

# Chapter 3 Errata

This chapter shows all revisions to the December 2003 draft joint document that have been made to respond to the comments contained in Chapter 2 and to make minor corrections. Text in standard print is original draft joint document text, underlined text is added text, and text that is struck out is deleted text.

## Summary

Revise language on page S-2, as follows:

- the Phase 2 improvements are added by the Board of Supervisors action to the list of MC&FP-funded improvements; and
- the Phase 2 improvements are added to a future MTP and ~~MTIP if federal funds are to be used to build these improvements...~~

Revise the second row of the fifth page of Table S.4-1 (“CEQA Impacts and Mitigation Measures Associated with the SPDI [Preferred Alternative]”), as follows:

CEQA Impacts	CEQA Mitigation Measures	CEQA Level of Significance before Mitigation	CEQA Level of Significance after Mitigation
BR5: Removal of and disturbance to up to 8–12 hectares (20–30 acres) of blue oak woodland and an undetermined number of native trees <u>(SU in the short term and S/LTS in the long term)</u>	BR3c: Install construction barrier fencing around the construction area to protect sensitive biological resources that will be avoided  BR5a: Minimize and compensate for impacts on blue oak woodlands and individual native oak trees by replanting oaks	S	<del>LTS</del> <u>SU in the short term and S/LTS in the long term</u>

Notes: Significance conclusion before mitigation/significance conclusion after mitigation. CEQA significance conclusions:

LTS = less than significant.

S = significant.

SU = significant and unavoidable.

## Chapter 1. Project Objectives/Purpose and Need and Description of the Proposed Project/Action

Revise language on page 1-6, as follows:

- the Phase 2 improvements are added by the Board of Supervisors action to the list of MC&FP-funded improvements; and
- the Phase 2 improvements are added to a future MTP and ~~MTIP if federal funds are to be used to build these improvements...~~

Revise language on page 1-13, as follows:

- the Phase 2 improvements are added by the Board of Supervisors action to the list of MC&FP-funded improvements; and
- the Phase 3 improvements are added to a future MTP and MTIP ~~if federal funds are to be used to build these improvements...~~

## Chapter 3. Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation—NEPA Evaluation

### Section 3.1 Land Use, Planning, and Growth

Replace the text beginning on page 3-4 and ending on page 3-9 (shown as deleted text below) with the following text (shown as underlined text):

The County’s General Plan EIR (May 2003) analyzes ten alternatives. Four alternatives are evaluated in equal weight. Six alternatives are evaluated comparatively (the numbering of these alternatives is not sequential since Alternatives 6 and 8 were determined to be legally infeasible). These alternatives are described below:

- **Equal-Weight Alternative #1: No Project (Writ Constrained):** The No Project (Writ Constrained) Alternative would allow development to proceed under the existing 1996 General Plan (see description of the 1996 General Plan Alternative below), but subject to constraints imposed by the Writ. This alternative reflects the conditions under which the County has been operating for the 4 years since the Writ was issued on July 19, 1999. This alternative looks at the growth that is reasonably foreseeable to occur if the County does not adopt a General Plan and the Writ remains in effect indefinitely.
- **Equal-Weight Alternative #2: Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus”:** The Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative is designed primarily to limit development to a level that can be reasonably accommodated on a defined roadway system that allows for only limited roadway expansion. This alternative holds U.S. 50 to a maximum of six through lanes between the Sacramento County line on the west and Ponderosa Road on the east.

This alternative assumes development of all lands for which there are approved development agreements and tentative subdivision maps. All other residential lands are allowed to be developed with up to four lots per existing parcel where permitted by the base land use designation. For 2025 projections, nonresidential property is assumed to be developed based on market forces, proportional to housing growth. Land use forecasts and traffic analyses have been prepared for both the 2025 and buildout scenarios. An LOS policy that generally sets LOS D for rural areas and LOS E for Community Regions is used. As indicated, U.S. 50 is set at six lanes. The land use map and policy set

for this alternative are described further below. By 2025, 25,839 new units and 34,455 new jobs are projected. At buildout, 41,652 new dwelling units (15,813 units constructed after 2025) and 86,688 new jobs (52,233 new jobs after 2025) could be accommodated.

