

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This summary is provided in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (State CEQA Guidelines) Section 15123. As stated in Section 15123(a), “[a]n EIR [environmental impact report] shall contain a brief summary of the proposed action and its consequences. The language of the summary should be as clear and simple as reasonably practical.” As required by the guidelines, this chapter includes (1) a summary description of the project, (2) a synopsis of environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures (Table ES-1), (3) identification of the alternatives evaluated and of the environmentally superior alternative, and (4) a discussion of the areas of controversy associated with the project.

ES.2 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

ES.2.1 Project Location

The project site is located in an unincorporated area of El Dorado County, in the eastern portion of the El Dorado Hills Community Region. It encompasses 280 acres on five parcels: Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs) 126-020-001, 126-020-002, 126-020-003, 126-020-004, and 126-150-023. Most of the site is located south of Green Valley Road. The northern tip of the site (portion of APN 126-150-023) is located north of the road. This portion of the project site is being removed as part of a boundary line adjustment being processed under a separate application to the County. The project also includes two proposed access roadway connections to Green Valley Road (C-Drive and A-Drive) that would use existing easements to access Green Valley Road. Existing land uses in the project area consist of single-family residences and rural residential areas.

ES.2.2 Project Background

The project site was previously proposed for development with an application that was submitted in 2011. The previous project was named “Dixon Ranch” and proposed a General Plan amendment, rezone, planned development, and a tentative subdivision map that would allow for the development of 605 residential lots (including 160 age-restricted units) that would have ranged from 4,724 square-feet to over 5 acres in size. Dixon Ranch also proposed two park sites, a clubhouse, and designated open space. Proposed circulation and infrastructure improvements included off-site improvements to access Green Valley Road, wastewater conveyance improvements, and electrical service improvements. Dixon Ranch was denied by the Board of Supervisors on February 14, 2017.

The proposed project is brought by a different applicant and is independent of Dixon Ranch. While a new project, the applicant has considered concerns expressed by the public and Board of Supervisors during hearings for Dixon Ranch. Most notably, the proposed project has substantially reduced the number of proposed residential lots from 605 to 379 (approximately 37 percent reduction in residential lots).

ES.2.3 Project Objectives

The applicant has identified the following objectives of the Generations at Green Valley Project:

- ▶ Implement the County’s General Plan by directing urban/suburban growth within the El Dorado Hills Community Region located adjacent to existing residential development in order to ensure the preservation of large expanses of open space and agricultural lands within the County.
- ▶ Establish a land use pattern that maintains and enhances the character of existing rural and urban communities, emphasizing both the natural setting and built design elements.

- ▶ Develop a thoughtful design that focuses higher density residential lots toward the center of the parcel and includes large residential lots, open space, and parks throughout the project as an amenity but especially the exterior to provide significant buffers between existing residential communities.
- ▶ Provide a range of residential densities and product type to meet the needs of the changing demographics of the County, including families, empty nesters, and active adults.
- ▶ Create a residential community containing open space and a range of passive and active recreational amenities for its residents and the community.
- ▶ Establish an economically viable project that provides a fair-share contribution of infrastructure to the community through the payment of fees and/or construction of off-site transportation improvements in accordance with the County's General Plan.
- ▶ Improve emergency access and evacuation routes in the project area.
- ▶ Provide a comprehensively planned project that is sensitive to environmental issues including wetland and tree preservation.

ES.2.4 Characteristics of the Project

The Generations at Green Valley Project proposes to amend the General Plan land use designations to High Density Residential (HDR), Low Density Residential (LDR), and Public Facilities (PF). The project would rezone the site to Residential, Single-Unit (R1 [6,000-square foot minimum]), Open Space (OS), Recreational Facilities, High Intensity (RF-H), and Residential Estate, Five-Acre (RE-5). The project also proposes a tentative subdivision map. The proposed development area of the project would be within the General Plan designated El Dorado Hills Community Region boundary.

Table ES-2 provides an overview of the proposed land uses of the project. Each of the project components is described in detail below.

Table ES-2 Generation at Green Valley Land Use Summary

Proposed General Plan Land Use Designation	Proposed Zoning	Summary of Proposed Land Use	Number of Lots
Residential			
Low Density Residential	Residential Estate -5 acre	Residential estate lots generally located along the perimeter of the site	18
High Density Residential	Residential, Single-Unit	Single-family residential lots generally located in the central and southern portion of the site, with 214 residential lots age restricted	361
<i>Total Number of Residential Lots</i>			<i>379¹</i>
Parks and Recreation Facilities			
High Density Residential	Recreational Facilities, High Intensity	Clubhouse site on a 3.3-acre lot (proposed as lot B)	1
Public Facilities	Recreational Facilities, High Intensity	Park site on a 4.0-acre lot (proposed as lot A)	1
Landscaping and Open Space			
Low Density Residential	Estate Residential -5 acre	Landscape lot L1	1
High Density Residential	Residential, Single-Unit	Landscape lots L2-L13	12
Low Density Residential	Open Space	Open space lots C, D, and I and a portion of F	4
Low Density Residential and High Density Residential	Open Space	Open space lots C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, and K.	9

¹ Lot 1 would retain the existing residence on the site. Thus, total new residential development would consist of 378 residential lots.

Sources: Generations at Green Valley Tentative Map dated December 2021 (CTA 2021a) and Generations at Green Valley Zoning and General Plan Map (CTA 2021b).

CIRCULATION IMPROVEMENTS

The project roadway system would consist of a “loop” private roadway system. Access to the project site would consist of two new roadway connections to Green Valley Road associated with proposed C-Drive and A-Drive would include dedicated deceleration lanes and turn lanes separated from the travel lanes of Green Valley Road. The C-Drive intersection with Green Valley Road would be limited to a right-turn in and left turn out access from C-Drive, while A-Drive intersection with Green Valley Road would be a signalized full access intersection. Proposed Lot 1 would continue to obtain roadway access from Verde Valley Lane for the existing on-site residence.

The project roadways would include sidewalks as well as a pedestrian trail that would connect the park site to a trail along the eastern side of C-Drive.

The project would include an emergency access/egress (EAE) at Lima Way to serve as a secondary means of emergency access and evacuation that would be gated but designed to be accessible by project residents during an evacuation order. There would also be two emergency vehicle access (EVA) road connections at Marden Drive and at East Green Springs Road (to the south) that would be stubbed to the property line for emergency vehicle use. These accesses would meet the design standards for gated developments as described in Section 130.30.090(D) of the El Dorado County Code of Ordinances and the El Dorado Hills Fire Department Ordinance 2022-01. The gates would also comply with all design and operation criteria included in Section D103.5 of El Dorado Hills Fire Department Ordinance 2022-01.

Based on the results of the 2022 Generations at Green Valley Transportation Impact Study prepared by Kimley-Horn (Kimley-Horn 2022), the project is proposing the following traffic signal operational improvements to address compliance with the El Dorado County Transportation and Circulation Element policies TC-Xd, TC-Xe, and TC-Xf. These improvements would not involve physical alteration of these intersections.

- ▶ Optimize traffic signal coordination on El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road from White Rock Road to Saratoga Way (North).
- ▶ Modify traffic signal phasing and hardware for the Silva Valley Parkway and Harvard Way intersection to provide a southbound right-turn overlap.

DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS

The project would include several drainage improvements in order to maintain or reduce peak flows leaving the site as well as flows and flood elevations in Green Springs Creek. Drainage improvements are shown in Figure 2-9a and 2-9b:

- ▶ Removal of the existing ponds within the Green Spring Creek corridor in the northern portion of the site through replacement of the existing upstream culvert crossing with a new Conspan crossing at the proposed C-Drive crossing, removal of the downstream embankment (downstream of C-Drive), and restoration of the creek channel to its approximate natural state near proposed A-Drive crossing. This would include the installation of rock slope protection and check dams within the channel. These improvements would require permitting under the federal Clean Water Act (Section 404) from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and approval of a streambed alteration agreement (1602 Permit) from California Department of Fish and Wildlife Service.
- ▶ Construction of eight on-site detention/water quality basins.

PUBLIC SERVICE PROVISION AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

The project proposes to obtain public and utility services from the following agencies:

- ▶ El Dorado Hills Fire Department (also known as the El Dorado Hills County Water District/Fire Protection District) for fire protection services;
- ▶ El Dorado Hills CSD for parks, recreation, and other community services; and
- ▶ El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) for water and wastewater services.

Obtaining services from these agencies would require the El Dorado Local Agency Formation Commission to approve the annexations of the site into the service boundaries of these agencies.

Off-Site Water Distribution Improvements

As noted above, EID is proposed to provide public water service to the project site, with the exception of proposed Lot 1 that would continue to use its existing on-site well for water supply. There are also two additional wells on-site that would be abandoned consistent with County regulations. On-site water supply would be distributed through a network of pipelines within the project's roadway right-of-way. The project would require the off-site improvements for water supply service identified below.

- ▶ Connection to an existing 8-inch water distribution pipeline within Lima Way on the project's western boundary.
- ▶ Construction of a new water distribution pipeline from the project's southern boundary to an existing 10-inch pipeline located in Greenview Drive. This distribution pipeline would be approximately one mile in length.
- ▶ Construction of a new water distribution pipeline from the project's eastern boundary along Green Valley Road to an existing 12-inch pipeline west of Pleasant Grove Middle School. This distribution pipeline would be approximately one mile in length.

Off-Site Wastewater Conveyance Improvements

EID is also proposed to provide wastewater conveyance and treatment services to the project, with the exception of proposed Lot 1 that would continue to use its existing on-site wastewater treatment system and lots 2 through 8 that would construct new on-site wastewater disposal systems. The proposed park site would use a restroom vault that would store wastewater until emptied by a wastewater disposal truck. On-site wastewater would be conveyed through a network of pipelines within the project's roadway right-of-way. The project would require the off-site improvements for wastewater conveyance listed below.

- ▶ Connection to an existing 8-inch gravity wastewater conveyance pipeline within Lima Way on the project's western boundary.
- ▶ Upsizing of approximately 1,600 linear feet of existing gravity wastewater pipeline upstream of the Highland Hills Lift Station that is currently located within a private open space corridor. The Highland Hills Lift Station is located along Loch Way and would be upgraded or expanded.
- ▶ Construction of approximately 8,500-linear foot force main from the Highland Hills Lift Station to an existing 15-inch gravity wastewater pipeline that flows to the St. Andrews Lift Station along Glenmore Way, Highland Drive, West Glenmore Way, Silva Valley Parkway, and a SMUD utility easement.
 - The St. Andrews Lift Station where the proposed new force main would discharge has limited capacity. Thus, the project identifies an alternative wastewater alignment where the proposed new force main would be extended further south along Silva Valley Parkway where it would connect to a 24-inch gravity flow pipeline south of Harvard Way should adequate capacity not be available at the time of project development.

ELECTRICAL SERVICE AND IMPROVEMENTS

Electrical service and natural gas would be provided by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). Off-site improvements include installation of a new electrical cable through the existing conduit on Sangiovese Drive; new trenching for installation of a 6-inch conduit and cable on a portion of Appian Way; and removal and replacement of cable in an existing conduit along portions of Lima Way, Aberdeen Lane, and Appian Way for a length of approximately 1.4 miles. Additionally, improvements to electrical distribution facilities along Green Valley Road to the western edge of the Travois Subdivision in Cameron Park for a length of approximately 2 miles. Natural gas service would consist of a connection to the existing natural gas pipeline in Lima Way along the western boundary of the site.

ES.3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

ES.3.1 Project-Specific Impacts

This EIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.) to evaluate the physical environmental effects of the proposed project. El Dorado County is the lead agency for the project. The County has the principal responsibility for approving and carrying out the project and for ensuring that the requirements of CEQA have been met.

Table ES-1, presented at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental impacts for the project. The table identifies the level of significance of the impact before mitigation, recommended mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after implementation of the mitigation measures.

ES.3.2 Significant and Unavoidable Impacts and Cumulative Impacts

Implementing the project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

- ▶ Impact 3.7-1 and 4-11: The project would result in GHG emissions during both construction and operational phases. While mitigation (Mitigation Measures 3.7-1a, 3.7-1b, and 3.14-2) has been identified to address this impact, the project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact under project and cumulative conditions.
- ▶ Impact 3.11-1: Short-term construction-generated noise levels associated with the project would expose nearby noise-sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels. While mitigation (Mitigation Measure 3.11-1) has been identified to address this impact, the project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact under project conditions.
- ▶ Impact 3.14-2 and 4-24: Implementation of the project would exceed the significance threshold of 19.1 VMT per capita for residential uses (i.e., 15 percent below the existing county VMT per capita) as identified in County Resolution 141-2020. While mitigation (Mitigation Measure 3.14-2) has been identified to address this impact, the project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact under project and cumulative conditions.
- ▶ Impact 3.15-1: The project would include the construction of on-site and off-site infrastructure improvements that would result in significant environmental impacts related to construction noise. While mitigation (Mitigation Measure 3.11-1), has been identified to address this impact, the project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact under project conditions.
- ▶ Impact 4-8: The project would contribute to the cumulative loss of oak woodland habitat due to the anticipated removal of approximately 56 acres of oak woodland habitat. Thus, the project's contribution to cumulative oak woodland loss identified in the Biological Resources Policy Update and ORMP Final EIR would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.

ES.4 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Chapter 5, "Alternatives," provides an analysis of alternatives to the proposed project. Brief descriptions of the alternatives evaluated in this Draft EIR provided below.

- ▶ Alternative 1: No Project–No Development Alternative - This alternative assumes no development of the site. The project site would remain in its current condition.
- ▶ Alternative 2: No Project/Development Consistent with the General Plan Alternative - The project site would be developed consistent with the site's current General Plan land use designation of Low Density Residential. This would result in on-site roadway improvements with three emergency vehicle access points and a 56 residential lot subdivision (five acre lots). Water and wastewater would consist of on-site wastewater disposal systems and wells. Off-site improvements would be limited to access improvements to Green Valley Road.

