and County of San Francisco* (1st Dist. 1984) 151 Cal.App.3d 61, 76-77 [198 Cal.Rptr. 634].) It is only by looking at the long-term effects of buildout that the needs for landscape-level mitigation (e.g. habitat conservation plan, groundwater management, road right-of -ways) and capacity mitigation (e.g. water conservation, energy conservation, walkable communities) become imperative.

Bottom line, to avoid taking a hard look at the impacts of full buildout in a general plan EIR is to court disaster.

That being said, the county is not required simply to blindly multiply the number of acres in each land use designation, by the maximum number of units allowed, and total the sums. There are legitimate ways to arrive at a more realistic “full buildout.” **The key is to make sure that any method you use to calculate “full buildout” is documented for the record, is based upon substantial evidence in the record, and is supported by reasonable inferences based upon that evidence. Finally, when in doubt, don’t underestimate the impacts.**

For example, one could adjust the buildout of each land use designation by multiplying the number of acres by an estimated density somewhere between the minimum and the maximum of the range. That estimated density could be developed from the average in the applications currently in process, with the argument that the best estimate of future densities is in recent project applications. Alternatively, the estimate could be derived from the average of density in that land use designation on the already built landscape, with the argument that the best indicator of future density is past developed density. Either way, you have an empirical fact as your basis and a reasonable inference to support your choice.

Other methods can also be used to get to a more accurate buildout estimate. For example, if land is precluded from development by a conservation easement in perpetuity, then you need not assume it will buildout. If large areas of government land are in long-term low intensity uses (like effluent spray fields) you need not assume they are going to buildout at higher intensities. Again, in each instance you are basing your position on a fact in the record, and making reasonable inferences based upon that fact.

We encourage the County to adopt General Plan policies that will limit the cumulative impacts of buildout. For example, if the General Plan Update included a policy that would mitigate all acres of lands taken out of open space through the acquisition of conservation easements at a ratio of 1 to 1 or 2 to 1, that would reduce open space conversion at buildout, and reduce the impacts of buildout. Similarly, target ratios of residential to commercial development in mixed use areas may help balance development of these areas and thereby mitigate impacts.

Remember when in doubt; do not underestimate the cumulative impacts of buildout. "It is vitally important that an EIR avoid minimizing the cumulative impacts. Rather it must reflect a conscientious effort to provide public agencies and the general public with adequate and relevant detailed information about them." [Citation.] A cumulative impact analysis which understates information concerning the

severity and significance of cumulative impacts impedes meaningful public discussion and skews the decisionmaker's perspective concerning the environmental consequences of a project, the necessity for mitigation measures, and the appropriateness of project approval. [Citation.] An inadequate cumulative impact analysis does not demonstrate to an apprehensive citizenry that the governmental decisionmaker has in fact fully analyzed and considered the environmental consequences of its action." *Citizens to Preserve Ojai v. County of Ventura* (2d Dist. 1985) 176 Cal.App.3d 421, 431 [222 Cal.Rptr. 247], quoting *San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth v. City and County of San Francisco* (1st Dist. 1984) 151 Cal.App.3d 61, 79 [198 Cal.Rptr. 634].) For example, if the buildout population is going to need 5 new schools, but there are no sites for them on the land use map, do not assume that there will be no new schools and that their impacts will not happen.

#### **IV) Pros and Cons of the County's 10,000 + 20,000 Approach**

##### **A) Pros**

###### **1) The number is defensible.**

The number reflects a rational decision based upon two very different growth projections from the Department of Finance, as informed by existing conditions in the county. As noted above, based upon 2007 DOF estimates, the Alternatives Report estimated a 2035 population of 68,294. That report also considered Alternative C, that has an estimated 2035 population of 80,136. The Planning Department is now estimating a population of about 75,000 in 2035. While more recent projections from DOF estimate only an additional 10,240 people by 2035, given the existing level of development project approvals, it makes sense for the County to consider the impacts of this very foreseeable level of development as a high-end potential number.