- **Equal-Weight Alternative #3: Environmentally Constrained:** This alternative is designed to limit or prevent adverse environmental effects associated with future development throughout the county. This alternative considers constraints associated with land use, topographic limitations, and important resources.

Land use designations were based on a number of factors relating to existing development patterns, important natural resources, infrastructure, and service availability and topography. It was developed by identifying the built environment around existing communities, and establishing Community Region and Rural Center boundaries that encouraged infill within those areas. The rest of the county was reviewed for constraints to development, taking into consideration the existing rural development patterns. Agricultural and biological resource data were reviewed, including the locations of rare and endangered plant and animal habitat, choice agricultural soils, the locations of river canyons and other topographic constraints, and the extent of contiguous native vegetation. Additional considerations included high fire hazard areas, access and other infrastructure availability, areas currently managed for agricultural and timber production, opportunities for separation of communities, and the proximity to larger holdings of state/federal lands.

This alternative assumes development of all lands for which there are development agreements and tentative subdivision maps. All other lands (both residential and nonresidential) have been reevaluated and some have been redesignated based on the environmental constraints. Community Regions and Rural Centers have been reduced in terms of both size and density. Rural Centers have also been reduced in terms of total number of units. A level of service (LOS) policy that sets LOS D for rural areas and LOS E for Community Regions is used. The land use map and policy set for this alternative are described further below. By 2025, 32,290 new dwelling units and 42,711 new jobs are projected. At buildout, 55,078 new units (22,788 after 2025) and 67,709 new jobs (24,998 after 2025) could be accommodated.

- **Equal-Weight Alternative #4: 1996 General Plan:** This alternative looks at growth under the 1996 General Plan as follows:
  - The General Plan policies include all amendments adopted before the Writ was issued.
  - The original horizon year of 2015 is extended 10 years into the future (to 2025) to allow for consistent environmental analysis.
  - The originally adopted 1996 Land Use exhibit is modified to reflect adopted land use amendments since that time, plus other corrections

identified by the Planning Commission and Board in the intervening period since adoption.

- The originally adopted Circulation exhibit includes minor modifications to planned roadways to reflect the change in horizon year.
- The Housing Element from the 1996 General Plan is replaced with the 2003 draft (as it is for all of the equal-weight alternatives) because under separate state statutes, the County’s Housing Element must be updated before the end of the year, whether or not a General Plan is adopted.

Remaining capacity through 2025 under this alternative is 17,926 dwelling units. This alternative, generally, allows more growth in more areas, resulting in less of a distinction between rural and developed areas. In general, this alternative has fewer protections for sensitive resources, less regulation for impact avoidance and design control, and does not impose a precise requirement for concurrency between infrastructure/services and development to be served except with respect to roadway infrastructure. Because subdivisions are allowed under this alternative, land use patterns at 2025 may be somewhat less scattered than under the No Project or Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative, but the total amount of development countywide would be greater than under the No Project Alternative or any of the other alternatives.

Like the other equal-weight alternatives, this alternative assumes development of all lands for which there are approved development agreements and tentative subdivision maps. The LOS policies from the 1996 General Plan as amended by Measure Y are used. U.S. 50 is planned to be a minimum of eight lanes per the 1996 Circulation Elemental, though additional lanes would be required to mitigate impacts on LOS under the buildout scenario. By 2025, 32,491 new dwelling units and 42,196 new jobs are projected. At buildout, 78,692 new units (46,201 after 2025) and 86,688 new jobs (44,492 after 2025) could be accommodated.