- ▶ Alternative 3: Mixed Use Development Alternative - This alternative would modify the proposed project site plan to provide mixed land uses in the eastern portion of the project site that would consist of 350 multi-family residential units for extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income households as defined by the 2021-2029 Housing Element and 30,000 square feet of commercial uses. This alternative would also designate proposed lots 2 through 4 as open space. All other aspects of the proposed project would be retained.
- ▶ Alternative 4: Reduced Build Alternative – This alternative would redesignate the project site as Medium Density Residential and Open Space under the General Plan, but would retain the existing on-site residence on a five-acre lot. This would allow the development of 155 residential lots (one-acre lots).
- ▶ Alternative 5: Dixon Ranch Alternative – This alternative would consist of the previously proposed Dixon Ranch Residential Project (Dixon Ranch), which was denied by the Board of Supervisors on February 14, 2017. The Dixon Ranch project proposed to subdivide the site to create 605 single-family residential lots (containing 604 new single-family detached residential units and the retention of the existing Dixon residence). Approximately 160 of these units would be age restricted. Dixon Ranch also proposed open space areas, including parks, trails, landscaped lots, and native open spaces.

ES.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123 requires the summary section of a Draft EIR to identify the areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123 requires the summary section of a Draft EIR to identify issues to be resolved related to the proposed project.

On February 26, 2024, a notice of preparation (NOP) was distributed for the project to responsible agencies, interested parties, and organizations, as well as private organizations and individuals that may have an interest in the project. A public scoping meeting was held on March 12, 2024. The purpose of the NOP and the scoping meeting was to provide notification that an EIR was being prepared for the project and to solicit input on the scope and content of the environmental document. The NOP and responses to the NOP are included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR. The following key concerns and issues were expressed during the scoping process:

- ▶ proposed density and extent of residential development proposed,
- ▶ change in landscape and land use characteristics of the project area (especially along Green Valley Road),
- ▶ air quality impacts and exposure to naturally occurring asbestos,
- ▶ water supply,
- ▶ wastewater capacity,
- ▶ biological resources,
- ▶ traffic and traffic safety on the Green Valley Road and Highway 50 corridors, and
- ▶ wildfire and evacuation.

ES.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of a Draft EIR to identify issues to be resolved in the EIR, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant project effects. The following issues, in addition to the areas of controversy, are identified to be resolved:

- ▶ whether the project should be approved, modified, or denied;
- ▶ whether the is consistent with the El Dorado County General Plan; and
- ▶ whether the mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR should be applied to the project.

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Aesthetics			
<p>Impact 3.1-1: Substantially Degrade the Existing Visual Character or Quality of Public Views of the Site and Its Surroundings</p> <p>Development of the proposed project would result in 379 residential lots, a clubhouse lot, a park site lot, 13 landscape lots, and nine open space lots on the 280-acre project site, as well as associated off-site roadway and utility improvements, altering the nonurbanized, open space landscape of the site to a suburban development. However, the project design includes open space and rural residential lots that would buffer and transition to the development in a manner that would be visually consistent with surrounding residential development. Further, the project would be consistent with General Plan policies that address visual resources. For these reasons, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.1-2: Create a New Source of Substantial Light or Glare Which Would Adversely Affect Day or Nighttime Views in the Area</p> <p>Project implementation would result in an increase in the amount of light and glare on the project site, which would affect nighttime views in the area. However, the project would comply with General Plan policies and El Dorado County's Zoning Ordinance and associated standards, which would require outdoor lighting to be shielded and directed so as not to have direct light fall outside property lines or public rights-of-way. Because the completed project would have similar characteristics with existing development in the project area, causing the completed project to coincide with the surrounding development, as well as comply with the mentioned regulations, implementing the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
Air Quality			
<p>Impact 3.2-1: Conflict with or Obstruct Implementation of an Applicable Air Quality Plan</p> <p>The applicable AQAP considered in this analysis is the 2023 Ozone Plan. Growth induced by the project is accounted for in the Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG's) Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), which informs the growth projections used in the development of the 2023 Ozone Plan. The project would exceed applicable</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.2-1a: Apply Tier-4 Emission Standards to All Diesel-Powered Off-Road Equipment</p> <p>Construction contractors for the project shall use only off-road construction equipment that meets EPA's Tier 4 emission standards, as defined in 40 CFR 1039, and comply with the appropriate test procedures and provisions contained in 40 CFR Parts 1065 and 1068. This measure can also be achieved by using battery-electric off-road equipment as it becomes available. Implementation of this measure shall be required</p>	LTS

NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>project-level thresholds related to construction NOx and TAC emissions. The project also would comply with all applicable EDCAQMD rules, including Rule 223-1 and Rule 223-2. However, the project includes a proposed General Plan Amendment, would exceed short-term construction and operational thresholds, and is not consistent with VMT-reduction objectives of the AQAP. This impact would be significant.</p>		<p>in the contract the project applicant establishes with its construction contractors. The project shall demonstrate its plan to fulfill the requirements of this measure in a report or project improvement plan details submitted to the County before the use of any off-road diesel-powered construction equipment on the site.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.2-1b: Implement Best Available Fugitive Dust Control Measures</p> <p>In accordance with Section 4.2.3 of the EDCAQMD CEQA Guide, the applicant shall ensure that construction and grading activities minimize short-term impacts on air quality by employing the dust reduction measures of the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) Rule 403, identified as mitigation in Section C.6 of the EDCAQMD CEQA Guide. Construction contractors shall implement the following dust control measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Earth-moving (except construction cutting and filling areas, and mining operations) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Control Action 1a. Maintain soil moisture content at a minimum of 12 percent, as determined by ASTM method D-2216, or other equivalent method approved by the District; two soil moisture evaluations must be conducted during the first three hours of active operations during a calendar day, and two such evaluations each subsequent four-hour period of active operations; OR ▪ Control Action 1a-1. For any earth-moving that is more than 100 feet from all property lines, conduct watering as necessary to prevent visible dust emissions from exceeding 100 feet in length in any direction. ▶ Earth-moving – construction fill areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Control Action 1b. Maintain soil moisture content at a minimum of 12 percent, as determined by ASTM method D-2216, or other equivalent method approved by the District; for areas that have an optimum moisture content for compaction of less than 12 percent, as determined by ASTM method 1557 or other equivalent method approved by the District, complete the compaction process as expeditiously as possible after achieving at least 70 percent of the optimum soil moisture content; two soil moisture evaluations must be conducted during the first three hours of active operations during a calendar day, and two such evaluations during each subsequent four-hour period of active operations. ▶ Earth-moving – construction cut areas and mining operations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Control Action 1c. Conduct watering as necessary to prevent visible emissions from extending more than 100 feet beyond the active cut or mining areas 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>unless the area is inaccessible to watering vehicles due to slope conditions or other safety factors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Disturbed surface areas (except completed grading areas) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Control Action 2a/b. Apply dust suppression in a sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface; any areas that cannot be stabilized, as evidenced by wind-driven dust, must have an application of water at least twice per day to at least 80 percent of the unstabilized area. ▶ Disturbed surface areas –completed grading areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Control Action 2c. Apply chemical stabilizers¹ within 5 working days or grading completion; OR ▪ Control Action 2d. Take action 3a or 3c specified for inactive disturbed surface areas. ▶ Inactive disturbed surface areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Control Action 3a. Apply water to at least 80 percent of all inactive disturbed surface areas daily when there is evidence of wind-driven fugitive dust, excluding any areas that are inaccessible due to excessive slope or other safety conditions; OR ▪ Control Action 3b. Apply dust suppressants in sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface; OR ▪ Control Action 3c. Establish a vegetative ground cover within 21 days after active operations have ceased; ground cover must be of sufficient density to expose less than 30 percent of unstabilized ground within 90 days of planting, and at all times thereafter; OR ▪ Control Action 3d. Utilize any combination of control actions 3a, 3b, and 3c such that, in total, they apply to all inactive disturbed surface areas. ▶ Unpaved roads <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Control Action 4a. Water all roads used for any vehicular traffic at least once per every two hours of active operations; OR ▪ Control Action 4b. Water all roads used for any vehicular traffic once daily and restrict vehicle speed to 15 mph; OR 	

¹ Chemical stabilizers are defined by EDCAQMD as a non-toxic chemical dust suppressant which must not be used if prohibited for use by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards, the California Air Resources Board, the Environmental Protection Agency, or any applicable law, rule or regulation; and should meet any specifications, criteria, or tests required by any federal, state, or local water agency. Unless otherwise indicated, the use of a non-toxic chemical stabilizer shall be of sufficient concentration and application frequency to maintain a stabilized surface (El Dorado County 2018).

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Control Action 4c. Apply chemical stabilizer to all unpaved road surfaces in sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface. ▶ Open storage piles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Control Action 5a. Apply chemical stabilizers; OR ▪ Control Action 5b. Apply water to at least 80 percent of the surface areas of all open storage piles daily when there is evidence of wind-driven fugitive dust; OR ▪ Control Action 5c. Install a three-sided enclosure with walls with no more than 50 percent porosity that extend, at a minimum, to the top of the pile. ▶ Track-out control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Control Action 6a. Pave or apply chemical stabilization at sufficient concentration and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface starting from the point of intersection with the public paved surface, and extending for a centerline distance of at least 100 feet and width of at least 20 feet; OR ▪ Control Action 6b. Pave from the point of intersection with the public paved road surface, extending for a centerline distance of at least 25 feet and a width of at least 20 feet, and install a track-out control device immediately adjacent to the paved surface such that exiting vehicles do not travel on any unpaved road surface after passing through the track-out control device. <p>Mitigation Measure 3.2-1c: Implement Asbestos Dust Mitigation Consistent with EDCAQMD Rule 223-1</p> <p>Consistent with EDCAQMD Rule 223-2 and County Ordinance 4548, if the presence of NOA is confirmed by a professional geologist through a geologic survey, the following asbestos dust control measures shall be implemented by the applicant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project applicant shall submit an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan to the Air Pollution Control Officer before the start of any construction activity that applies to EDCAQMD's Rule 223-1. An updated Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan must be submitted if the project is significantly modified, a new grading permit is issued, the owner/operator changes or the Air Pollution Control Officer requests that a new plan be submitted. 2. Construction activities shall not commence until the Air Pollution Control Officer has approved or conditionally approved the Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan. The project applicant shall provide written notification to the Air Pollution Control Officer at least 10 days before the commencement of earthmoving activities by email, fax, or mail. The requirement to submit an Asbestos Dust 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>Mitigation Plan shall apply to all such activities conducted for residential and nonresidential (e.g., commercial, industrial, or institutional) purposes or conducted by any governmental entity.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. An owner/operator may submit one Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan covering multiple construction stages within the same project, provided the plan includes a description of activities and control measures for all stages of the project. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall specify the expected start and final completion date of each project. 4. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall describe all dust mitigation measures to be implemented before, during, and after any dust-generating activity, such as the application of soil stabilizers, pre-watering soil before cut-and-fill activities, and covering haul vehicles. Additional measures may be identified by the EDCAQMD or contractor as appropriate. 5. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall contain all the information described in Section 223-2.5.B of Rule 223. The Air Pollution Control Officer shall approve, disapprove, or conditionally approve the Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan within 30 days of plan submittal. The County will not issue a grading permit for any phase of construction until it has received the approved Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan. Compliance with the approved plan will be documented, at the applicant's expense, through periodic monitoring and annual reporting to the County. 6. An owner/operator shall retain a copy of an approved Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan at the project site. The approved Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall remain valid until the termination of all dust-generating activities. Failure to comply with the provisions of an approved Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan is deemed to be a violation of Rule 223. Regardless of whether an approved Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan is in place, or even when the owner/operator responsible for the plan is complying with an approved Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan, the owner/operator shall comply also with all requirements of this rule at all times. 7. The name(s), address(s), and phone number(s) of person(s) and owner(s)/operator(s) responsible for the preparation, submittal, and implementation of the Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan and responsible for the dust-generating operation and the application of dust control measures shall be included in the plan. 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall include a plot plan that shows the type and location of the project. 9. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall identify the total area of land surface to be disturbed and the total area in acres of the entire project site. 10. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall identify the expected start and completion dates of dust-generating and soil disturbance activities to be performed on the site. 11. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall identify the actual and potential sources of fugitive dust emissions on the site and the location of bulk material handling and storage areas, paved and unpaved roads, entrances and exits where carryout/track-out may occur, and traffic areas. 12. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall require the implementation of best management practices (Rule 223-2, Tables 1–4) or other effective measures for construction, bulk material handling, carry- and track-out management, and blasting activities. 13. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall require that dust control measures (Rule 223-2, Tables 5 and 6) be implemented during construction. 14. If chemical dust suppressants are to be applied, the following information must be included in the Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan: product specifications; manufacturer’s usage instructions (method, frequency, and intensity of application); type, number, and capacity of application equipment; and information on environmental impacts and approvals or certifications related to the appropriate and safe use for ground application. 15. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall identify specific surface treatment(s) and/or control measures to be used to control material carryout, track-out, and sedimentation where unpaved and/or access points join paved roads. 16. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall state how often the items specified in Section 223-2.9, and any other items identified in the plan, will be reported to EDCAQMD. 17. The contractor must have clearly displayed signage at multiple points along the project’s boundary line notifying that soils in the area may contain NOA, also stating that NOA is a known carcinogen. The signage shall also provide the phone number of the contractor as well as EDCAQMD to allow reporting of excessive fugitive dust. 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.2-2: Generate Short-Term Construction-Related Emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}</p> <p>Construction of the project (including off-site roadway and infrastructure improvements) would result in emissions of NO_x emissions would exceed daily EDCAQMD thresholds. Further, the EDCAQMD CEQA Guide states that for the impact related to particulate matter emissions to be considered less than significant, projects must incorporate dust mitigation measures in compliance with the dust reduction measures outlined in Rule 403 of SCAQMD. Although the project would include the dust reduction measures of EDCAQMD's Rule 223-1, it would not include the dust mitigation measures of SCAQMD's Rule 403 by design. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	Implement Mitigation Measures 3.2-1a and 3.2-1b.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.2-3: Generate Long-Term Operational Emissions of ROG, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}</p> <p>Operation of the project would result in emissions of criteria pollutants from mobile, area, and energy sources. Because emissions of ROG and NO_x would not exceed EDCAQMD thresholds, operational emissions associated with the project would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.2-4: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations (TACs and NOA)</p> <p>Based on the HRA prepared for the project, construction would produce substantial diesel PM such that EDCAQMD's threshold for TAC cancer risk exposure of 10 in one million would be exceeded. Using this numerical threshold, the project would generate substantial emissions of TACs, causing an adverse health impact from TAC exposure. The project also would be located in an area known to contain NOA that could create public health hazards from NOA dust generated during construction. Therefore, this impact would be significant.</p>	S	Implement Mitigation Measures 3.2-1a and 3.2-1c.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.2-5: Generate Other Emissions (Such as Those Leading to Odors) Adversely Affecting a Substantial Number of People</p> <p>Odors resulting from construction-generated diesel exhaust would be temporary and would dissipate quickly because of the highly dispersive properties of diesel PM. Operation of the project would not result in the generation of nuisance odors because residential land uses are not associated with the generation of odors. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