The County has a large inventory of approved development projects that have various degrees of potential to build out. Some may do so before 2035, and some may do so after 2035, and some may never be built at all. The County has approved developments in the Copperopolis area nearly sufficient to accommodate an additional 20,000 residents. Although anything related to water rights is uncertain, there is potential for the County in concert with CCWD to secure the water rights to serve that number of new residents. There are sufficient parcels in the greater Valley Springs area to accommodate nearly 5,000 people. Other communities in Calaveras County have some infrastructure capacity to grow as well. Because the County and local service providers are essentially playing catch-up to develop the infrastructure and the conservation efforts necessary to accommodate the level of approved development, it makes sense for the General Plan Update and its EIR to take this level of development under consideration. Thus, it is reasonable to select a growth projection greater than 10,000 people and less than 35,000 people. As noted below, the degree of reasonableness of this projection depends upon the County making other consistent general plan update choices.

## **2) The debate is not focused on the impacts and needs of buildout.**

Too often in general plan updates people freak out when they look at the full buildout scenario. This is especially true in counties like Calaveras, where there is a huge disparity between the 20-year growth projection and the buildout population. That buildout projection becomes the focus of the general plan debate. Better foci for the debate include how to improve the quality of the next 500 units of the built environment, how to maintain and the long-term integrity of the natural environment, and how to ensure that all residents of Calaveras County will share in its future prosperity. By choosing a reasonable growth projection number, the County is not pushing the focus of the debate onto the buildout projection.

## **3) It gives us a reasonable number to translate into achievable tasks for the County and other services providers of water, wastewater treatment, roads, schools, emergency services, etc.**

Following completion of the General Plan Update, service providers will be faced with the task of translating general plan population projections into short and long-term capital improvement plans. They will be faced with trying to equitably pass the costs of capital replacement onto existing residents and capital expansion onto new development. The additional countywide population growth projection of 10,000 outside of Copperopolis by 2035 provides a reasonable number for service providers outside of Copperopolis to prepare to serve. The population growth projection of 20,000 in Copperopolis by 2035 establishes a very ambitious target for service providers that is consistent with interests of those with approved projects and some with proposed development. At the same time, the projected growth suggests capital improvements incremental enough to be feasibly funded within their useful lives.

## **4) It suggests a rationale for mitigating impacts in Copperopolis different than in the rest of the County.**

Separating the growth projections for Copperopolis and the rest of the County suggests that mitigation impact fees, connection charges, and other means of financing infrastructure in Copperopolis should be separated for the similar mechanisms used for the rest of the County. This will ensure that fees set aside for Copperopolis are spent in Copperopolis. It will also ensure that the costs associated with Copperopolis development do not financially burden other communities in the County.

This approach has been used elsewhere. When development in El Dorado County was focused in El Dorado Hills, that region had a separate traffic impact mitigation fee. That fee was needed to help finance very expensive freeway overpass expansion, not yet needed in other parts of the county. In later years, when additional freeway overpasses were needed throughout the County, the traffic impact mitigation fees were merged.



**5) It opens the door for an economic development opportunities analysis (infill analysis) for the existing communities outside of Copperopolis.**

The modest growth numbers outside of Copperopolis shifts focus in those communities onto infill of existing lots within those communities, and within the near-term capability of service providers. **We strongly encourage the Planning Department to take the General Plan Update as an opportunity to identify the available capacity for economic development in existing communities given their systems for potable water delivery, wastewater treatment, transportation, education, and environmental impact mitigation.** In other words, turn the Municipal Service Reviews and the Environmental Impact Reports on their head. Instead of using those reports to identify capacity and service shortages, use them to identify the low-cost, near-term, capacity for development in communities throughout the County. Make this information available to help investors to direct economic development where, and in the amount, that the County can provide for it, at the lowest costs and with the lowest impacts. Provide this information to service providers to help them prioritize their capital improvement projects.

**B) Cons**

**1) It overestimates near-term needs.**

We recognize that the growth projection overestimates near-term needs. We do not expect the growth to happen in equal increments over the life of the plan. It may start out very slowly. We will not be surprised if the growth projection is reached long after 2035.

