CHAPTER 2.0 DRAFT EIR TEXT CHANGES

Since release of the Draft EIR (DEIR) on May 1, 2003, the following changes have been made to clarify, amplify, and/or provide minor technical corrections to the first three volumes. In the case where information is deleted, it is shown in ~~strikeout~~ format. Where information is added, it is underlined.

The following changes are shown sequentially (by page number) in the order in which they appear in the DEIR. These changes are also referenced in Chapter 4.0 (Responses to Comments) where appropriate. A revised copy of Table 2-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigations Measures is provided in Appendix A.

DEIR VOLUME 1, Chapter 1 through Section 5.6

Page xix: The eighth line is revised as shown:

~~APCD Air Pollution Control District~~
AQMD Air Quality Management District.

Chapter 2, Summary Table – See revised Summary Table for each equal-weight alternative in Appendix A of this Response to Comment document.

Chapter 3, See revised Exhibits 3-5, 3-7, 3-9, 3-10, and Tables 3-9, 3-10, 3-11, and 3-12 in Appendix C.

Page 3-1, the third sentence of the paragraph under **3.2.1 Regional Location** is revised as follows:

> The City of Folsom ~~city of Sacramento~~ is just west of the county's westernmost border.

Page 3-7, the third bullet is revised as follows:

> Commercial development and other nonresidential development may be approved provided that it is consistent with the land use designations of the 1996 General Plan and the land use designations and policies of the ~~January 11, 1994,~~ "Public Review Draft General Plan", accepted by the Board of Supervisors on January 11, 1994, and ~~it~~ would not significantly impair the County's ability to adopt and implement a new General Plan.

Page 3-15: the top paragraph is revised as follows:

> …provisions. As required by Government Code Section 65302, ~~the Land Use Element considers~~ flooding and timber production issues~~. These issues~~ are ~~also~~ addressed in the Health, Safety and Noise Element (flooding) and the Agricultural and Forestry Element (timber production).

Page 3-15, the last two sentences of the first partial paragraph on the page are revised to read as follows:

> As required by Government Code §65302, the Land Use Element considers flooding (by reference to the Health, Safety and Noise Element) and timber production issues. These issues are also addressed in the Health Safety and Noise Element (flooding, as mentioned above) and the Agricultural and Forestry Element (timber production).

Page 3-24, the last paragraph is revised as follows:

> The residential density ranges remain the same for all of the alternatives. Maximum nonresidential floor-area ratios (FAR), defined as the ratio between building size and lot size, are established for ~~the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" and Environmentally Constrained alternatives, but were not included in the 1996 General Plan, and therefore are not a part of the No Project and No Project and 1996 General Plan~~ each of the alternatives. The maximum research and development FAR is 0.3 for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and 0.2 for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, ~~but otherwise the FAR designations for these two alternatives are the same~~ and establish a range of FAR for commercial and industrial, as described in Table 3-3, below. With the exception of research and development, the FAR standards are the same for these two alternatives. The No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives establish a 0.25 FAR for commercial, industrial, and research and development.

Page 5.1-13, second bullet, has been modified to read as follows:

- a grading permit under the Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance (County Code §15.14), if the project would disturb more than ~~300~~ 250 yards of soil;

Page 5.1-27, Table 5.1-5, second paragraph under Eldorado National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, is revised as follows:

> All non-jurisdictional land in Eldorado National Forest is also given a General Plan jurisdiction of Natural Resources because land is frequently traded between ~~the County~~ private landowners and USFS. This designation ensures that these lands are protected appropriately for the type of anticipated use.

Pages 5.1-34 and 5.1-35, the following text is added at the end of Mitigation Measure 5.1-1 for both the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Environmentally Constrained Alternative:

> **New Implementation Measure:** Create a joint powers authority (JPA) or other mechanism to coordinate with the incorporated cities within the county regarding land use activities and compatibility, capital improvement programs, and funding opportunities within the spheres of influence of the cities.