El Dorado County

Generations at Green Valley Project Draft EIR

ES-13

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Archaeological and Historical Cultural Resources			
<p>Impact 3.3-1: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of Unique Archaeological Resources</p> <p>Locus A and Locus B of historic-era archaeological site P-9-1140/CA-ELD-3016/H3 were recommended eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 1. Similarly, it was recommended that the precontact portion of P-9-5445 be treated as a resource under CEQA. Project-related ground-disturbing activities could result in damage to these and other yet-undiscovered archaeological resources as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-1a: Develop and Implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Training</p> <p>Green Valley Road Benefits shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for archaeologists to prepare a worker environmental awareness training. Training shall be provided to all construction personnel and supervisors who will have the potential to encounter and alter archaeological resources. A copy of the worker environmental awareness training shall be provided to the County before construction activities begin. The topics to be addressed in the worker environmental awareness training will include, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ types of cultural resources located on the project site, ▶ types of evidence that indicates cultural resources might be present (e.g., glass shards, lithic scatters), ▶ what to do if a worker encounters a possible resource, ▶ what to do if a worker encounters animal bones or possible human bones, and ▶ repercussions for removing or intentionally disturbing archaeological resources. <p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-1b: For All Ground-Disturbing Construction Activities, Halt Ground Disturbance upon Discovery of Subsurface Archaeological Features</p> <p>If any precontact or historic-era subsurface archaeological features or deposits, including locally darkened soil (“midden”), that could conceal cultural deposits are discovered during construction, all ground-disturbing activity within 100 feet of the resources shall be halted, and a qualified professional archaeologist shall be retained to assess the significance of the find. If the qualified archaeologist determines the archaeological material to be Native American in nature, Green Valley Road Benefits and the County shall contact the appropriate Native American tribe(s) for their input on the preferred treatment of the find. If the find is determined to be significant by the archaeologist (i.e., because it is determined to constitute a unique archaeological resource), the archaeologist shall develop, and Green Valley Road Benefits shall implement, appropriate procedures to protect the integrity of the resource and ensure that no additional resources are affected. Procedures could include but would not necessarily be limited to preservation in place (which shall be the preferred manner of mitigating impacts on archaeological sites), archival research, subsurface testing, or contiguous block unit excavation and data recovery (when it is the only feasible mitigation, and pursuant to a data recovery plan).</p>	<p>LTS</p>

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-1c: Establish an Archaeological Buffer for P-9-1140 and P-9-5445</p> <p>Before any ground-disturbing activities are conducted in the vicinity of the resources, a qualified archaeologist, in cooperation with a tribal monitor/consultant (if available), shall establish construction fencing around the rock outcrop containing two shallow milling cups of P-9-5445. This fencing shall be established five feet from the rock outcrop. In addition, a qualified archaeologist shall establish construction fencing around the CRHR-eligible portions of P-9-1140 (Loci A and B). This fencing shall be established five feet from the rock walls. After both fencings are established, the fencings shall be checked periodically to make sure they remain in place, as determined by the archaeologist. This will ensure that the Loci A and B from P-9-1140 and the rock outcrop from P-9-5445 continue to be avoided during project-related work. The fences shall remain in place until project work in the vicinity of the resources is complete; the fence should be checked fence removal shall be overseen by the archaeologist.</p>	
<p>Impact 3.3-2: Disturb Human Remains</p> <p>Based on documentary research, no evidence suggests that any precontact or historic-era marked or unmarked human interments are present on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site or in the off-site roadway and infrastructure improvement areas. However, ground-disturbing construction activities could uncover previously unknown human remains. Compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097 would make this impact less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
Biological Resources			
<p>Impact 3.4-1: Result in Disturbance to or Loss of Special-Status Plant Species</p> <p>Development of the project site, including ground disturbance associated with construction of residences, other buildings, roads, parking areas, and off-site improvement infrastructure (e.g., pipeline, conduit, cable), could result in direct removal of special-status plants or damage that results in the eventual loss of special-status plants if they are present on the project site. Because the loss of special-status plants could substantially affect the abundance, distribution, and viability of local and regional populations of these species, this impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-1: Conduct Special-Status Plant Surveys, and Implement Avoidance Measures and Mitigation</p> <p>The following requirements apply to the off-site improvement areas. However, if project activities in the main portion of the project site that was surveyed in 2021 do not commence prior to spring of 2025, these requirements shall apply to the entire project site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Before implementation of project construction activities and during the blooming period for the special-status plant species with potential to occur on the project site (Table 3.4-5), a qualified botanist shall conduct protocol-level surveys for special-status plants in the off-site improvement areas and shall resurvey the main project site following survey methods from CDFW’s Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts on Special-Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities (CDFW 2018 or most recent version). The qualified botanist shall (1) be knowledgeable about plant taxonomy; (2) be familiar with plants of the Sierra 	LTS

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation																																																																																																																																		
		<p>Nevada region, including special-status plants and sensitive natural communities; (3) have experience conducting floristic botanical field surveys as described in CDFW's protocol document; (4) be familiar with the California Manual of Vegetation (Sawyer et al. 2009 or current version, including updated natural communities data at http://vegetation.cnps.org/); and (5) be familiar with federal and state statutes and regulations related to plants and plant collecting.</p> <p>► If special-status plants are not found, the botanist shall document the findings in a report to the applicant and El Dorado County, and no further mitigation shall be required.</p> <p>Table 3.4-5 Typical Blooming Period for Special-Status Plants That May Occur on the Project Site</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1056 613 1827 1117"> <thead> <tr> <th>Species</th> <th>Jan</th> <th>Feb</th> <th>Mar</th> <th>Apr</th> <th>May</th> <th>Jun</th> <th>Jul</th> <th>Aug</th> <th>Sep</th> <th>Oct</th> <th>Nov</th> <th>Dec</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Jepson's onion</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Big-scale balsamroot</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Stebbins' morning-glory</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Red Hills soaproot</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dwarf downingia</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tuolumne button-celery</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pincushion navarretia</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Layne's ragwort</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sanford's arrowhead</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Note: This is the published blooming period for the species across their entire range and through history. The actual blooming period for any species at a given location in a given year is variable and should be based on observations of nearby reference populations.</p> <p>Source: Data compiled by Ascent in 2024; CNPS 2023.</p> <p>► If special-status plants are found during special-status plant surveys and cannot be avoided, the applicant shall, in coordination/consultation with CDFW or USFWS, as appropriate depending on species status, develop and implement a site-specific mitigation strategy to compensate for loss of occupied habitat or</p>	Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jepson's onion													Big-scale balsamroot													Stebbins' morning-glory													Red Hills soaproot													Dwarf downingia													Tuolumne button-celery													Pincushion navarretia													Layne's ragwort													Sanford's arrowhead													
Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec																																																																																																																									
Jepson's onion																																																																																																																																					
Big-scale balsamroot																																																																																																																																					
Stebbins' morning-glory																																																																																																																																					
Red Hills soaproot																																																																																																																																					
Dwarf downingia																																																																																																																																					
Tuolumne button-celery																																																																																																																																					
Pincushion navarretia																																																																																																																																					
Layne's ragwort																																																																																																																																					
Sanford's arrowhead																																																																																																																																					

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>individuals. Mitigation measures shall include, at a minimum, preserving and enhancing existing populations, establishing populations through seed collection or transplantation from the site that is to be affected, and/or restoring or creating habitat in sufficient quantities to offset loss of occupied habitat or individuals. Potential mitigation sites could include suitable locations within or outside the project site. Habitat and individual plants lost shall be mitigated at a minimum 1:1 ratio, considering acreage as well as function and value. The following success criteria shall be used for preserved and compensatory populations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The extent of occupied area and plant density (number of plants per unit area) in compensatory populations shall be equal to or greater than that in the affected occupied habitat. ▪ Compensatory and preserved populations shall be self-producing. Populations would be considered self-producing when: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plants reestablish annually for a minimum of 5 years with no human intervention, such as supplemental seeding; and • reestablished and preserved habitats contain an occupied area and flower density comparable to those in the existing occupied habitat areas in similar habitat types in the project vicinity. ▪ If off-site mitigation includes dedication of conservation easements, purchase of mitigation credits, or other off-site conservation measures, the details of these measures shall be included in the mitigation plan, including designating responsible parties for long-term management, conservation easement holders, long-term management requirements, success criteria, including at a minimum, those listed above and other details, as determined appropriate by a qualified biologist to target the preservation of long-term viable populations. <p>Documentation of the completion of the mitigation strategy and coordination/consultation process with CDFW or USFWS shall be provided to El Dorado County before commencement of any project construction activities.</p>	
<p>Impact 3.4-2: Result in Disturbance to or Loss of Special-Status Wildlife Species and Habitat</p> <p>Project implementation would include land use conversion and development activities including ground disturbance, vegetation removal, and overall conversion of wildlife habitat, which could result in disturbance, injury, or mortality of several</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2a: Conduct Protocol-Level Surveys for California Red-Legged Frogs, Implement Conservation Measures, and Consult with USFWS</p> <p>If construction does not start before July 2025, the following measures shall be implemented to minimize the likelihood of take of California red-legged frogs before and during project construction:</p>	<p>LTS</p>

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>special-status wildlife species if present, reduced breeding productivity of these species, and loss of species habitat. This impact would be significant.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The project applicant shall obtain a qualified biologist to repeat USFWS protocol surveys for California red-legged frog in accordance with the Revised Guidance on Site Assessments and Field Surveys for the California Red-Legged Frog (USFWS 2005) in the two on-site ponds, the seep, Green Spring Creek, and Allegheny Creek (i.e., within the off-site improvement area). ▶ If California red-legged frogs are not detected, then additional mitigation would not be required. If California red-legged frogs are detected, the following measures shall be implemented. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The project applicant shall consult with USFWS under Section 7 or Section 10 of the ESA. USACE is presumed to be the federal action agency because it has jurisdiction over the aquatic habitat on the project site (see Impact 3.4-4). If it is determined, in consultation with USFWS, that take of this species could occur after implementation of the conservation measures described below, then the project applicant may be required to obtain incidental take authorization through Section 7 consultation or a Section 10 permit pursuant to the ESA. In this case, the project shall not proceed until a Biological Opinion is issued by USFWS. ▪ The following Conservation Measures shall be implemented before and during project implementation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A biologist approved by USFWS (approved biologist) shall supervise and implement all conservation measures. All construction contracts shall expressly include language requiring compliance with the conservation measures. • At least 30 days before the start of project construction activities, the project applicant shall submit to USFWS the names and credentials of all biologists proposed to work on the project for approval. No project work shall begin until the project applicant has received approval from USFWS that biologists are qualified to implement the proposed conservation measures. • The approved biologist shall provide mandatory worker awareness training for all project construction personnel before work begins. The training shall describe, at a minimum, the biology, identification, and habitat needs of California red-legged frog and the conservation measures (e.g., avoidance measures, best management practices, notification protocols if California red-legged frogs are encountered) required to protect them. 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amphibian exclusionary fencing shall be installed between aquatic habitat (i.e., on-site ponds, seeps, Green Spring Creek, and Allegheny Creek) and the work area to prevent California red-legged frogs from dispersing from aquatic habitat into the active work area. The fencing shall be installed under the direction of the approved biologist. The exclusion fencing shall be maintained for the duration of project construction and shall be inspected by the biologist at least once per week. • The approved biologist shall survey the development area for California red-legged frog no more than 48 hours before the start of project construction work (i.e., visual encounter surveys using walking transects of the entire development area). If California red-legged frogs are detected during the survey, project construction activities shall cease within a buffer surrounding the individual the size of which shall be established by the qualified biologist, but shall be at least 100 feet, and CDFW and USFWS shall be notified. • Each morning before work begins, the approved biologist shall inspect all vehicles, heavy equipment, and stored pipes for the presence of California red-legged frogs. • The approved biologist shall be present at work areas during initial ground-disturbing activities within 500 feet of the on-site ponds, the seep, Green Spring Creek, and Allegheny Creek and shall be available to visit work areas at all other times in the event a California red-legged frog is encountered. • The approved biologist may designate biological monitors to oversee on-site compliance with all conservation measures. The approved biologist shall ensure that monitors receive appropriate training, including training on the identification of California red-legged frogs. If this species is encountered in work areas, biological monitors shall be authorized to stop any construction activities that may pose a threat to the animal, all equipment shall be turned off, and the approved biologist shall be notified immediately. Work shall not continue until the biologist has contacted CDFW and USFWS for guidance. • Project construction activities in areas where California red-legged frog occurs shall not occur during the rainy season, when California red-legged frogs may be active (typically November through March), unless the entire development area has been graded before the onset of winter rains. For 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>any work activities occurring after the onset of winter rains (i.e., usually mid-November, but variable from year to year), the approved biologist or biological monitor trained by the approved biologist shall be present at all times, even if ground-disturbing activities have been completed. Periodic monitoring may be acceptable, as approved by USFWS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a work area is to be dewatered by pumping (e.g., the ponds), intakes shall be completely screened with mesh not larger than 0.2 inch to prevent California red-legged frogs from entering the pump system. • Nighttime construction work shall not occur. • All food-related trash items shall be disposed of in secure, closed containers and removed regularly to reduce the potential to attract predators. After construction, all trash and construction debris shall be removed from work areas on the project site. • All refueling, maintenance, and staging of equipment and vehicles shall occur at least 60 feet from habitat adjacent to the project site that may be occupied by any life stage of the California red-legged frog. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional conservation measures may be recommended by USFWS during the consultation process, and these measures shall be implemented by the project applicant and shall supersede the measures described above. <p>Documentation of compliance with this mitigation measure and the consultation process with USFWS shall be provided to El Dorado County before commencement of any project construction activities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2b: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Coast Horned Lizard, Implement Avoidance Measures, and Relocate Individuals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Within 14 days before the initiation of any construction activity or off-site improvements, a qualified biologist familiar with the life history of coast horned lizard shall conduct a focused visual survey of habitat suitable for this species on the project site, which shall include walking linear transects of the site. ▶ If coast horned lizards are not detected during the focused survey, the qualified biologist shall submit a report summarizing the results of the survey to the applicant and El Dorado County, and further mitigation shall not be required. ▶ If coast horned lizards are detected, a qualified biologist with an appropriate CDFW Scientific Collecting Permit that allows handling of reptiles shall be present during initial ground disturbance activities and shall inspect the project site before initiation of project activities. If coast horned lizards are detected, the 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>qualified biologist shall move individuals into nearby suitable habitat that will not be disturbed by project activities.</p> <p>Documentation of compliance with this mitigation measure shall be provided to El Dorado County before commencement of any project construction activities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2c: Implement Conservation Measures for Foothill Yellow-Legged Frog and Consult with CDFW and USFWS</p> <p>Before and during activities associated with pond removal (e.g., pond dewatering, other in-water work) and other project construction activities (e.g., vegetation clearing, ground disturbance, staging, heavy equipment use) within approximately 50 feet of Green Spring Creek, Allegheny Creek (i.e., within the off-site improvement area), or the ponds, the following measures shall be implemented to minimize the likelihood of take of foothill yellow-legged frogs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Because the project site is within the range of foothill yellow-legged frog and dispersal habitat potentially suitable for this species is present on the project site (i.e., creeks), the project applicant shall obtain a qualified biologist to conduct focused surveys for foothill yellow-legged frog in accordance with <i>Visual Encounter Survey Protocol for Rana boylei in Lotic Environments</i> (Peek et al. 2017) or any official protocol subsequently released by CDFW or USFWS. Focused surveys shall be conducted when different life stages (e.g., egg masses, tadpoles, adults) of the species are most identifiable, which is during and immediately following the breeding season. To increase the likelihood of detection, at least three surveys will be conducted, including a survey during the breeding/oviposition period (April–June) prior to project implementation, a tadpole survey in the late spring/early summer (June through early August) prior to project implementation, and a survey for subadult and adult foothill yellow-legged frogs in the late summer (late August through early October) prior to project implementation. If any foothill yellow-legged frog life stage is detected during focused surveys, subsequent surveys would not be required and the project proponent would initiate consultation with CDFW and USFWS as described below. ▶ If foothill yellow-legged frogs are not detected during the focused surveys described above, within 24 hours of commencement of ground-disturbing activities and pond dewatering activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct a final pre-activity survey of Green Valley Creek and Allegheny Creek for foothill yellow-legged frogs (including egg masses, tadpoles, and adults). 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