- **Alternative #5: 2001 Project Description:** The 2001 Project Description alternative is so-named because initially, at the time the General Plan EIR NOP was released (August 6, 2001), it was the County’s preferred alternative. It was thought to represent a more moderate growth scenario than that presented by the 1996 General Plan. It is based in large part on the prior 1994 General Plan alternative modified to reflect: (1) Measure Y, projects approved in the County between the 1996 General Plan adoption and the 1999 Writ; and (2) direction from the Board of Supervisors.
- **Alternative #7: Roadway Constrained Eight-Lane:** This alternative would allow the maximum amount of growth that could be accommodated within the planned roadway system assuming U.S. 50 is built to eight lanes and assuming a LOS policy that generally sets LOS D for rural areas and LOS E for community centers. This would allow somewhat more congestion on roadways than the 1996 General Plan/No Project LOS policies. All lands covered by an approved development agreements or tentative subdivision

maps are assumed to develop as planned. All other residential parcels are assumed to develop with up to one unit. As a part of this alternative, no additional lot splits or new subdivisions are allowed, and nonresidential property is assumed to develop based on market forces, proportional to housing growth (identical to the No Project Alternative at 2025). A preliminary traffic analysis was conducted for the 2025 scenario.

- **Alternative #9: Modified El Dorado Hills Development South Of U.S. 50:**

The focus of this alternative is to examine planned land uses in the El Dorado Hills market area, south of U.S. 50, and to identify land use modifications that could result in a significant reduction in trip generation and improvement in traffic congestion in that area. This alternative assumes significant modifications of planned land uses including the El Dorado Hills Business Park, the adjoining specific plan areas (Valley View and Carson Creek), and other properties within the market area south of U.S. 50, to the extent that this may be legally possible. The business park is not subject to any vesting mechanisms, such as a development agreement, but may be affected by bonds sold for financing. The Carson Creek development is vested by an approved development agreement. The Valley View development is vested by an approved development agreement, but is subject to a traffic mitigation measure linking development capacity with the availability of adequate roadway infrastructure. The feasibility of this alternative would depend, among other things, on the willingness of the development agreement holder(s) to negotiate changes to the plans vested by the agreements.

Assuming the County's ability to make such changes, the overall goal of this alternative is to have higher density and intensity of land use in a smaller area. This alternative assumes no change in the total projected number of jobs and dwelling units, but rather a reorganization of land uses to create a better mix that encourages walking and bicycle trips. Class 1 bicycle paths with grade-separated crossings and a shuttle system would be important components. Residential and nonresidential land uses would be balanced to match housing type with salaries. A high level of connectivity would be required.

- **Alternative #10: New White Rock Road Connection:** This alternative assumes a new connection to White Rock Road in the area south of U.S. 50 and east of Latrobe Road. There are several connections the road could make: Suncast Lane, Investment Boulevard, Sandstone Drive, or Golden Foothill Parkway to White Rock Road; Investment Boulevard to Payen Road; or the extension of Payen Road to connect to Latrobe Road south of the El Dorado Hills Business Park. All of these potential connections would need to include a route to and interchange with U.S. 50 in Sacramento County. The intent is to create a new access-restricted east/west roadway for an additional outlet for traffic from the business area south of U.S. 50 to the freeway. The feasibility of this alternative is not known. It would rely on approvals from the City of Folsom and/or Sacramento County. These agencies have been reluctant in the past to approve this type of roadway connection from El Dorado County.

- **Alternative #11: Transit Emphasis:** This alternative assumes as its base the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, subject to such modifications necessary to promote the development of light rail and extended transit opportunities in the county. The extension of light rail from the end of the planned Folsom line to El Dorado Hills would be included under this alternative. An improved commuter, feeder, and local bus system; improved park-and-ride facilities; and extensive nonvehicular system would also be included.
- **Alternative #12: Compact Development:** This alternative would establish policies and land use designations that promote a more compact urban form. This would include changes to the County’s land use designations to allow greater densities. Among the goals to be attained with this alternative are development densities and design that support walking, bicycling, and transit, allow for mixed use, and create market incentives for the development of affordable housing. The range of possible mechanisms for achieving this includes modifications to residential densities to increase yield by decreasing minimum lot sizes. Another approach would be to target specific designations to create incentives for more affordable housing. For example, the High-Density Residential designation could be increased to a maximum of 15 dwelling units per acre for projects including a specified percentage of affordable housing. To address concerns about the intensity of housing, projects that develop with these increased maximums could be restricted to no more than 200 units at a location. To further emphasize a shift from rural to more urban development patterns within community regions, these changes could be accommodated by reducing densities of land outside of designated Community Regions and Rural Centers.