The County's growth projections will look more reasonable if the General Plan Update directs the County, and encourages service providers, to plan for slower growth at first. This would begin by **proposing short-term objectives that look at meeting the immediate needs of the next 1,100 people to come to Calaveras County. The first five-year capital improvement plans would be focused on meeting this immediate need. The separate mid-term and long-term objectives would look to providing for larger increments of growth in subsequent phases.**

**2) Development approvals in Copperopolis may continue to exceed the capacity of the natural environment and the built infrastructure.**

As became painfully obvious during the analysis of the Sawmill project, past development projects in Copperopolis have been approved despite an insufficient water supply to serve all that development, despite the lack of a current benefit basin plan to fund the necessary road infrastructure, and despite the lack of any habitat conservation plan to address red-legged frog and tiger salamander. There are other local concerns regarding school and park capacity that have not been addressed in the draft Community Plan, as well as a significant hurdle posed by the County having no wildlife corridor or open space plan for the Copperopolis basin. The CPC

is very concerned that, by focusing two thirds of the projected future growth in Copperopolis, the Board of Supervisors may be waving the green flag to more development approvals, despite the ongoing failure to provide for needed infrastructure and habitat conservation. **The General Plan Update can and should indicate that additional entitlements in the Copperopolis area will come only after the necessary water is secured, only after adequate roads are planned and funded, and only after habitat conservation plans are complete, senior citizen services are provided for, schools are approved, parks are dedicated, and library services are sufficient to meet the needs of the already approved development.** Let's demonstrate that we can serve the development that has already been approved before we commit to providing the infrastructure for more.

### **3) New developments under the 20,000-person cap in Copperopolis might try to tier down from the General Plan Update EIR to avoid impact analysis.**

From the beginning of the General Plan Update process, a major focus of the CPC has been to encourage the County to develop county-wide mitigation programs that project applicants can participate in to mitigate their impacts. This would provide for better impact mitigation and faster processing of development projects.

However, the County has yet to endorse this approach. In fact, most recently, the County's focus has been to complete a "low-cost" environmental review, and to produce a General Plan Update that avoids mandatory language that commits the County to specific actions. It appears that the County intends to perpetuate the uncertain and time consuming process of deferring mitigation to project-level impact analyses and custom mitigation measures for each proposed project. While we have not given up trying to convince the County to develop county-wide mitigation programs, if the County insists on continuing to defer mitigation to project-level reviews, then that needs to be made clear in the program EIR for the General Plan Update.

We are trying to avoid the CEQA "shell game." We don't want proposed development projects in Copperopolis to try to use the cursory impact analyses in the General Plan Update program-EIR as a substitute for project-level analyses. The detailed impact analysis and mitigation has to happen at the program level or the project level. It cannot be avoided at both levels.

When preparing a program EIR, a lead agency can and should identify which impacts must be subsequently re-evaluated at the project level. This has two very important results. First, it puts all project developers and EIR contractors on notice that the County will not accept a project-level EIR that does little more than refer to the General Plan Update for impact analysis and mitigation. **Second, by assuring folks concerned with general plan impacts that the impacts will be evaluated again and mitigated at the project-level, those concerned will not be forced to litigate those issues at the General Plan level.**

As you may recall, EBMUD's program EIR on its 2040 Water Supply Management Plan repeatedly identified impacts of local concern as insignificant or fully mitigated at the program

level. Thus, these impacts would not be reviewed and further mitigated at the project level. Any subsequent project-level challenge based on those issues would be untimely. Thus, folks concerned about those impacts had no choice but to challenge EBMUD's program EIR.

The County can and should avoid the above scenario with its General Plan Update program EIR. The County should make it clear that subsequent developments will complete a project-level environmental review to evaluate project level impacts, and to re-evaluate mitigation measures.

**4) Future infrastructure investment could be over-directed to Copperopolis.**

Just because two thirds of the new development is going to Copperopolis does not mean that two thirds of all capital projects and expenditures should be in Copperopolis. Other existing communities have capital replacement needs to address public health and safety concerns. Dangerous roads need to be straightened. Failing wastewater treatment systems need to be upgraded. Leaking water lines need to be replaced. The General Plan Update should acknowledge these needs, and include policies to promote the equitable distribution of capital projects, state funding, and federal funding, throughout the geographic regions of the County.