El Dorado County

Generations at Green Valley Project Draft EIR

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ If foothill yellow-legged frogs are not detected during the focused surveys and pre-activity survey, then additional mitigation would not be required. If foothill yellow-legged frogs are detected during any of the above-described surveys, the following measures shall be implemented. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consultation with USFWS under Section 7 or Section 10 of the ESA shall occur. USACE is presumed to be the federal action agency because it has jurisdiction over the aquatic habitat on the project site (see Impact 3.4-4). If it is determined, in consultation with CDFW and USFWS, that take of foothill yellow-legged frog could occur after implementation of the conservation measures described below, then the project applicant may be required to obtain incidental take authorization through Section 7 consultation or a Section 10 permit pursuant to the ESA and through Section 2081 of the California Fish and Game Code pursuant to CESA. In this case, the project shall not proceed until a Biological Opinion is issued by USFWS. ▶ The following Conservation Measures shall be implemented before and during project implementation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A biologist approved by CDFW and USFWS (approved biologist) shall supervise and implement all conservation measures. All construction contracts shall expressly include language requiring compliance with the conservation measures. ▪ At least 30 days before the start of project construction activities, the project applicant shall submit to CDFW and USFWS the names and credentials of all biologists proposed to work on the project for approval. No project work shall begin until the project applicant has received approval from CDFW and USFWS that biologists are qualified to implement the proposed conservation measures. ▪ The approved biologist shall provide mandatory worker awareness training for all project construction personnel before work begins. The training shall describe, at a minimum, the biology, identification, and habitat needs of foothill yellow-legged frogs and the conservation measures (e.g., avoidance measures, best management practices, notification protocols if foothill yellow-legged frogs are encountered) required to protect them. ▪ Amphibian exclusion fencing shall be installed between aquatic habitat (i.e., Green Spring Creek, and Allegheny Creek) and the work area to prevent foothill yellow-legged frogs from dispersing from aquatic habitat into the active work area. The fencing shall be installed under the direction of the 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>approved biologist. The exclusion fencing shall be maintained throughout the life of the project construction and shall be inspected by the biologist at least once per week.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The approved biologist shall survey the development area for foothill yellow-legged frogs no more than 48 hours before the start of activities associated with pond removal (e.g., pond dewatering, other in-water work) and other project construction activities (e.g., vegetation clearing, ground disturbance, staging, heavy equipment use) within approximately 50 feet of Green Spring Creek, Allegheny Creek, or the ponds. If foothill yellow-legged frogs are detected during the survey, all project construction activities shall cease within a buffer surrounding the individual the size of which shall be established by the qualified biologist, but shall be at least 100 feet, and CDFW and USFWS shall be notified. • Each morning before work begins, the approved biologist shall inspect all vehicles, heavy equipment, and stored pipes for the presence of foothill yellow-legged frogs. • The approved biologist shall be present at work areas during all initial ground-disturbing activities within 50 feet of Green Spring Creek, Allegheny Creek, and the ponds and shall be available to visit work areas at all other times in the event that a foothill yellow-legged frog is encountered. • The approved biologist may designate biological monitors to oversee on-site compliance with all conservation measures. The approved biologist shall ensure that monitors receive appropriate training, including training on the identification of foothill yellow-legged frogs. If this species is encountered in work areas, biological monitors shall be authorized to stop any construction activities that may pose a threat to the animal, all equipment shall be turned off, and the approved biologist shall be notified immediately. Work shall not continue until the biologist has contacted CDFW and USFWS for guidance. • If a work area is to be dewatered by pumping (e.g., the ponds), intakes shall be completely screened with mesh not larger than 0.2 inch to prevent foothill yellow-legged frogs from entering the pump system. • Nighttime construction work shall not occur. • All food-related trash items shall be disposed of in secure, closed containers and removed regularly to reduce the potential to attract 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>predators. After construction, all trash and construction debris shall be removed from work areas on the project site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All refueling, maintenance, and staging of equipment and vehicles shall occur at least 50 feet from habitat adjacent to the development area (i.e., creeks) that may be occupied by any life stage of foothill yellow-legged frog. <p>▶ Additional conservation measures may be recommended by CDFW or USFWS during the consultation process, and these measures shall be implemented by the project applicant, and shall supersede the measures described above.</p> <p>Documentation of compliance with this mitigation measure and the consultation process with CDFW and USFWS shall be provided to El Dorado County before commencement of any project construction activities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2d: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Western Pond Turtle, Implement Avoidance Measures, and Relocate Individuals</p> <p>▶ Western pond turtles are known to occupy the ponds on the project site. Within 24 hours of commencement of ground-disturbing activities and pond dewatering activities, a qualified biologist familiar with the life history of western pond turtle and experienced in performing surveys for western pond turtle shall conduct a focused survey of aquatic and upland habitat suitable for the species on the project site, including segments of creeks that may be used as migration corridors for the species (i.e., Green Spring Creek, Allegheny Creek). The qualified biologist shall inspect the project site for western pond turtles, as well as suitable terrestrial nesting or overwintering habitat (i.e., burrows).</p> <p>▶ If a western pond turtle nest is observed within the project site during the preconstruction survey, the nest shall be fenced off and avoided until the eggs hatch or the nest is no longer active, as determined by a qualified biologist. The fenced area shall be open on one side with the opening facing the nearest aquatic habitat so that hatchling turtles can freely travel from the nest to the aquatic habitat. A qualified biologist shall monitor the nest area to ensure that hatchlings do not disperse into the construction area. Monitoring shall occur until the qualified biologist determines that the nest is no longer be active. If any hatchlings are observed on the project site, relocation of hatchlings shall occur as described in the encounter protocol below.</p> <p>▶ A qualified biologist shall be present during all pond dewatering activities and initial ground-disturbing activities to monitor these activities. If a western pond turtle is encountered, work shall be suspended in a 100-foot radius of the animal</p>	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>until the animal leaves the project site on its own volition. If necessary, a qualified biologist shall notify CDFW to determine the appropriate procedures related to relocation, which shall include, but not be limited to, obtaining a valid and applicable CDFW Scientific Collecting Permit. Any worker who inadvertently injures or kills a western pond turtle or who finds a western pond turtle dead, injured, or entrapped must immediately report the incident to the applicant, who must immediately notify CDFW. Entrapped western pond turtles shall be relocated by a qualified biologist with a valid and applicable CDFW Scientific Collecting Permit if approved by CDFW.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Because western pond turtle is proposed for listing under the ESA, if the species is listed before the completion of project construction activities that could result in injury to or mortality of turtles (i.e., pond dewatering, ground disturbance, grading, land conversion), then the project applicant may be required to consult with USFWS under Section 7 or Section 10 of the ESA. USACE is presumed to be the federal action agency because it has jurisdiction over the aquatic habitat on the project site (see Impact 3.4-4). If it is determined, in consultation with USFWS, that take of this species could occur after implementation of the measures described above, then the project applicant may be required to obtain incidental take authorization through Section 7 consultation or a Section 10 permit pursuant to the ESA. In this case, the project shall not proceed until a Biological Opinion is issued by USFWS. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any conservation measures developed in coordination with USFWS during the course of formal or informal consultation under Section 7 or during Section 10 consultation would supersede the measures listed here. ▪ Such conservation measures could include, but would not be limited to, seasonal work restrictions for initial ground disturbance, preconstruction surveys by a qualified biologist, installation of wildlife exclusion fencing, biological monitoring, and worker environmental awareness training. Additional measures could include preservation, restoration, or enhancement of habitat on- or off-site; purchase of habitat credits from an agency-approved mitigation/conservation bank; work with a local land trust to preserve land; or any other method acceptable to USFWS. ▶ If USFWS determines that listing of western pond turtle under ESA is not warranted, or the species is not listed prior to project completion, then the above measures related to consultation with USFWS would not be applicable. 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

El Dorado County

Generations at Green Valley Project Draft EIR

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>Documentation of compliance with this mitigation measure and the coordination/consultation process with CDFW and USFWS shall be provided to El Dorado County before commencement of any project construction activities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2e: Conduct Take Avoidance Survey for Burrowing Owl, Implement Avoidance Measures, and Compensate for Loss of Occupied Burrows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A qualified biologist shall conduct a focused survey for burrowing owls in accessible areas of habitat suitable for the species on and within 500 feet of the project site and off-site improvements no less than 14 days before initiating ground-disturbing activities using survey methods described in Appendix D of the CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 2012). Inaccessible areas (e.g., adjacent private property) will not be surveyed directly, but the biologist may use binoculars or a spotting scope to survey these areas. ▶ If no occupied burrows are found, the qualified biologist shall submit a report documenting the survey methods and results to the applicant and El Dorado County, and no further mitigation shall be required. ▶ If an active burrow is found within 500 feet of pending construction activities that would occur during the nonbreeding season (September 1 through January 31; i.e., the only season where burrowing owls are expected to occur on the project site), the applicant shall establish and maintain a minimum protection buffer of 164 feet around the occupied burrow throughout construction. The actual buffer size shall be determined by the qualified biologist based on the time of year and level of disturbance in accordance with guidance provided in the CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation, and may be as large as 1,640 feet (CDFW 2012). The protection buffer may be adjusted if, in coordination with CDFW, a qualified biologist determines that an alternative buffer would not disturb burrowing owl use of the burrow because of particular site features or other buffering measures. If occupied burrows are present that cannot be avoided or adequately protected with a no-disturbance buffer, a burrowing owl exclusion plan shall be developed, as described in Appendix E of the CDFW Staff Report. Burrowing owls shall not be excluded from occupied burrows until the project burrowing owl exclusion plan is approved by CDFW. The exclusion plan shall include a compensatory habitat mitigation plan (see below). ▶ If burrowing owls are evicted from burrows and the burrows are destroyed by implementation of project activities, the applicant shall mitigate the loss of occupied habitat in accordance with guidance provided in the CDFW Staff 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>Report, which states that permanent impacts on nesting, occupied and satellite burrows, and burrowing owl habitat (i.e., grassland habitat with suitable burrows) shall be mitigated such that habitat acreage and the number of burrows are replaced through permanent conservation of comparable or better habitat with similar vegetation communities and burrowing mammals (e.g., ground squirrels) present to provide for nesting, foraging, wintering, and dispersal. The applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to develop a burrowing owl mitigation and management plan that incorporates the following goals and standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mitigation lands shall be selected based on comparison of the habitat lost to the compensatory habitat, including type and structure of habitat; disturbance levels; potential for conflicts with humans, pets, and other wildlife; density of burrowing owls; and relative importance of the habitat to the species throughout its range. ▪ If feasible, mitigation lands shall be provided adjacent or proximate to the project site so that displaced owls can relocate with reduced risk of injury or mortality. The feasibility of providing mitigation adjacent or proximate to the project site depends on availability of sufficient habitat to support displaced owls that may be preserved in perpetuity. ▪ If habitat suitable for burrowing owl is not available for conservation adjacent or proximate to the project site, mitigation lands can be secured off-site and shall aim to consolidate and enlarge conservation areas outside planned development areas and within foraging distance of other conservation lands. Mitigation may also be accomplished through purchase of mitigation credits at a CDFW-approved mitigation bank, if available. Alternative mitigation sites and acreages may also be determined in coordination with CDFW. ▪ If burrowing owl habitat mitigation is completed through permittee-responsible conservation lands, the mitigation plan shall include mitigation objectives, site selection factors, site management roles and responsibilities, vegetation management goals, financial assurances and funding mechanisms, performance standards and success criteria, monitoring and reporting protocols, and adaptive management measures. Success shall be based on the number of adult burrowing owls and pairs using the site and whether the numbers are maintained over time. Measures of success, as suggested in the CDFW Staff Report, shall include site tenacity, the number 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>of adult owls present and reproducing, colonization by burrowing owls from elsewhere, changes in distribution, and trends in stressors.</p> <p>Documentation of compliance with this mitigation measure and the coordination process with CDFW shall be provided to El Dorado County before commencement of any project construction activities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2f: Conduct Focused Surveys for Special-Status Birds, Nesting Raptors, and Other Native Nesting Birds, and Implement Protective Buffers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ To minimize the potential for loss of special-status bird species, raptors, and other native birds, project activities (e.g., tree removal, vegetation clearing, ground disturbance, staging, construction of off-site improvements) shall be conducted during the nonbreeding season (approximately September 1 through January 31, as determined by a qualified biologist), if feasible. If project activities are conducted during the nonbreeding season, no further mitigation shall be required. ▶ Within 7 days before the onset of project activities during the breeding season (approximately February 1 through August 31, as determined by a qualified biologist), a qualified biologist familiar with birds of California and with experience conducting nesting bird surveys shall conduct focused surveys for special-status birds, other nesting raptors, and other native birds. Surveys shall be conducted in accessible areas within 1 mile of the project site for golden eagle, 0.25 mile of the project site for white-tailed kite, 500 feet of the project site for other raptor species and special-status birds, and 50 feet of the project site for non-raptor common native bird nests. ▶ If no active nests are found, the qualified biologist shall submit a report documenting the survey methods and results to the applicant and El Dorado County, and no further mitigation shall be required. ▶ If active nests are found, impacts on nesting birds shall be avoided by establishing appropriate buffers around active nest sites identified during focused surveys to prevent disturbance to the nest. Project activity shall not commence within the buffer areas until a qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged, the nest is no longer active, or reducing the buffer would not likely result in nest abandonment. Buffers typically shall be 1 mile for golden eagle, 0.25 mile for white-tailed kite, and 500 feet for other raptors. Buffer size for non-raptor bird species shall be determined by a qualified biologist. Factors to be considered for determining buffer size shall include presence of natural buffers provided by vegetation or topography, nest height 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>above the ground, baseline levels of noise and human activity, species sensitivity, and proposed project activities. Generally, buffer size for these species shall be at least 500 feet for tricolored blackbird colonies, 100 feet for other special-status bird species, and at least 20 feet for common bird species. The size of the buffer may be adjusted if a qualified biologist determines that such an adjustment shall not be likely to adversely affect the nest. Any buffer reduction for a special-status bird species shall require coordination with CDFW. Daily monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist during project activities shall be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest as determined by the qualified biologist, the buffer has been reduced, or if birds within active nests are showing behavioral signs of agitation (e.g., standing up from a brooding position, flying off the nest) during project activities, as determined by the qualified biologist.</p> <p>Documentation of compliance with this mitigation measure and any required coordination with CDFW shall be provided to El Dorado County before commencement of any project construction activities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2g: Implement Limited Operating Period, Conduct Focused Surveys, and Implement Avoidance Measures for Crotch’s Bumble Bee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Initial ground-disturbing work (e.g., grading, vegetation removal, staging, construction of off-site improvements) shall take place between August 15 and March 15, if feasible, to avoid impacts on nesting Crotch’s bumble bees. ▶ Regardless of the feasibility of the above limited operating period, a qualified biologist familiar with bumble bees of California and experienced using survey methods for bumble bees shall conduct a habitat assessment and focused survey for Crotch’s bumble bee before the start of any ground-disturbing activities. Surveys shall be performed when Crotch’s bumble bee is most likely to be identified, typically from April through August (i.e., the colony active period) when floral resources and ideal weather conditions are present, and shall follow the methods in Survey Considerations for California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Candidate Bumble Bee Species (CDFW 2023). Surveys shall be conducted during the colony active period closest to the start of planned construction activities. Survey results shall be submitted to the applicant and El Dorado County no less than 7 days before construction begins. ▶ The applicant shall submit a survey report to CDFW within 1 month of survey completion and shall notify CDFW and El Dorado County within 24 hours if Crotch’s bumble bees are detected. 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