To date, eleven CEQA alternatives have been identified. Based on preliminary analysis, the General Plan EIR will contain an equal weight impact analysis of four alternatives: No Project; 1996 General Plan; Environmentally Constrained; and Roadway Constrained 6 Lane “Plus”. Although up to 5 equal weight alternatives have been contemplated, the 4 identified herein have been determined to provide a reasonable range pursuant to the requirements of the CEQA Guidelines. The remaining 7 alternatives will be analyzed at a lesser level of detail. All alternatives are briefly described below (Tschudin pers. comm.).

- **Equal Weight Alternative 1, No Project:** This alternative assumes only development that would be allowed under the Writ of Mandate. Development of all lands covered by an approved Development Agreement and all lands for which there is an approved Tentative Subdivision Map is assumed. All other residential parcels are assumed to develop with at least 1 unit. No additional lot splits or new subdivisions are assumed. Non-residential property is assumed to develop based on market forces, proportional to housing growth. Land use forecasts and traffic analysis have been completed for both a 2025 scenario and full build out. The LOS policies from the 1996 General Plan (including Measure Y policies) are assumed. Highway 50 is planned for 8-

lanes (6 mixed flow and 2 high occupancy vehicle [HOV]) generally west of Cameron Park. The land use map and policy set for this alternative are the 1996 General Plan land use map and policy set, subject to the limitations of the Writ of Mandate. By 2025, 21,434 new units and 34,414 new jobs are projected. At build-out, 29,520 new units and 87,198 new jobs are projected.

- **Equal Weight Alternative 2, 1996 General Plan:** This alternative assumes development under the 1996 General Plan, as adopted, including Measure Y policies and modified to incorporate any amendments to the Plan made prior to the decision on the General Plan lawsuit in February 1999. Development of all lands for which there are approved Development Agreements and Tentative Subdivision Maps is assumed. Development of all land as designated in the 1996 General Plan is assumed at maximum densities. Non-residential property is assumed to develop based on market forces, proportional to housing growth. Land use forecasts and traffic analysis have been completed for both a 2025 and build-out scenario. The LOS policies from the 1996 General Plan (including Measure Y policies) are used. Highway 50 is planned to be a minimum of 8 lanes per the 1996 Circulation Element, with additional lanes required to mitigate levels of service under the build-out scenario. A land use map and policy set for this alternative are already in place. By 2025, 32,491 new units and 42,202 new jobs are projected. At build-out, 78,692 new units and 89,350 new jobs are projected.
- **Equal Weight Alternative 3, Environmentally Constrained:** This alternative balances a variety of environmental constraints (including geology, habitats, and sensitive plant and wildlife species) and constrains development in more sensitive areas. Development of all lands for which there are Development Agreements and Tentative Subdivision Maps is assumed. All other lands (both residential and non-residential) have been reevaluated and some have been redesignated based generally on the environmental constraints. Community regions and rural centers have been reduced, both in terms of size and density. Rural centers have also been reduced in terms of total number of units. Land use designations have been redefined. Land use forecasts and traffic analysis for both the 2025 and build-out scenarios are underway. An LOS policy consistent with Measure Y, that generally sets LOS D for rural areas and LOS E for community centers is being used. The size of Highway 50 will be determined in the course of the modeling for this alternative. A land use map and policy set for this alternative are being developed.
- **Equal Weight Alternative 4, Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus”:** This alternative assumes all growth that would be allowed under Measure Y Policy 3.5.1.6.1, using the 1996 General Plan land use distribution as a starting point. A truly roadway constrained 6-lane alternative would only assume as much development as could be accommodated on the defined roadway system, without causing roadway levels of service to be exceeded. We know from prior modeling that approximately 14,000 to 15,000 units can be accommodated. This alternative goes beyond this by keeping Highway 50 at

6 lanes, and allowing all growth that could proceed under Measure Y Policy 3.5.1.6.1—hence the “Plus” in the name.