Page 5.1-48, Mitigation Measure 5.1-2 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is revised as follows:

> Please refer to the proposed Mitigation Measure 5.1-2 for the No Project Alternative above. Additionally, add the following new implementation measure:
>
> **New Implementation Measure:** Develop and implement a program that addresses preservation of community separation, as outlined in this new policy. The program shall address provisions for a parcel analysis and parcel consolidation/transfer of development rights.
>
> For the same reasons as expressed above, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Page 5.1-48, Mitigation Measure 5.1-2 of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is revised as follows:

> Please refer to the proposed Mitigation Measure 5.1-2 for the ~~No Project Alternative~~ Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative above. For the same reasons as expressed above, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Page 5.1-51, the third full paragraph is revised as follows:

> The 5-acre minimum parcel size allowed under the Low Density Residential designation provides minimal buffering between residential and agricultural or timber uses. A 5-acre parcel is 217,801 square feet (sf), or approximately 330 feet by 660 feet for a typical parcel. A single-family residence adjacent to agricultural uses on the 660-foot side would require a 200-foot buffer, leaving 130 feet on the 330-foot side from the edge of the buffer area to the far edge of the parcel. If the 330-foot side were adjacent to an agricultural use as well, a 200-foot buffer could not be attained. Administrative relief could be granted, but the residential use may still be disturbed by the adjacent activity. This illustration demonstrates the ~~potential difficulty~~ difficulties of adequately buffering a 5-acre residential parcel from activities that could disturb the occupants.

Page 5.1-67, the text under Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(d), Policy LU-3n (Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative)/Policy LU-3o (Environmentally Constrained Alternative), is revised to add the following:

> D. Industrial public facility uses such as wastewater treatment facilities shall be considered appropriate in the Industrial and Natural Resources land use designations. Water storage facilities shall be considered appropriate in all land use designations where size and design are compatible with the setting.

Page 5.2-22, the text under ***Wineries Ordinance*** is revised as follows:

> The Wineries Ordinance (County Code Section 17.14.200) was also adopted in January 2001 to provide for the development of wineries and encourage agricultural and tourism industries within the county. Wineries were previously regulated under the 1986 provision of the Ranch Marketing Ordinance. Wineries are permitted by right within the agricultural zone districts SA-10, ~~SA~~AP, PA, AE, ~~and all commercial zones except Professional Office Commercial (CPO) zoning. The wineries must be~~ when located on parcels of 20 acres or more, with a minimum of 5 acres of planted grapes. Wineries are also permitted by right in all commercial zones except Professional Office Commercial (CPO). Tasting rooms and other accessory uses (such as tours, promotional events, and special events involving up to 250 people) are permitted by right ~~within the~~ on commercially ~~and agricultural~~ zoned parcels ~~districts~~ and on agriculturally zoned parcels of 20 acres or more.

Page 5.2-60, Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(c) is changed as follows:

> Revised Policy 8.1.3.4: A threshold of significance for loss of agricultural land shall be established by the Agriculture Department and the Planning Department, with opportunity for public comment before adoption, to be used in rezone applications requesting conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural lands…

Page 5.2-60, Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(d) is changed to add the following text immediately following Revised Policy 8.1.3.2:

> In addition, the County shall revise Policy 8.1.4.1 of the Agriculture and Forestry Element of the General Plan as follows:
>
> > **Policy 8.1.4.1** The County Agricultural Commission shall review all discretionary development applications and the location of proposed public facilities involving land zoned for or designated agriculture ~~agricultural district and Williamson Act Contract land~~, or lands adjacent to such lands, and shall make recommendations to the reviewing authority. Before granting approval, a determination shall be made by the approving authority that the proposed use:

A. Will not intensify existing conflicts or add new conflicts between adjacent residential areas and agricultural activities; and

B. Will not create an island effect wherein agricultural lands located between the project site and other non-agricultural lands will be negatively affected; and

C. Will not significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to agricultural lands.

This change would have the effect of ensuring that compatibility reviews take place for all lands zoned for agricultural use not simply those lands located in agricultural districts.