El Dorado County

Generations at Green Valley Project Draft EIR

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>▶ If Crotch’s bumble bees are detected during the focused survey, appropriate avoidance measures shall be implemented. Avoidance measures shall include, but not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Protective buffers shall be implemented around active nesting colonies or overwintering queens until these sites are no longer active. A qualified biologist, in coordination with CDFW, shall determine the appropriate buffer size to protect nesting colonies or overwintering queens; however, the buffer shall be a minimum of 50 feet. <p>If impacts on Crotch’s bumble bee cannot be avoided, the applicant shall obtain an incidental take permit (ITP) from CDFW and shall implement all avoidance measures included in the ITP.</p> <p>Documentation of compliance with this mitigation measure and any required coordination with CDFW or acquisition of an ITP shall be provided to El Dorado County before commencement of any project construction activities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2h: Conduct Surveys for Milkweed Plants, Monarch Eggs, and Monarch Caterpillars, and Implement Avoidance Measures</p> <p>▶ If construction activities (e.g., ground disturbance, vegetation removal, staging) on the project site occur during the period when milkweed plants may host monarch eggs or caterpillars (approximately mid-March through late September) a qualified biologist shall survey the project site for milkweed plants. If milkweed plants are found, a qualified biologist shall inspect the milkweed plants for the presence of monarch eggs or caterpillars no more than 14 days before plant removal. If monarch eggs or caterpillars are detected, the milkweed plants shall be avoided until they are no longer being used by monarch caterpillars, as confirmed by a qualified biologist, if feasible. If no eggs or caterpillars are detected, no additional protection measures are necessary.</p> <p>Documentation of compliance with this mitigation measure shall be provided to El Dorado County before commencement of any project construction activities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2i: Conduct Focused American Badger Surveys, and Establish Protective Buffers</p> <p>▶ Within 14 days before commencement of project activities, a qualified wildlife biologist familiar with American badger and experienced using survey methods for the species shall conduct focused surveys of habitat suitable for the species on the project site to identify any American badger dens.</p>	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ If occupied dens are not found, the qualified biologist shall submit a report summarizing the results of the survey to the applicant and El Dorado County, and further mitigation shall not be required. ▶ If occupied dens are found, impacts on active badger dens shall be avoided by establishing exclusion zones around all active badger dens, the size of which shall be determined by the qualified biologist, but shall be a minimum of 100 feet. No project activities (e.g., vegetation removal, ground disturbance, staging) shall occur within the exclusion zone until denning activities are complete or the den is abandoned, as confirmed by a qualified biologist. The qualified biologist shall monitor each den once per week to track the status of the den and to determine when it is no longer occupied. When it is no longer occupied, project activities within the exclusion zone may occur. <p>Documentation of compliance with this mitigation measure shall be provided to El Dorado County before commencement of any project construction activities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2j: Conduct Focused Bat Surveys, and Implement Avoidance Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Within 14 days before any tree removal or removal of abandoned buildings, a qualified biologist familiar with bats and bat ecology, and experienced in conducting bat surveys, shall conduct surveys for bat roosts in suitable habitat (e.g., large trees, crevices, cavities, exfoliating bark, foliage, buildings) on and adjacent to the project site. ▶ If no evidence of bat roosts is found, the qualified biologist shall submit a report summarizing the results of the survey to the applicant and El Dorado County, and no further study shall be required. ▶ If evidence of bat maternity roosts or hibernacula is observed, the species and number of bats using the roost shall be determined by a qualified biologist using noninvasive methods. Bat detectors (i.e., acoustic monitoring) or evening emergence surveys shall be used if deemed necessary to supplement survey efforts by the qualified biologist. ▶ A no-disturbance buffer of 250 feet shall be established around active pallid bat, Townsend’s big-eared bat, or western red bat maternity roosts or hibernacula, as well as substantial maternity roosts or hibernacula of other bat species considered to be a wildlife nursery by the qualified biologist, and project activities shall not occur within this buffer until after the roosts are unoccupied as determined by a qualified biologist. 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>► If roosts of pallid bat, Townsend’s big-eared bat, or western red bat are determined to be present and must be removed, the bats shall be excluded from the roosting site before the tree is removed. A program addressing compensation, exclusion methods, and roost removal procedures shall be developed in coordination with CDFW before implementation. Exclusion methods may include use of one-way doors at roost entrances (bats may leave but not reenter) or sealing roost entrances when the site can be confirmed to contain no bats. Exclusion efforts may be restricted during periods of sensitive activity (e.g., during hibernation or while females in maternity colonies are nursing young). The loss of each roost (if any) resulting from the project shall be replaced in coordination with CDFW and may require construction and installation of bat boxes suitable to the bat species and colony size excluded from the original roosting site. If determined necessary during coordination with CDFW, replacement roosts shall be implemented before bats are excluded from the original roost sites. After the replacement roosts are constructed and it is confirmed that bats are not present in the original roost site by a qualified biologist, the roost tree or building may be removed. For roost trees, a two-step tree removal process supervised by a qualified biologist shall be implemented, including removal of all branches that do not provide roosting habitat on the first day, and removal of the remaining portion of the tree on the following day. Documentation of compliance with this mitigation measure shall be provided to El Dorado County before commencement of any project construction activities.</p>	
<p>Impact 3.4-3: Result in Degradation or Loss of Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Communities</p> <p>Project implementation would result in ground disturbance, vegetation removal, and land development, which also would result in removal of riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities. This impact would be significant.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-3a: Compensate for Loss of Valley Needlegrass Grassland</p> <p>The following measures shall be implemented before vegetation removal or ground-disturbing activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ► The applicant shall compensate for unavoidable loss of valley needlegrass grassland on the project site such that no net loss of habitat function occurs by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ restoring degraded valley needlegrass grassland outside the project site or on the project site at a ratio sufficient to offset the loss of habitat function (at least 1:1) or ▪ preserving existing valley needlegrass grassland of equal or better value to the sensitive natural community affected through a conservation easement at a ratio sufficient to offset the loss of habitat function (at least 1:1). ► Prepare and implement a Compensatory Mitigation Plan that includes the following elements: 	<p>LTS</p>

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ For preserving existing habitat outside the project site in perpetuity, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan shall include a summary of the proposed compensation lands (e.g., the number and type of credits, location of mitigation bank or easement), parties responsible for the long-term management of the land, and the legal and funding mechanism for long-term conservation (e.g., holder of conservation easement or fee title). The applicant shall provide evidence in the plan that the necessary mitigation has been implemented or that the applicant has entered into a legal agreement to implement it and that compensatory habitat shall be preserved in perpetuity. ■ For restoring or enhancing habitat outside the project site, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan shall include a description of the proposed habitat improvements, success criteria that demonstrate the performance standard of maintained habitat function (below) has been met, legal and funding mechanisms, and parties responsible for long-term management and monitoring of the restored or enhanced habitat. ■ The following success criteria shall be required to maintain habitat function for preserved and compensatory populations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The extent of occupied area and density of plants associated with the sensitive natural community (number of plants per unit area) in compensatory habitats shall be equal to or greater than the affected occupied habitat. ● Compensatory and preserved sensitive natural communities shall be self-producing. Populations would be considered self-producing when: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - plants associated with sensitive natural communities reestablish annually for a minimum of 5 years with no human intervention, such as supplemental seeding, and - reestablished and preserved habitats contain an occupied area and density comparable to existing occupied habitat areas in similar habitat types in the project vicinity. <p>Documentation of compliance with this mitigation measure shall be provided to El Dorado County before commencement of any project construction activities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-3b: Compensate for Loss of Riparian Habitat</p> <p>The following measures shall be implemented before vegetation removal or ground-disturbing activities:</p>	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A Streambed Alteration Notification shall be submitted to CDFW, pursuant to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code. If proposed project activities are determined to be subject to CDFW jurisdiction, the applicant shall abide by the measures to protect fish and wildlife resources required by any executed agreement before any vegetation removal or activity that may affect the resource. Measures to protect fish and wildlife resources shall include, at a minimum, a combination of the following mitigation. ▶ The applicant shall compensate for the loss of Fremont cottonwood riparian woodland habitat such that no net loss of habitat function and values occurs by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restoring and preserving degraded riparian habitat outside the project site or on the project site (at least 1:1); ▪ purchasing riparian habitat credits at a CDFW-approved mitigation bank (at least 1:1); or ▪ preserving existing riparian habitat of equal or better value to the affected riparian habitat through a conservation easement at a ratio sufficient to offset the loss of riparian habitat function (at least 1:1). ▶ The applicant shall prepare and implement a Compensatory Mitigation Plan that includes the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For preserving existing riparian habitat outside the project site in perpetuity, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan shall include a summary of the proposed compensation lands (e.g., the number and type of credits, location of mitigation bank or easement), parties responsible for the long-term management of the land, and the legal and funding mechanism for long-term conservation (e.g., holder of conservation easement or fee title). The applicant shall provide evidence in the plan that the necessary mitigation has been implemented or that the applicant has entered into a legal agreement to implement it and that compensatory habitat shall be preserved in perpetuity. ▪ For restoring or enhancing riparian habitat outside the project site, the Compensatory Mitigation Plan shall, at a minimum, include a description of the proposed habitat improvements, success criteria that demonstrate the performance standard of maintained habitat function has been met, legal and funding mechanisms, and parties responsible for long-term management and monitoring of the restored or enhanced habitat. ▪ Compensatory mitigation may be satisfied through compliance with permit conditions, or other authorizations obtained by the applicant (e.g., Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement), if these requirements are equally or more effective than the mitigation identified above. 	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		Documentation of compliance with this mitigation measure and receipt of a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW (or a letter from CDFW stating that such an Agreement is not required) shall be provided to El Dorado County before commencement of any project construction activities.	
<p>Impact 3.4-4: Result in Degradation or Loss of State or Federally Protected Wetlands</p> <p>Project implementation would result in ground disturbance, vegetation removal, and land development, which would result in removal (fill) of state and federally protected wetlands. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-4: Obtain Permits for Impacts on Wetlands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Authorization for fill of waters of the United States shall be secured from USACE and the RWQCB through the permitting processes for Clean Water Act Sections 401 and 404. In association with Section 404 and before the issuance of any grading permit, Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Central Valley RWQCB shall be obtained. For impacts on waters of the state that are not also waters of the United States and are therefore not covered by the 401 Water Quality Certification, the applicant shall apply to the RWQCB for Waste Discharge Requirements following the State Wetland Definition and Procedures for Discharges of Dredged or Fill Material to Waters of the State (State Water Resources Control Board 2021). Any waters of the United States or waters of the state that are affected by the project shall be replaced on a no-net-loss basis in accordance with the applicable USACE and State Water Resources Control Board mitigation standards in place at the time of construction. ▶ Before commencing activity that may divert the natural flow or otherwise alter the bed or bank of any lake or stream on the project site (e.g., Green Spring Creek), the applicant shall notify CDFW, through issuance of a Lake and Streambed Alteration Notification (notification). If CDFW determines, based on the notification, that project activities trigger the need for a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement, the project applicant shall obtain an agreement from CDFW before the activity commences. The applicant shall conduct project construction activities in accordance with the agreement, including implementing reasonable measures in the agreement necessary to protect fish and wildlife resources, when working within the bed or bank of waterways or in riparian habitats associated with those waterways. These measures may include, but not be limited to, demarcation of the construction area, biological monitoring, environmental awareness training for construction crews, and compensatory measures (e.g., restoration, long-term habitat management). <p>Agreement from CDFW, as well as wetland permitting from USACE, shall be provided to El Dorado County before commencement of any project construction activities.</p>	LTS