Development of all lands for which there are approved Development Agreements and Tentative Subdivision Maps is assumed. All other residential lands are allowed to develop under the 1996 General Plan land use designations, up to a maximum of 4 units per parcel. Non-residential property is assumed to develop based on market forces, proportional to housing growth. Land use forecasts and traffic analysis for both the 2025 and build out scenarios are underway. An LOS policy consistent with Measure Y, that generally sets LOS D for rural areas and LOS E for community centers is being used. As indicated, Highway 50 is set at 6 lanes. A land use map and policy set for this alternative are being developed.

- **CEQA Alternative 5, 2001 Project Description:** This alternative is based in large part on the 1994 General Plan land use alternative considered during the prior General Plan process, modified in accordance with Measure Y, subsequently approved projects in the County, and direction from the Board of Supervisors. Development of all lands for which there are approved Development Agreements and Tentative Subdivision Maps is assumed. Development of all land as designated in the 2001 map is assumed at maximum densities. Non-residential property is assumed to develop based on market forces, proportional to housing growth. Land use forecasts and traffic analysis have been completed for both a 2025 and build out scenario. An LOS policy consistent with Measure Y, that generally sets LOS D for rural areas and LOS E for community centers is being used. Highway 50 is planned for 8-lanes. A land use map and policy set for this alternative are already in place. By 2025, 32,158 new units and 41,880 new jobs are projected. At build out, 73,814 new units and 76,836 new jobs are projected.

The results of this alternative closely resemble the 1996 General Plan which will be subject to detailed equal weight analysis in the EIR. As the Board has already confirmed, equal weight analysis of this alternative would be duplicative.

- **CEQA Alternative 6, Roadway Constrained 6-Lane:** This alternative allows the maximum amount of growth that could be accommodated within the planned roadway system assuming Highway 50 at 6 lanes. The capacity under this alternative is approximately 14,000 to 15,000 units. No additional residential units can be accommodated under this alternative. Some non-residential growth is assumed based on existing commitments, the Business Park, and Phase I of Missouri Flat. Preliminary traffic analysis is underway for the 2025 scenario. An LOS policy that generally sets LOS D for rural areas and LOS E for community centers is being used. No land use map or policy set for this alternative has been developed.

This alternative would require a policy set and land use map that precludes further development in the County beyond the 14,000 to 15,000 unit capacity of the planned roadways. The number of units for which there are existing



vested commitments (units covered under approved Development Agreements or Tentative Subdivision Maps) is roughly this same number. Assuming that the Development Agreement and Tentative Subdivision Map units proceed, land use designations on all other properties under this alternative would need to be revised to preclude additional development. Individual residential parcels would no longer be allowed 1 unit as a matter of right. This alternative has been identified by County Counsel's office as having significant legal implications in this regard.

- **CEQA Alternative 7, Roadway Constrained 8-Lane:** This alternative allows the maximum amount of growth that could be accommodated within the planned roadway system assuming Highway 50 at 8 lanes. Development of all lands covered by an approved Development Agreement or Tentative Subdivision Map is assumed. All other residential parcels are assumed to develop with at least 1 unit. No additional lot splits or new subdivisions are assumed. Non-residential property is assumed to develop based on market forces, proportional to housing growth (identical to No Project 2025). Preliminary traffic analysis is underway for the 2025 scenario. An LOS policy that generally sets LOS D for rural areas and LOS E for community centers is being used. No land use map or policy set for this alternative has been developed.

Preliminary modeling indicates that the results of this alternative closely resemble the No Action Alternative, which will be subject to detailed equal weight analysis in the EIR. Equal weight analysis of this alternative would be duplicative.

Policies that do affect the results of this alternative include modification of the Business Park and adjoining land uses, and/or the addition of a new connection to White Rock Road. These concepts could have a mitigating effect under any of the identified alternatives and thus they have been broken out separately below (see Alternatives 9 and 10).