**5) The County may argue that the General Plan Update will have no impact because all projected development through 2035 may occur on existing parcels.**

Without a General Plan provision prohibiting all new development approvals through 2035, there is no enforceable mechanism to ensure that no new development approvals will occur under the General Plan Update, and that no new impacts will result. Even if there were such a policy, that policy itself would have environmental impacts, because it would direct future growth to areas and in densities that have significant impacts. Thus, there is no way to lawfully avoid evaluating the impacts of growth under the General Plan Update.

**6) The County may not look at the GPU impacts cumulatively at buildout.**

As noted in Section III, C, above, it is critical that the General Plan Update EIR evaluate the cumulative impacts of the General Plan at buildout.

**V. Conclusions**

In summary, in an effort to support the completion of the general plan update in a spirit of cooperation, we at the CPC can accept the Board of Supervisors' growth projection direction of May 14, 2013. However, our acceptance of the growth projection is based upon the County's acceptance of the implications of that growth projection. Those implications include:

1) That the General Plan Update and its EIR will provide data to inform decisionmakers and the public about how to improve the quality of the next 500 units of the built environment, how to maintain and the long-term integrity of the natural environment, and how to ensure that all residents of Calaveras County will share in its future prosperity. Remember that the purposes of

CEQA include to “foster meaningful public participation and informed decisionmaking” and to “afford the fullest possible protection to the environment.” (CEQA Guidelines, sec. 15126, subd. f; *Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency* (2002) 103 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 98, 110; citing *Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 390.)

2) Following completion of the General Plan Update, the County will continue to help service providers to translate general plan projections into short and long-term capital improvement plans. The General Plan Update will direct the County, and encourage service providers, to plan for slower growth in the first phase of plan implementation. The first five-year capital improvement plans would be focused on meeting immediate needs. The separate mid-term and long-term objectives would look to providing for larger increments of growth in subsequent phases. This approach will make the growth numbers appear less exaggerated and more rational.

3) That County impact mitigation fees, and other means of financing infrastructure, in and for Copperopolis will be separated from the similar mechanisms used for the rest of the County, so that the costs of that growth are born by those who cause them. The County will encourage other service providers to do the same. The market can efficiently allocate resources only if the goods reflect the entire costs of production, and the consumers pay the price that reflects those costs.

4) That the General Plan Update will indicate that additional entitlements in the Copperopolis area will come only after the necessary water is secured, only after adequate roads are planned and funded, and only after habitat conservation plans are complete, senior citizen services are provided for, schools are approved, parks are dedicated, and library services are sufficient to meet the needs of the already approved development.

5) That the Planning Department will embrace the General Plan Update as an opportunity to identify the available capacity for economic development in existing communities.

6) The County General Plan Update EIR will make it clear that subsequent developments will require a project-level environmental review to evaluate project level impacts, and to consider any additional mitigation measures.

7) The General Plan Update will include policies to promote the equitable distribution of capital projects, state funding, and federal funding, throughout the geographic regions of the County.

8) The General Plan Update EIR will fairly and properly evaluate the impacts of development under the General Plan Update, and not employ legally questionable schemes to attempt to avoid these analyses. This includes the fair and proper analysis of cumulative impacts at general plan buildout.

After you have had an opportunity review of this letter and discuss it with your general plan team, we would appreciate meeting with you to discuss the eight items noted above, and to answer any of your questions. We do not wish to let unspoken differences fester. We would

prefer to use the General Plan Update time to address potential conflicts and to try to work out our differences forthrightly

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Thomas P. Infusino".

Thomas P. Infusino, Facilitator

Calaveras Planning Coalition

P.S. Please retain a copy of this document and enclosures for the administrative record.

cc. Rebecca Willis

Attached: California Department of Finance, *County Population Estimates and Components of Change by Year – July 1, 2000 – 2010*; and *State and County Population Projections – Race/Ethnicity and 5-Year Age Groups 2010-2060*.