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.4-5: Interfere with Wildlife Movement Corridors or Impede the Use of Wildlife Nurseries</p> <p>Development of the project site would result in removal of natural habitat that has been identified as an ECA. Natural habitat on the project site may also provide roosting habitat for common bat species (i.e., in large oak trees). The project site likely does not function as a critical wildlife movement corridor, and the most significant feature contributing to habitat connectivity, Green Spring Creek, would be largely incorporated into open space areas and potentially restored after removal of human-made instream ponds. Impacts on bat roosts shall be addressed through mitigation described for impact 3.4-2. Therefore, the impact related to wildlife movement corridors and wildlife nurseries would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.4-6: Conflict with Local Policies and Ordinances</p> <p>Project implementation would result in removal of oak trees and oak woodlands and development in a rare plant mitigation area established by the County, which could result in conflict with the El Dorado County ORMP. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-6a: Compensate for Removal of Protected Oak Trees and Oak Woodlands Consistent with the El Dorado County ORMP</p> <p>Before removing oak trees or oak woodlands on the project site, the applicant shall implement the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The applicant shall submit a final version of the Oak Resources Technical Report and an Oak Resources Code Compliance Certificate to the El Dorado County Community Development Services Planning and Building Department that address all on-site and off-site oak tree and oak woodland impacts. ▶ Upon application approval, the applicant shall compensate for loss of protected oak trees and oak woodlands through any combination of in-lieu fees, conservation, and/or replanting, as required under the ORMP. <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-6b: Compensate for Impacts through In-Lieu Rare Plant Mitigation Fee Payment Consistent with the El Dorado County Code</p> <p>Before issuance of a building permit, the project applicant shall pay the current Rare Plant Mitigation Fee for the portions of the project area within Mitigation Area 1. This fee is currently \$885 per dwelling unit equivalent, but the fee may change before building permit application.</p>	LTS
Energy			
<p>Impact 3.5-1: Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy, During Project Construction or Operation</p> <p>Construction activities associated with the project would be temporary and would not increase long-term energy or fuel demand. Regarding operation, the project would comply with the energy efficiency requirements of both the 2022 CalGreen Code and the 2022 California Energy Code. However, because the project would</p>	S	Implement Mitigation Measures 3.7-1a and 3.14-2.	LTS

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>include natural gas utilities and would exceed the County's VMT threshold (resulting in greater fuel consumption than if project VMT were to be below the threshold), the project would increase the consumption of fossil fuels relative to existing conditions. This impact would be significant.</p>			
<p>Impact 3.5-2: Conflict With or Obstruct a State or Local Plan for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency</p> <p>Because natural gas is assumed to be included in the design and operation of the project, the project would conflict with the building decarbonization and fossil fuel reduction goals of both the 2022 Scoping Plan and the Energy Efficiency Action Plan and obstruct the implementation of these plans to achieve the State's goals of reducing fossil fuel consumption and increasing energy efficiency. Therefore, this impact would be significant.</p>	S	Implement Mitigation Measures 3.7-1a, 3.7-1b, and 3.14-2.	LTS
Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources			
<p>Impact 3.6-1: Result in Loss, Injury, or Death Resulting from Seismic Hazards</p> <p>The county is identified as having relatively low potential for seismic activity and a review of published geologic maps, in the General Plan EIR, and the Geotechnical Study confirm that project implementation is not likely to cause potential adverse effects associated with strong seismic shaking. Compliance with CBC requirements would ensure that potential adverse effects related to strong seismic shaking would be further minimized. In addition, the project site is not located on land prone to liquefaction or landslides, and due to the project site's underlying geology and slope stability, the potential damage related to liquefaction is considered negligible. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.6-2: Result in Substantial Soil Erosion or the Loss of Topsoil</p> <p>Because of the natural topographical gradients of the project site and proposed construction grading activities, soil erosion from development of the project's residential uses may occur on the site. However, compliance with SWRCB's Construction General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order WQ 2022-0057-DWQ) and County Code of Ordinances Chapter 110.14 (Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control) would ensure that impacts related to substantial erosion or the loss of topsoil during construction, operation, and maintenance would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.6-3: Be Located on Expansive Soil, Creating Substantial Direct or Indirect Risks to Life and Property or Located on a Geologic Unit or Soil That Is Unstable or That Would Become Unstable as a Result of the Project, and Potentially Result in On- or Off-Site Landslide, Lateral Spreading, Liquefaction, or Collapse</p> <p>Soil exploration and index testing analysis conducted for the Geotechnical Study confirmed that the soils on-site are nonexpansive soils. The project site is not located on an unstable geologic unit, and the Geotechnical Study found no evidence of slope instability. The project site is also not located on land susceptible to liquefaction or landslides, and due to the distance to the nearest lake and creek, lateral spreading also is considered negligible. As part of the County’s project approval and review process, a site-specific, project-specific final geotechnical report would be prepared. Any recommendations related to soil compaction or unstable soils would be incorporated into the project. As a result, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.6-4: Have Soils Incapable of Adequately Supporting the Use of Septic Tanks or Alternative Wastewater Disposal Systems Where Sewers Are Not Available for the Disposal of Wastewater</p> <p>One existing residence onsite would be demolished for the construction of the project, and its septic system would be properly abandoned in accordance with County requirements. A total of 7 five-acre lots proposed under the project would have on-site wastewater disposal systems. A on-site septic system analysis has been prepared for the project and the project would be subject to County Code of Ordinances Chapter 110.32 and the County’s OWTS Manual, both of which provide performance standards for OWTS to protect the environment and public health. Nevertheless, the Septic Study recommended that additional testing be completed to confirm the suitability of proposed wastewater disposal systems onsite. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-4: Complete Additional Percolation Exploration</p> <p>Prior to approval of the final map, the project applicant shall complete a septic feasibility analysis for proposed lots 2, 5, 6, and 7 to confirm that the proposed wastewater disposal areas are suitable for lots not covered during the original exploration.</p>	LTS
<p>Impact 3.6-5: Directly or Indirectly Destroy a Unique Paleontological Resource or Site or Unique Geologic Feature</p> <p>The project area is underlain by metavolcanic and ultramafic rocks of the Foothills Melange-Ophiolite Terrane of Late Paleozoic to Mesozoic age, limiting the potential for paleontological resources, which typically are found in sedimentary geologic conditions. Nevertheless, no comprehensive paleontological studies have been conducted in the county, and as a result, no information is available regarding the sensitivity of certain areas. As identified in the project site geotechnical investigations, the site consists of geologic conditions common in the</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-5a: Educate Construction Personnel in Recognizing Fossil Materials</p> <p>Before construction begins, the project applicant shall ensure that all construction workers who will be on-site during construction of the project receive training provided by a qualified paleontologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s qualifications to ensure that construction personnel can correctly identify fossilized materials in the event of inadvertent discovery. Proof of training shall be submitted to the County.</p>	LTS

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>region and does not contain unique geologic features. Although it is anticipated that the project does not contain unique paleontological resources, the potential to discover paleontological resources onsite still exists. This impact would be significant.</p>		<p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-5b: Implement Procedures for the Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources</p> <p>If any paleontological resources are encountered during development of the project, the construction contractor shall ensure that all activities in the immediate area of the find are halted and that the applicant and County are informed. The applicant shall then retain a qualified paleontologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s qualifications to evaluate the discovery, prepare a report evaluating the discovery, and include recommendations in the report pursuant to the guidelines established by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, including, if applicable, development and implementation of a paleontological resource impact mitigation program for treatment of the discovery.</p>	
<p>Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change</p>			
<p>Impact 3.7-1: Generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Either Directly or Indirectly, That May Have a Significant Impact on the Environment or Conflict With an Applicable Plan, Policy or Regulation Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing the Emissions of Greenhouse Gases?</p> <p>The project would result in GHG emissions during both construction and operational phases. Project-generated construction emissions would not exceed SMAQMD’s 1,100 MTCO₂ per year screening level; however, the project would not comply with the Tier 1 BMPs recommended by SMAQMD regarding electric development (BMP 1) and EV charging (BMP 2). Therefore, the project would be required to meet the criteria of SMAQMD’s Tier 2 BMP 3 which requires that the project meets the VMT reduction targets directed by OPR as legislated by SB 743. The project would not meet this target. For these reasons, this impact would be significant.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure 3.14-2: Implement a Transportation Demand Management Program</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.7-1a: Install CalGreen Tier 2-Compliant On-Site Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of construction permits, the project applicant shall incorporate the appropriate number of EV charging equipment to meet the Tier 2 requirements of Part 6 of the Title 24 California Building Code (CalGreen code) in effect at the time of project construction. Requirements by project component, are as follows:</p> <p>Residential Parking:</p> <p>For each dwelling unit, a dedicated 208/240-volt branch circuit shall be installed in the raceway (i.e., the enclosed conduit that forms the physical pathway for electrical wiring to protect it from damage) required by Section 4.106.4.1 of the CalGreen Code. The branch circuit and associated overcurrent protective device shall be rated at 40 amperes minimum. Other electrical components, including a receptacle or blank cover, related to this section shall be installed in accordance with the California Electrical Code.</p> <p>Clubhouse Parking:</p> <p>Based on the total number of parking spaces included in the design of the proposed clubhouse, the applicant shall use Table A5.106.5.3.2 in Appendix A5 “Nonresidential Voluntary Measures” of the CalGreen Code to determine the number of EV capable spaces required for the club house land use in order to meet the Tier 2 requirement. The applicant must install the appropriate number of EV capable spaces to comply with the required number of spaces determined by Table A5.106.5.3.2.</p>	<p>SU</p>

NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>Mitigation Measure 3.7-1b: Decarbonize Residential and Clubhouse Buildings or Purchase Offsets</p> <p>The applicant shall ensure that the project would be constructed without natural gas infrastructure. The County shall be responsible for ensuring that the applicant has met the conditions of this measure prior to the issuance of permits, as demonstrated in plan submittals for County review and approval.</p> <p>OR, if the implementation of the above is deemed to be economically or technically infeasible, the project at a minimum shall have all-electric appliances (e.g., heating and cooling systems, stoves/ovens, dishwashers, and water heaters) AND purchase carbon offsets to minimize the project’s emissions from natural gas combustion as detailed below.</p> <p>To the degree that a project relies on GHG mitigation measures, the County, EDCAPCD, and CARB recommend that lead agencies prioritize on-site design features, such as those listed under Mitigation Measures 3.7-1a and 3.7-1b and direct investments in GHG reductions within the vicinity of the project site to provide potential air quality and economic co-benefits locally. While emissions of GHGs and their contribution to climate change is a global problem, emissions of air pollutants, which have an adverse localized effect, are often emitted from similar activities that generate GHG emissions (i.e., mobile, energy, and area sources). For example, direct investment in a local building retrofit program could pay for cool roofs, solar panels, solar water heaters, smart meters, energy efficient lighting, energy efficient appliances, energy efficient windows, insulation, and water conservation measures for homes within the geographic area of the project. Other examples of local direct investments include financing the installation of regional EV charging stations, paying for electrification of public school buses, and investing in local urban forests. These investments would not only achieve GHG reductions but would also directly improve regional and local ambient air quality. However, to adequately mitigate GHG emissions by 27,120 MTCO_{2e} (30 years of GHG emissions), it is critical that any such investments in actions to reduce GHG emissions meet the criteria of being real, quantifiable, permanent, verifiable, enforceable, and additional, consistent with the standards set forth in Health and Safety Code section 38562, subdivisions (d)(1) and (d)(2). Such credits shall be based on protocols approved by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), consistent with Section 95972 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations. Such credits must be purchased through one of the following: (i) a CARB-approved registry, such as the Climate Action Reserve, the American Carbon Registry, and the</p>	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>Verified Carbon Standard; (ii) any registry approved by CARB to act as a registry under the California Cap and Trade program; or (iii) through the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association’s (CAPCOA’s) GHG Rx and EDCAPCD.</p> <p>Prior to issuing building permits for project development, the County shall confirm that the project developer has fully offset the project’s remaining GHG emissions from natural gas combustion by relying upon one of the following compliance options, or a combination thereof:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ demonstrate that the project developer has directly undertaken or funded activities that reduce or sequester GHG emissions that are estimated to result in GHG reduction credits (if such programs are available), and retire such GHG reduction credits in a quantity equal to the project’s remaining GHG emissions; ▶ provide a guarantee that it shall retire carbon credits issued in connection with direct investments (if such programs exist at the time of building permit issuance) in a quantity equal to the modified Phase 2 Project’s remaining GHG emissions; ▶ undertake or fund direct investments (if such programs exist at the time of building permit issuance) and retire the associated carbon credits in a quantity equal to the modified Phase 2 Project’s remaining GHG emissions; or ▶ if it is impracticable to fully offset the project’s GHG emissions through direct investments or quantifiable and verifiable programs do not exist, the project developer or its designee may purchase and retire carbon credits that have been issued by a recognized and reputable, accredited carbon registry in a quantity equal to the project’s remaining GHG Emissions. 	