- **CEQA Alternative 8, Modified Development Agreements:** This alternative assumes that land use modifications can be made to the 6 Development Agreements (Serrano, Bass Lake, Marble Valley, Promontory, Carson Creek, and Valley View) to minimize environmental impacts. These modifications would include significant changes in density, design, and/or number of units. This alternative has been identified by County Counsel's office as having significant legal implications and may not be legally feasible.
- **CEQA Alternative 9, Modified Business Park and Adjoining Land Uses:** This alternative assumes significant modifications of planned land uses for the Business Park, and the adjoining specific plans (Valley View and Carson Creek) to the extent this may be legally possible. The Business Park is not subject to any vesting mechanisms such as a development agreement. The Carson Creek development is vested by an approved Development Agreement. The Valley View development is vested by an approved Development Agreement, but is subject to Measure Y and may be restricted

~~from proceeding given Measure Y constraints on residential development. Both developments were the subject of settlement agreements.~~

~~Under this alternative, assuming the County's ability to make such changes, the Business Park would be subject to significant reductions in land use intensities. Similarly, assuming the County's ability to make such changes, the Valley View and Carson Creek developments would be subject to significant changes in land use to decrease the overall number of units and geographic area where development is allowed, and to increase the density where roadway capacity could support the units. The alternative would be structured with a policy objective of achieving a balance of jobs and housing between the Business Park and the adjoining development.~~

~~No land use map or policy set for this alternative has been developed. No land use forecasts or traffic analysis specific to this alternative have been completed. Rather it was recognized that this alternative may be a mitigation option that could apply to the General Plan under several of the identified alternatives, and should be treated as such in the CEQA analysis. Therefore, this alternative will be subjected to a lesser level of detail in the alternatives analysis and may be identified as mitigation where appropriate in the EIR.~~

- ~~**CEQA Alternative 10, New White Rock Road Connection:** This alternative assumes a new connection to White Rock Road in the area south of Highway 50 and east of Latrobe Road. There are several connections the road could make including: Suncastr Lane, Investment Boulevard, Sandstone Drive, or Golden Foothill Parkway to White Rock Road; Investment Boulevard to Payen Road; or the extension of Payen Road to connect to Latrobe Road south of the Business Park. All of these potential connections would need to include a connection to Highway 50 in Sacramento County. The intent is to create a new access restricted east/west outlet for funneling traffic from this area to the freeway.~~

~~No land use map or policy set for this alternative has been developed. No land use forecasts for this alternative have been run. This measure is expected to have significant mitigating effects on traffic and related impacts under several of the identified alternatives, and should be treated as such in the CEQA analysis. Therefore, this alternative will be subjected to a lesser level of detail in the alternatives analysis and may be identified as mitigation where appropriate in the EIR.~~

- ~~**CEQA Alternative 11, Transit Emphasis:** This alternative would establish policies and land use designations that promote the development of light rail and extended transit opportunities in the County. The extension of light rail from the end of the planned Folsom line to El Dorado Hills would be included in the Plan. An improved commuter, feeder, and local bus system, improved Park and Ride facilities, and extensive non-vehicular system would also be planned. No land use map or policy set for this alternative has been developed. No land use forecasts or traffic analysis specific to this alternative have been run. Rather it was recognized that this alternative may be a~~

~~mitigation option that could apply to the General Plan under several of the identified alternatives, and should be treated as such in the CEQA analysis. Therefore, this alternative will be subjected to a lesser level of detail in the alternatives analysis and will be identified as mitigation where appropriate in the EIR.~~

Revise Table 3.1-1, “Acquisitions and Easements under the 4-Lane Tight Diamond Interchange,” as follows:

Assessor's Parcel Number <sup>a</sup>	Impact Area			Comments <sup>b</sup>
	Meter <sup>2</sup>	Foot <sup>2</sup>	Acre	
327-130-47	<del>4,400</del> <u>1,325</u>	<del>45,070</del> <u>14,375</u>	<del>0.35</del> <u>0.33</u>	Permanent acquisition of property; no structure, parking, or signage loss
327-130-49	<del>3,500</del> <u>3,198</u>	<del>37,675</del> <u>34,412</u>	<del>0.86</del> <u>0.79</u>	Permanent acquisition of property; no structure, parking, or signage loss
327-130-43	<del>4,500</del> <u>1,756</u>	<del>46,146</del> <u>18,731</u>	<del>0.37</del> <u>0.43</u>	Permanent acquisition of property; no structure, parking, or signage loss
327-130-46	<del>4,500</del> <u>4,344</u>	<del>48,439</del> <u>46,609</u>	<del>4.14</del> <u>1.07</u>	Permanent acquisition of property; no structure, parking, or signage loss
327-130-45	<del>4,500</del> <u>1,461</u>	<del>46,146</del> <u>15,682</u>	<del>0.37</del> <u>0.36</u>	Permanent acquisition of property; no structure, parking, or signage loss
327-130-37	<del>2,100</del> <u>2,126</u>	<del>22,605</del> <u>23,087</u>	<del>0.52</del> <u>0.53</u>	Permanent acquisition of property; no structure, parking, or signage loss

### Section 3.7 Hydrology, Water Quality, and Floodplains

Revise the fourth paragraph on page 3-93, as follows:

The RWQCB implements its authority through the issuance and enforcement of waste discharge requirements or other permit authorizations for waste discharge to land and waters within its jurisdiction. Construction activities that disturb greater than ~~5 acres~~ 1 acre are required to obtain authorization for waste discharges from the RWQCB under the statewide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permit for general construction activity (statewide general permit). ~~(Effective March 10, 2003, this requirement will apply to projects disturbing 1 acre or more.)~~

### **Section 3.8 Wildlife and Botanical Resources, Threatened and Endangered Species, and Wetlands and Waters of the U.S.**

Omit the duplicated text on page 3-117, as follows:

- Policy 7.4.1.6. Where substantial modifications of natural communities and habitats of special status plants and animal species through grading or other disturbances occur in anticipation of or prior to either the submittal and/or approval of a formal discretionary application, that application shall be accompanied with a comprehensive habitat restoration and/or off-site mitigation plan. The provisions of the plan shall be implemented as part of the project approval.
- ~~Policy 7.3.3.2. All feasible project modifications shall be considered to avoid wetland disturbance. Direct or indirect losses of wetlands and/or riparian vegetation associated with discretionary application approval shall be compensated by replacement, rehabilitation, or creation of a wetlands habitat on a no-net-loss basis. Compensation may result in provision of wetlands habitat on or off-site at a minimum of 1:1 ratio as associated with the disturbed resource. A wetland study and mitigation monitoring program shall be submitted to the County and concerned State and Federal agencies for review prior to permit approval.~~

Revise page 3-138 as follows:

- Clean construction equipment at designated wash stations by steam cleaning equipment before entering the construction area.

### **Section 3.9 Historic and Archeological Preservation**

Revise the second paragraph on page 3-145, as follows:

“...Twelve of the 27 buildings, 1 bridge (Old Weber Creek Bridge, No. 25-05), the 2 irrigation ditches (Missouri Flat and Farmer’s Free Bridge Ditches) are 50 years old or older...”

### **Section 3.14 Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities**

Revise the second full paragraph on page 3-43, as follows:

Missouri Flat Road within the project area provides a discontinuous system of sidewalks. ~~No sidewalks currently exist on the Missouri Flat Road overcrossing.~~  
No pedestrians....”

Revise the third bullet on page 3-36 as follows:

- Freeway “weaving areas” were analyzed using the Caltrans LOS/C Method described in the *Highway Design Manual...*”

### Section 3.12 Utilities/Emergency Services

Revise the third paragraph on page 3-190, as follows:

“...Relocation costs would be funded and would occur before project construction to accommodate construction activities and preserve continuity of service. The County would coordinate with EID and PG&E prior to and during construction to ensure that any replacement or relocation of facilities is done in accordance with utility standards. If services were stopped...”