Pages 5.2-61 and 62, the text following Mitigation Measure 5.2-1 Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is revised as shown:

Mitigation Measure 5.2-1—Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" Alternative
The County shall implement all of the following measures:

- Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(a): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a)
- Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(b): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b)
- Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(c): Identify Acceptable Mitigation for Loss of Agricultural Land
- Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(d): ~~Implement Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(d) of the No Project Alternative~~ Provide Additional Protection for Agricultural Use
- Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(e): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(e) of the No Project Alternative
- Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(f): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(f) of the No Project Alternative

Page 5.2-62, at the bottom of the page, Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(d) of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(d): ~~Implement Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(d) of the No Project Alternative~~ Provide Additional Protection for Agricultural Use

~~Please refer to the proposed Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(d) for the No Project Alternative above.~~ The County shall revise Implementation Measure AF-A of the Agriculture and Forestry Element of the General Plan as follows:

…

2. Provisions that address suitable densities of and setbacks on lands adjacent to agriculturally-zoned lands to protect current and future agricultural production on those agricultural lands. The County may impose setbacks greater than those provided in the Zoning Ordinance where needed to protect agricultural resources. Administrative relief to any agricultural setback may be granted when reasonable use of the property would otherwise be denied. New parcels cannot be created unless the size of the new parcel is large enough to allow for an adequate setback from surrounding agriculturally zoned lands.

…

In addition, the County shall revise Item 2 of Implementation Measure AF-E of the Agriculture and Forestry Element of the General Plan as follows:

MEASURE AF-E
Develop a procedure for the Agricultural Commission to review and provide recommendations regarding discretionary projects that may affect agricultural, grazing, and forestry lands including all lands zoned for agriculture. [Policies AF-1d, AF-1f, AF-1g, and AF-4a]

Page 5.2-63, the following text at the top of the page under Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(e) is revised as follows:

Adopt a new policy with the same text as Revised Policy 8.1.3.2 presented in ~~Please refer to the~~ proposed Mitigation Measure ~~5.2-1(e)~~ 5.2-1(d) for the No Project Alternative above.

Page 5.2-63, the following text is added under Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(f):

Please refer to the proposed Mitigation Measure 5.2-1(f) for the No Project Alternative above. Additionally, revise Measure AF-A to add the following after item 7:

8. Standards for agricultural fencing on residential parcels adjoining grazing lands.

Page 5.2-64, table at the top of the page, Mitigation Measure 5.2-2 is clarified as follows:

5.2-2: Limit Extent of Ranch Marketing Activities, Wineries, and Other ~~None~~Agricultural Promotional Uses within Agricultural Designations

Page 5.2-65, the third paragraph is revised as follows:

Policies 8.2.2.1(E) and 8.2.2.1(F) allow for ranch marketing and visitor-serving activities in agricultural areas. According to the Ranch Marketing Ordinance (County Code § 17.14.180), ranch marketing activities are permitted by right in

SA-10, PA, and AE zones on parcels of 10 acres or more where 5 acres are in permanent crop production or where 10 acres are in annual crop production. In addition, the Ranch Marketing Ordinance (County Code § 17.14.180) and Wineries Ordinance (County Code § 17.14.190) identify various land uses that require site plan review or a special use permit in agricultural areas. ~~No minimum parcel size is required for visitor-serving uses.~~ Under the Wineries Ordinance (County Code § 17.14.200), minimum parcel size is 20 acres and at least 5 acres must be planted in wine grapes for commercial production.