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<p>Impact 3.8-1: Create a Significant Hazard through Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials or Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment through Reasonably Foreseeable Upset and Accident Conditions Involving the Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment</p> <p>Project construction activities and subsequent operation would involve hazardous materials. All hazardous materials used would be subject to the federal, state, and local requirements that provide protection measures to avoid impacts to the environment and public health. However, the project would require demolition of existing structures and other construction activities on the site that may contain asbestos building materials, lead paint, and other hazardous materials. This impact would be significant.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.8-1a: Remove Pit Debris and Conduct a Hazardous Building Materials Survey</p> <p>As part of site preparation for construction, debris identified in the pit near the residence at 1856 Green Valley Road will be removed and disposed of at a permitted landfill facility. Prior to any demolition of structures, A hazardous building materials survey shall be conducted by a qualified and licensed professional for all structures proposed for demolition under the project. All loose and peeling lead-based paint and asbestos-containing material (ACM) shall be abated by certified contractor(s) in accordance with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s asbestos National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) requirements, which specify mandatory work practices to be</p>	<p>LTS</p>
--	----------	---	------------

NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>followed during demolition and renovation of all structures, installations, and buildings, which protect the public and environment by minimizing the release of asbestos fibers during renovation and demolition activities (El Dorado County 2024b; USEPA 2024). All other hazardous materials shall be removed from buildings prior to demolition in accordance with County CUPA regulations. The completion of abatement activities shall be documented by a qualified environmental professional(s) and submitted to the County for review.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.8-1b: Require Soil Sampling If Stained Soil or Unusual Soil Odor Is Encountered During Construction of Off-Site Improvements</p> <p>If stained soils or unusual soil odors are encountered, halt work conditions would be implemented on the portions of the area with stained or odorous soils and a qualified geotechnical soils engineer shall conduct soil sample testing to confirm if there are any constituents that exceed established screening level thresholds. If any screening level thresholds are exceeded, the applicant shall coordinate with the County and other applicable regulatory agencies (e.g., Regional Water Quality Control Board and Department of Toxic Substances Control) to remediate the extent of soil contamination until such contamination is below all acceptable constituent screening levels.</p>	
<p>Impact 3.8-2: Emit Hazardous Emissions or Handle Hazardous or Acutely Hazardous Materials, Substances, or Waste within 0.25 Miles of an Existing or Proposed School</p> <p>Although there are no schools within 0.25-mile of the project site, construction materials (which would include hazardous materials) may be transported to the project site using local public streets, and as such, hazardous materials in association with the construction of the project may be handled via transport within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school located along these local public streets. Nevertheless, the handling and transportation of hazardous materials during construction would be subject to the requirements of the USDOT, and CHP. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.8-3: For a Project Located within an Airport Land Use Plan or, Where Such a Plan Has Not Been Adopted, Within 2 Miles of a Public Airport or Public Use Airport, Would the Project Result in a Safety Hazard or Excessive Noise for People Residing or Working in the Project Area</p> <p>The project site is not located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Because of this distance, the project site is not located within any of the three ALUCP, as discussed previously under Section 3.8.2, "Environmental Setting."</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>Therefore, construction and operation of the project would not have the potential to subject people residing or working in the project area to excess levels of aircraft noise. However, the project site is subject to the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAA), Part 77 notification area due to exceeding the slope ratio stated in Part 77 of Title 14 in the Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR 77). Project development is not expected to create new impacts to navigable airspace given the height of future residential structures in relation to topography, height of existing oak woodlands and overhead powerline facilities in the project area. This impact would be less than significant.</p>			
Hydrology and Water Quality			
<p>Impact 3.9-1: Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements Construction of the project, including off-site roadway and infrastructure improvements, would include earth-disturbing activities, which would result in the potential for increased erosion, runoff, and sedimentation on that site that could have subsequent effects on water quality. The project would be required to implement a SWPPP and associated BMPs to control erosion, reduce sedimentation and turbidity of surface runoff, and provide leak and spill protection for heavy equipment and hazardous material use. During operation, the project would be required to implement BMPs and LID measures in accordance with existing State and El Dorado County regulations, including the Grading Ordinance, the Design Manual, the Drainage Manual, and the West Slope Development and Redevelopment Standards and Post Construction Storm Water Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.9-2: Substantially Alter Drainage Patterns of the Project Site Such That Substantial Erosion and Siltation Would Occur Construction of the project and off-site improvements would include earth-disturbing activities that have the potential to result in soil erosion during excavation, grading, trenching, and soil stockpiling. Implementation of the project and the proposed off-site improvements would be subject to existing regulations pertaining to construction erosion control BMPs and post-construction stormwater runoff control, including the County's Grading Ordinance, the County SWMP's Construction Site Runoff Control Program, NPDES Construction General Permit, County's Design Manual, and MS4 permit requirements. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that the impacts associated with soil erosion and siltation on-site or off-site would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.9-3: Substantially Alter Drainage Patterns of the Project Site Such That Flooding On-Site or Off-Site Would Occur, or Flood Flows Would Be Impeded or Redirected</p> <p>Project components such as roads and houses would alter surface drainage patterns as a result of adding impermeable surface and altering flow patterns that could yield increased amounts of stormwater runoff resulting in on-site or off-site flooding. However, the Storm Drainage Evaluation prepared for the project concluded that the proposed drainage facilities incorporated into the project design would be sufficient to manage stormwater runoff on-site and would not result in adverse impact to downstream channels. The project would also not impede or redirect flood flows because the project is not located in flood hazard zone and the surface water flow would be managed by the proposed drainage facilities. Therefore, the impacts related to flooding on-site or off-site and impeding or redirecting flood flows would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.9-4: Conflict with or Obstruct Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan</p> <p>The Basin Plan implemented by the Central Valley RWQCB is a master policy document for managing water quality in the region. Folsom Lake is the closest waterbody to the project site and is identified in the Basin Plan with various beneficial uses. Folsom Lake is an impaired waterbody listed for mercury. Implementation of the project and the proposed off-site improvements would not use mercury containing materials and would not violate water quality standards as discussed in Impact 3.9-1. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
Land Use, Planning, and Agriculture and Forestry Resources			
<p>Impact 3.10-1: Cause a Significant Environmental Impact Because of a Conflict with Any Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation Adopted for the Purpose of Avoiding or Mitigating an Environmental Effect.</p> <p>Implementation of the project would include General Plan amendments and rezoning. These changes to the General Plan would not alter or conflict with General Plan land use policy provisions and would be consistent with the SACOG 2020 MTP/SCS. As identified in the Sections 3.1 through 3.17 of the Draft EIR, implementation of identified mitigation measures would address project consistency with the General Plan policy provisions that address environmental effects. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Noise and Vibration			
<p>Impact 3.11-1: Construction Activities Could Result in a Substantial Temporary Increase in Noise Levels at Nearby Noise-Sensitive Receptors</p> <p>Short-term construction-generated noise levels associated with the project would expose nearby noise-sensitive receptors to noise levels that could exceed the FTA’s recommended daytime construction noise criteria of 90 dB Leq. Thus, this impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.11-1: Implement Construction-Noise Reduction Measures</p> <p>To minimize noise levels during construction activities, the construction contractor shall comply with the following measures during all construction work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekends, and on federally recognized holidays. ▶ All construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers’ recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation. ▶ Where construction equipment with back-up alarms are available they shall be equipped with either audible self-adjusting backup alarms or alarms that only sound when an object is detected. Self-adjusting backup alarms shall automatically adjust to 5 dB over the surrounding background levels. All non-self-adjusting backup alarms shall be set to the lowest setting required to be audible above the surrounding noise levels. ▶ For all off-site improvement construction activities anticipated to occur within 31 feet of an existing residential land use, install a temporary solid barriers (e.g., plywood, noise curtains) around the construction site or construction equipment such that the line-of-sight between construction activities and the adjacent sensitive land uses is blocked ▶ Designate a disturbance coordinator and post that person’s telephone number conspicuously around the construction site and provide to nearby residences. The disturbance coordinator shall receive all public complaints and be responsible for determining the cause of the complaint and implementing any feasible measures to alleviate the problem. ▶ Restrict construction vehicle navigation to and from the project site to Green Valley Road so that heavy vehicles and equipment are not accessing the site via local roadways (as detailed in Mitigation Measure 3.14-3). 	SU
<p>Impact 3.11-2: Exposure of Persons to or Generation of Excessive Vibration</p> <p>The use of heavy-duty construction equipment can generate various increased vibration levels. According to the FTA, vibratory rollers generate ground vibration levels of 0.20 in/sec PPV at 25 feet. Based on modeling conducted, vibration levels from the use of a vibratory roller could exceed the threshold of significance of 0.2</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.11-2: Develop and Implement Construction Vibration Control Measures</p> <p>This mitigation measure would apply to construction activity within 73 feet of an occupied residence or other sensitive receptor.</p>	LTS

NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>in/sec PPV for structural damage within 26 feet and 80 VdB for human annoyance within 73 feet of any vibratory roller activities. Because the project site is directly adjacent to residential uses to the west and south, it cannot be guaranteed that construction would not occur within 73 feet of those sensitive receptors. Therefore, the impact would be significant.</p>		<p>Vibration control measures shall be identified prior to construction and implemented during construction for areas where sensitive receptors or structures are located (i.e., 75 feet from occupied residential structures and 26 feet from any structure). The vibration control measures shall be included in a program and provided to the County prior to construction activities. Vibration control measures shall consider all potential vibration-inducing activities that would occur within the distance parameter described above and include various measures, setback distances, precautions, monitoring programs, and alternative methods to vibration-intensive activities with the potential to result in adverse impacts to sensitive receptors or structures. The following vibration control measures (or other equally effective measures approved by the County) shall be included in the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ To prevent structural damage and disturbance for sensitive land uses, minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration producing activities (e.g., vibratory roller) shall be established based on the proposed activities and locations, once determined. Established setback requirements can be breached only if a project-specific, site-specific, technically adequate ground vibration study indicates that the buildings would not be exposed to ground vibration levels in excess of 0.2 PPV (in/sec) or 80 VdB, and ground vibration measurements performed during the construction activity confirm that the buildings are not being exposed to levels in excess of these limits. ▶ Limit vibration-intensive activities to the daytime hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday. ▶ Phase high-impact activities so as not to occur simultaneously with other construction activities. 	
<p>Impact 3.11-3: Exposure to Existing Sensitive Receptors to New Stationary Noise Sources</p> <p>Project related stationary noise would consist of recreational activities and HVAC mechanical equipment. Depending on the proximity of future HVAC equipment to neighboring sensitive receptors, HVAC noise levels could potentially result in an 8 dBA increase over existing noise levels and exceed the applicable County nighttime noise standard of 45 dBA Leq and 55 dBA Lmax for stationary noise sources. Therefore, stationary noise impacts would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.11-3: Heating, Ventilation, and Cooling Noise</p> <p>An acoustical assessment shall be required as part of building permit submittal associated with proposed HVAC equipment, subject to County review and approval prior to issuance of building permits. The acoustical assessment shall evaluate the potential operational noise impacts attributed to HVAC noise. The acoustical assessment shall be completed by a qualified acoustical consultant that shall verify that the chosen mechanical equipment for individual development projects would not exceed the county noise ordinance for stationary noise sources of 55 dB Leq and 70 dB Lmax (daytime) or 45 dBA Leq and 55 dBA Lmax (nighttime) at the receiving property line of the nearest sensitive receptor. Where the acoustical analysis determines that noise levels would exceed applicable noise standards,</p>	LTS

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		noise reduction measures shall be identified. Noise reduction measures may include, but are not necessarily limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Selecting equipment with sound power specifications that do not exceed the 45 dBA Leq or 55 dBA Lmax at the nearest noise-sensitive receptor. ▶ Installing the equipment at a distance no less than the 50 feet. ▶ Employing noise dampening techniques such as solid enclosures or parapets walls to block the line-of-sight between the noise source and the noise-sensitive receptors. Blocking the line of sight with a solid barrier or enclosure would reduce noise levels by at least 5 dBA. 	
<p>Impact 3.11-4: Long-Term Traffic Noise Increases</p> <p>Project operation would result in an increase in traffic volumes along project-affected roadways, resulting in long-term permanent increases in traffic noise. Traffic noise modeling was conducted for the existing and the existing plus project conditions. Based on modeling conducted and applicable County of El Dorado allowable incremental noise increase standards (General Plan Policy 6.5.1.12), a significant increase in noise would occur if traffic noise would increase by 1.5 dB Ldn to 5 dB Ldn depending on the existing noise level. None of the studied roadway segments would result in a traffic noise increase of 1.5 dB Ldn or more. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
Population and Housing			
<p>Impact 3.12-1: Induce Substantial Unplanned Population Growth in an Area, Either Directly or Indirectly</p> <p>The proposed project would consist of General Plan land use designation amendments, rezoning, and approval of a tentative subdivision map to create 379 residential lots. With the future development of the proposed residential lots, the proposed project would create population growth within the unincorporated area of El Dorado County. However, the County, through its General Plan, anticipates additional population growth over the next 20 years. The site is also part of assumed areas of development within the SACOG 2020 MTP/SCS. As such, the population growth increase associated with the project is considered to be within the County’s projected increase and no substantial unplanned population growth would occur. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS

NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Public Services and Recreation			
<p>Impact 3.13-1: Result in Increased Demand for Fire Protection Facilities and Services</p> <p>Implementation of the project would result in conversion of oak woodland and grassland into a residential neighborhood in the El Dorado Hills community and would add between 854 to 1,077 residents to the area. The location and additional population would increase the demand for fire protection and emergency services on-site. The project would be served by EDHFD and would be required to comply with County, State, and EDHFD fire protection requirements, as well as pay development fees. The project would not trigger a need for additional equipment or new fire protection facilities that would create a physical impact on the environment. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.13-2: Result in Increased Demand for Police Protection Facilities and Services</p> <p>Implementation of the project would result in the expansion of residential uses in the project area, increasing demand for law enforcement services. No reduction in law enforcement services to the project area would be expected. In addition, no additional facilities or equipment would be required by the project that would create a physical impact on the environment. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.13-3: Result in Increased Demand for Public School Facilities and Services</p> <p>Implementation of the project would result in 379 new residential units, which using the generation rates provided from the school districts, may lead to an increase of up to 38 students to EDUHSD and 212 students at RUSD. The project would not include any new school facilities or services but would introduce additional students to existing schools in EDUHSD and RUSD. EDUHSD and RUSD have capacity to increase student enrollment, even accounting for future development in El Dorado County. In addition, the project would be required to pay school impact fees to assist the school districts with meeting the increased demand for school services. Government Code Section 65995(h) states that the payment or satisfaction of a fee, charge, or other requirement levied or imposed under Section 17620 of the Education Code is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impact for the planning, use, development, or provision of adequate school facilities. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.13-4: Result in Increased Demand for Park Facilities and Services</p> <p>Implementation of the project would result in between 854 to 1,077 residents in the project area who would use parks and recreational facilities. The El Dorado County General Plan and County Code of Ordinances Chapter 120.12 require 5.0 acres of parks and recreation facilities per 1,000 residents for new residential development projects through land dedication and/or fees in lieu of land dedication for new development projects in El Dorado Hills CSD. The project design includes a 4.0-acre park and community clubhouse that would provide a variety of recreational resources and would be required to pay park dedication fees. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
Transportation			
<p>Impact 3.14-1: Conflict with a Program, Plan, Ordinance, or Policy Addressing the Circulation System, Including Transit, Roadway, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities</p> <p>The project includes the implementation of pedestrian facilities on the project site, as well as off-site improvements consistent with General Plan policies. Additionally, the project would be subject to, and constructed in accordance with, applicable County roadway design and safety guidelines. The project would not permanently alter the physical transportation network external to the project site such that existing and planned bicycle, pedestrian, and transit services would be adversely affected. For these reasons, the impact on transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.14-2: Conflict or Be Inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) Regarding Vehicle Miles Traveled</p> <p>Construction activities would be temporary and intermittent and thus would not result in long-term increases in vehicular trips. The average number of construction trips generated would be 60 per day and therefore would satisfy the screening threshold for small projects as established by the OPR Technical Advisory and adopted by reference in County Resolution 141-2020. The VMT Memo determined that implementation of the project would result in a residential VMT per capita of 19.6. Therefore, implementation of the project would exceed the significance threshold of 19.1 VMT per capita for residential uses (i.e., 15 percent below the existing county VMT per capita) as identified in County Resolution 141-2020. For this reason, the project would conflict with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.14-2: Implement a Transportation Demand Management Program</p> <p>Before issuance of the first building permit in the first phase of development, the applicant shall develop a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program for the project and shall submit the TDM program to El Dorado County for review and approval. The TDM program must be designed to achieve a 3-percent reduction in daily vehicle miles traveled generated by the proposed residential uses.</p> <p>The project’s homeowners association (HOA) shall be responsible for implementing the TDM program and included in the covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs). The HOA shall be responsible for funding and overseeing the delivery of trip reduction/TDM proposed programs and strategies to achieve the trip reduction objective, which may include, but shall not be limited to, the following strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ School Pool Programs: Organize a program that matches families in carpools for school pick-up and drop-off; 	SU

NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Subsidized Transit Program: Provide either partially or fully subsidized transit passes for all residents who request them and shall publicize the availability of transit passes to residents in periodic communications; and ▶ Voluntary Travel Behavior Change Program: The HOA shall provide educational materials (e.g., brochure) to new homebuyers that target individual attitudes towards travel and provide tools for individuals to analyze and alter their travel behavior. <p>The HOA shall submit an annual status report on the TDM program to El Dorado County beginning 1 year after the issuance of any certificate of occupancy and continuing until full project buildout. Data shall be collected in October of each year and submitted by December 31 of each year. The report shall be prepared in the form and format designated by the County, which must either approve or disapprove the program within 90 days. The HOA shall conduct household travel surveys to determine TDM program participation, estimated mode shares, and trip reduction levels. The survey instrument and monitoring plan shall be reviewed and approved by the County before implementation. The HOA shall also develop and implement a program to monitor daily traffic volumes entering and exiting project site, to be conducted annually and which shall take into account ongoing construction traffic, as appropriate, through coordination with on-site construction contractors.</p>	
<p>Impact 3.14-3: Substantially Increase Hazards Due to a Geometric Design Feature (e.g., Sharp Curves or Dangerous Intersections) or Incompatible Uses (e.g., Farm Equipment)</p> <p>The project would involve the construction of a new residential subdivision in the El Dorado Hills community with 379 residential lots, 214 of which would be age restricted. The project would be subject to, and constructed in accordance with, applicable roadway design and safety guidelines. However, because the project could increase transportation hazards during construction and operations, this impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.14-3: Prepare and Implement a Construction Traffic Control Plan</p> <p>Prior to project construction, the project contractor(s) shall prepare and implement a detailed construction traffic control plan subject to review by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation. The traffic control plan shall demonstrate appropriate traffic handling during construction activities for all work that could impact the traveling public (e.g., the transport of equipment and materials to the project area). The traffic control plan shall minimize hazards through industry-accepted traffic control practices and, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Include coordination with the responsible agency departments, including the County Department of Transportation and El Dorado Hills Fire Department no less than 10 days prior to the start of the work for each phase to specify whether any temporary vehicle, pedestrian, or bicycle construction detours are needed. ▶ Describe the proposed work zone; detours and/or lane closures if applicable; signalized and non-signalized intersections affected by the work; and trucks, including the number and size of trucks per day, expected arrival/departure times, and truck circulation patterns (i.e., restrict construction vehicle navigation 	LTS

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		to and from the project site to Green Valley Road so that heavy vehicles and equipment are not accessing the site via local roadways). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Identify all staging areas. ▶ Provide flag personnel where warranted. ▶ Utilize portable message signs and information signs at construction sites as needed. ▶ Provide appropriate tapers and lengths, signs, and spacing. ▶ Provide appropriate channelization devices and spacing. ▶ Provide work hours/workdays. ▶ Provide proposed speed limit changes, if applicable. ▶ Ensure that adequate emergency vehicle access to all surrounding parcels and properties is always maintained. 	
<p>Impact 3.14-4: Result in Inadequate Emergency Access</p> <p>Fire services would be provided by the El Dorado Hills Fire Department. The project would be required to meet standards and regulations identified in the California Fire Code, as adopted by Fire Department Ordinance 2022-01, including provisions related to maintaining emergency access during construction and operations. Additionally, the project design would be subject to review by the County and emergency service agencies; thus, ensuring that the project would be designed to meet all applicable emergency access design standards. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
Utilities and Service Systems			
<p>Impact 3.15-1: Cause Environmental Impacts from Construction of New Infrastructure</p> <p>The project would include the construction of on-site and off-site infrastructure improvements that would result in significant environmental impacts. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	SU	As noted above, several mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures 3.2-1a, 3.2-1b, 3.2-1c, 3.2-1d, 3.3-1a, 3.3-1b, 3.4-1, 3.6-5a, 3.6-5b, 3.8-1, 3.11-1, and 3.11-2) would reduce impacts associated with construction, including that associated with off-site infrastructure. However, as noted in Section 3.11, "Noise," there are no additional, feasible mitigation measures to reduce Impact 3.11-1 due to the proximity of off-site receptors.	SU
<p>Impact 3.15-2: Have Sufficient Water Supplies</p> <p>Water supplies from EID would be adequate to serve buildout of the project under average, dry, and multiple-dry years based on the EID 2022 Water Supply and Demand Report and the EID 2020 UWMP. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS

NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.15-3: Impacts on Available Wastewater Treatment Capacity Implementing the project would create an additional 86,640 gallons of wastewater per day at buildout. This additional wastewater flow to the EDHWWTP could be accommodated in the plant’s current permitted capacity of 4.0 mgd. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.15-4: Impacts on Solid Waste Facility Capacity and Compliance with Regulations Related to Solid Waste Implementing the project would increase the county’s population and associated solid waste generation. County solid waste facilities and the Potrero Hills Landfill have capacity to accommodate the project. In addition, the project would be required to comply with and participate in the El Dorado Hills CSD’s and County’s solid waste handling and diversion programs, which would reduce the amount of waste disposed of at the landfill. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
Tribal Cultural Resources			
<p>Impact 3.16-1: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource Tribal consultation under AB 52 has not resulted in the identification of tribal cultural resources on the project site. However, excavation activities associated with project construction may disturb or destroy previously undiscovered significant subsurface tribal cultural resources. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.16-1: Protect Previously Undiscovered Tribal Cultural Resources Implement Mitigation Measure 3.3-1b. Mitigation Measure 3.16-1b: Establish a Buffer for P-55-5445’s Rock Outcrop Implement Mitigation Measure 3.3-1c.</p>	LTS
Wildfire and Evacuation			
<p>Impact 3.17-1: Physically Interfere with or Substantially Impair an Adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan The project would include circulation improvements and development of an emergency access/egress at Lima Way to serve as a secondary means of emergency access and evacuation, and two emergency vehicle access road connections in addition to proposed access to Green Valley Road. The project-specific WES concluded that implementation of the project is not anticipated to create substantial traffic congestion and time delays that extends into the evacuation zone and would not impede clearing within the evacuation zone. However, the El Dorado County Sheriff’s Office has identified the need for special traffic signal operations during an evacuation to improve traffic flow along the Green Valley Road corridor. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.17-1: Participate in Green Valley Road Traffic Signal Improvements for Evacuation To assist in timely evacuations, prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall coordinate with the El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) and El Dorado County Sheriff’s Office, Office of Emergency Services (OES) to identify the infrastructure needed to remotely trip the traffic signals to green at Green Valley Road at Silva Valley Parkway, El Dorado Hills Boulevard, Francisco Drive, at Pleasant Grove Middle School, and Silver Springs Parkway. The applicant shall fund the necessary infrastructure and said infrastructure shall be installed prior to building permit issuance, to the satisfaction of El Dorado County DOT and OES. The County shall attempt to identify additional funding sources to assist in the funding of these improvements.</p>	LTS

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.17-2: Exacerbate Wildfire Risks due to Slope, Prevailing Winds, and Other Factors, and Thereby Expose Project Occupants to Pollutant Concentrations from a Wildfire or the Uncontrolled Spread of a Wildfire</p> <p>Project site development would result in construction and operational activities that could introduce new ignition sources that could increase wildfire hazards. The project would implement its Fire Safe Plan that addresses potential impacts resulting from wildland fire hazards and identifies measures necessary to mitigate these hazards. Implementation of the project and the associated Fire Safe Plan would not exacerbate wildfire risk, nor would it substantially increase the likelihood that the project would expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.17-3: Exacerbate Wildfire Risks or Result in Temporary or Ongoing Impacts to the Environment due to the Installation or Maintenance of Associated Infrastructure</p> <p>The project would include on-site and off-site infrastructure improvements, including EA roads, water, wastewater, and electrical improvements, and internal roadway improvements. The extension of public water service would improve the ability to combat potential fire incidents on-site. In addition, implementation of the project's Fire Safe Plan would involve vegetation management that would be required to comply with biological protection criteria established in the Fire Safe Plan and mitigation measures identified in this Draft EIR. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.17-4: Expose People or Structures to Significant Risks of Loss, Injury, or Death, Involving Wildland Fire or Risks Including Downslope or Downstream Flooding or Landslides, as a Result of Runoff, Post-Fire Slope Instability, or Drainage Changes</p> <p>As discussed in Impacts 3.17-1 and 3.17-2, implementation of the project would not substantially exacerbate wildfire risk. The project would improve conditions related to on-site wildfire risk through vegetation fuel modification and implementation of the fire prevention strategies identified in the Fire Safe Plan. A post-fire condition of the project site is not expected with implementation of the Fire Safe Plan that would create site instability that would expose people or structures to significant risks of loss, injury, or death due to wildland fire or to risks related to downslope, flooding, or landslides. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required for this impact.	LTS

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

El Dorado County

Generations at Green Valley Project Draft EIR

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Cumulative Impacts			
Impact 4-1: Contribute to Cumulative Visual Character Impacts		The project’s contribution to substantial changes to visual character impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-2: Contribute to Cumulative Lighting and Glare Impacts		The project’s contribution to substantial changes to lighting and glare impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-3: Contribute to Cumulative Conflicts with or Obstruction of Implementation of an Applicable Air Quality Plan		The project’s contribution to cumulative conflicts with the 2030 Ozone Plan would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-4: Contribute to Cumulative Construction Air Quality Impacts		The project’s contribution to cumulative construction air quality impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-5: Contribute to Cumulative Operational Air Quality Impacts		The project’s contribution to cumulative operational air quality impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-6: Contribute to Cumulative Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants, Naturally Occurring Asbestos, Carbon Monoxide, and Odor		The project’s contribution to cumulative exposure to TACs, NOA, carbon monoxide, and odor impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-7: Contribute to Cumulative Impacts on Historical and Archaeological Resources and Human Remains		The project’s contribution to any significant cumulative impact related to cultural resources (archaeological resources) or human remains would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-8: Contribute to Cumulative Impacts on Biological Resources		The project’s contribution to cumulative oak woodland loss identified in the Biological Resources Policy Update and ORMP Final EIR would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable. No additional feasible mitigation measures are available to address this cumulative impact.	
Impact 4-9: Contribute to Cumulative Energy Impacts		The project’s contribution to cumulative energy impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact 4-10: Contribute to Cumulative Impacts on Paleontological Resources		The project's contribution to cumulative impacts on paleontological resources would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-11: Contribute to Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Impacts		The project's contribution to cumulative GHG and climate change impacts would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable. No additional feasible mitigation measures are available to address this cumulative impact.	
Impact 4-12: Contribute to Cumulative Hazard and Hazardous Material Impacts		The project's contribution to cumulative hazard and hazardous material impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-13: Contribute to Cumulative Water Quality Impacts		The project's contribution to cumulative water quality impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-14: Contribute to Cumulative Drainage and Flooding Impacts		The project's contribution to cumulative drainage and flooding impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-15: Contribute to Cumulative Land Use and Planning Impacts		The project's contribution to cumulative land use and planning impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-16: Contribute to Cumulative Construction Noise and Vibration Impacts		The project's contribution to cumulative construction noise and vibration impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-17: Contribute to Cumulative Traffic Noise Impacts		The project's contribution to cumulative traffic noise impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-18: Contribute to Cumulative Operational Noise Impacts		The project's contribution to cumulative operational noise impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-19: Contribute to Cumulative Population and Housing Impacts		The project's contribution to cumulative population growth impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

El Dorado County

Generations at Green Valley Project Draft EIR

ES-55

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact 4-20: Contribute to Cumulative Fire Protection Impacts		The project’s contribution to cumulative fire protection services impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-21: Contribute to Cumulative Law Enforcement Impacts		The project’s contribution to cumulative law enforcement services impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-22: Contribute to Cumulative Public School Impacts		The project’s contribution to cumulative public school service impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-23: Contribute to Cumulative Park and Recreation Impacts		The project’s contribution to cumulative public park and recreation impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-24: Contribute to Cumulative Impacts on Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities		The project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-25: Contribute to Cumulative Impacts on Vehicle Miles Traveled		The project’s contribution to cumulative VMT impacts would be cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable. No additional feasible mitigation measures are available to address this cumulative impact.	
Impact 4-26: Contribute to Cumulative Geometric Design Hazard Impacts		The project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on design hazards would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-27: Contribute to Cumulative Emergency Access Impacts		The project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on emergency access would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-28: Contribute to Cumulative Water Supply Impacts		The project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on water supply would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-29: Contribute to Cumulative Wastewater Service Impacts		The project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on wastewater service would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact 4-30: Contribute to Cumulative Solid Waste Impacts		The project's contribution to cumulative impacts on solid waste service would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-31: Contribute to Cumulative Tribal Cultural Resource Impacts		The project's contribution to cumulative impacts on tribal cultural resources would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	
Impact 4-32: Contribute to Cumulative Wildfire and Evacuation Impacts		The project's contribution to cumulative impacts on wildfire hazards and evacuation would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation is required for this impact.	

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

El Dorado County

Generations at Green Valley Project Draft EIR

ES-57

This page is intentionally left blank.