## Chapter 5. California Environmental Quality Act Evaluation

### Section 5.1 Land Use, Planning, and Growth

Revise Table 5.1-1, “Acquisitions and Easements under the Preferred Alternative,” as follows:

Assessor's Parcel Number	Phase 1				Ultimate Phase			
	Impact Area			Comments	Impact Area			Comments
	Meter <sup>2</sup>	Foot <sup>2</sup>	Acre		Meter <sup>2</sup>	Foot <sup>2</sup>	Acre	
327-130-47	4,400 1,325	45,070 14,375	0.35 0.33	Permanent acquisition of property; no structure, parking, or signage loss	450	4,615 0	0.04 0.00	Permanent acquisition of property; no structure, parking, or signage loss
327-130-49	3,500 3,198	37,675 34,412	0.86 0.79	Permanent acquisition of property; no structure, parking, or signage loss		0	0.00	
327-130-43	4,500 1,756	46,146 18,731	0.37 0.43	Permanent acquisition of property; no structure, parking, or signage loss		0	0.00	
327-130-46	4,500 4,344	48,439 46,609	1.11 1.07	Permanent acquisition of property; no structure, parking, or signage loss		0	0.00	
327-130-45	4,500 1,461	46,146 15,682	0.37 0.36	Permanent acquisition of property; no structure, parking, or signage loss		0	0.00	
327-130-37	2,400 2,126	22,606 23,087	0.52 0.53	Permanent acquisition of property; no structure, parking, or signage loss		0	0.00	

Revise language on page 5-12, as follows:

- the Phase 2 improvements are added by the Board of Supervisors action to the list of MC&FP-funded improvements; and

- the Phase 2 improvements are added to a future MTP and ~~MTIP if federal funds are to be used to build these improvements...~~

Revise Table 5.1-3, “Acquisitions and Easements under the 6-Lane Tight Diamond Alternative,” as follows:

Assessor's Parcel Number <sup>a</sup>	Phase 1	Ultimate Phase			Comments <sup>c</sup>
		Impact Area <sup>b</sup>			
		Meter <sup>2</sup>	Foot <sup>2</sup>	Acre	
327-130-47		450	4,615 0	0.04 0.00	Permanent acquisition of property; no structure, parking, or signage loss; same as Ultimate Phase of SPDI
327-130-49	Same as preferred alternative		0	0.00	Same as Ultimate Phase of SPDI
327-130-43			0	0.00	Same as Ultimate Phase of SPDI
327-130-46			0	0.00	Same as Ultimate Phase of SPDI
327-130-45			0	0.00	Same as Ultimate Phase of SPDI
327-130-37			0	0.00	Same as Ultimate Phase of SPDI

### Section 5.8 Wildlife and Botanical Resources, Threatened and Endangered Species, and Wetlands and Waters of the U.S.

Revise fourth bullet on page 5-73, as follows:

- short-term disturbance of ~~critical~~ habitat for CRLF; and

Revise page 5-84 as follows:

- Clean construction equipment at designated ~~wash~~ stations by steam cleaning equipment before entering the construction area.

### Section 5.9 Historic and Archeological Resources

Revise the third full paragraph on page 5.95, as follows:

See Chapter 4 for a discussion of cumulative impacts related to ~~earth resources and hazardous materials~~ cultural resources.

### Section 5.12 Utilities/Emergency Services

Revise the fourth paragraph on page 5-113, as follows:

“...Relocation costs would be funded and would occur before project construction to accommodate construction activities and preserve continuity of service. The County would coordinate with EID and PG&E prior to and during construction to ensure that any replacement or relocation of facilities is done in accordance with utility standards. If services were stopped...”

Revise second paragraph on page 5-46, as follows:

If the County decides to go forward with Phase 2 (SPDI) of the project ~~and decides to use federal funds to build Phase 2~~, Phase 2 would be included in a future MTP and MTIP and modeled for transportation conformity.