Page 5.2-69, Mitigation Measure 5.2-2 is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 5.2-2: Limit Extent of Ranch Marketing Activities, Wineries, and Other Agricultural Promotional Uses within Agricultural Designations ~~and Require Compatibility Review~~

Page 5.2-69, Mitigation Measure 5.2-2 of the No Project Alternative is revised to add the following text immediately following the proposed new policy:

In addition, the County shall revise Policy 8.2.4.3 of the Agriculture and Forestry Element of the General Plan as follows:

Policy 8.2.4.3 Visitor serving uses may include but are not limited to: recreational fishing, camping, stables~~, golf courses~~ and other similar uses, lodging facilities, and campgrounds.

Page 5.2-69, the last paragraph of Mitigation Measure 5.2-2 of the No Project Alternative is revised as follows:

With implementation of this mitigation measure impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level because the amount of agricultural land converted to ranch marketing uses would be limited and because golf courses (which are not related to agriculture) would not be listed as an appropriate use of agricultural land.

Page 5.2-69, Mitigation Measure 5.2-2 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is revised as follows:

Please refer to the new policy in the proposed mitigation measure for the No Project Alternative above. Additionally, revise Measure AF-E as follows:

Revised Measure AF-E: Develop a procedure for the Agricultural Commission to review and provide recommendations regarding ~~discretionary~~ projects that may affect agricultural, grazing, and forestry lands. The procedure shall include a compatibility review for ranch marketing, winery, and visitor-serving uses to ensure that the proposed use will not affect agricultural production on surrounding properties. The procedure shall also include compatibility requirements for AE

(Exclusive Agriculture) zoned land, pursuant to California Government Code Section 51238.1.

With implementation of this mitigation measure…

Page 5.2-69, Mitigation Measure 5.2-2 for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is revised as follows:

Please refer to the new policy in the proposed mitigation measure for the No Project Alternative above. Additionally, revise Measure AF-E as shown for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. With implementation of this mitigation measure…

Page 5.2-80, the first paragraph under "Forest Products and Logging Industry", is revised as follows:

El Dorado County's timberlands provide economic benefits for businesses and residents of the county by serving as a ~~major~~ source of employment (i.e., the logging industry) and providing the raw material for forest products, including lumber for construction. El Dorado County has several lumber mills, including ~~three~~ two that produce high volumes of lumber for national and international markets.

Page 5.2-84, the following text is added to the end of the first paragraph under El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance heading:

The County's Timberland Preserve Zone district is intended to identify Timberland Production Zones, consistent with the California Forest Taxation Reform Act.

Page 5.2-84, the fourth sentence in the first paragraph under California Forest Taxation Reform Act of 1976 is revised as follows:

CDF has jurisdiction over timber harvest and timberland conversion decisions in TPZs~~, which it passes down to county agriculture departments~~.

Page 5.2-85, the first paragraph is revised as follows:

Although the Forest Taxation Reform Act is a State regulation, the County has jurisdiction to develop and establish criteria and standards unrelated to the conduct of timber operations that apply to TPZs within its purview. TPZs encompass approximately 149,000 acres in the county (Shih 2002). Although ~~the County~~ CDF makes harvest and conversion decisions in TPZs, ~~CDF~~ the County participates in the process as a responsible agency.

Page 5.2-89, the following change is made to Impact 5.2-4 in the table at the top of the page:

5.2-4: Conversion of Timberland, Including Lands Currently in Timber Production and Lands Zoned for Timber Production to Nonforestry Uses

Page 5.3-24, the following change is made to Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(b):

The County shall revise Policies 2.6.1.1, 2.6.1.3, and 2.6.1.6 as follows:

…

Revised Policy 2.6.1.3: Until such time as the Scenic Corridor Ordinance is adopted, the County shall review all projects within designated State Scenic Highway corridors for compliance with State criteria. Discretionary projects reviewed prior to the adoption of the Scenic Corridor Ordinance that would be visible from any of the important public scenic viewpoints identified in Table 5.3-1 and Exhibit 5.3-1 of the El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report shall be subject to design review, and all policies relating to the protection of scenic corridors shall be applicable to such projects until scenic corridors have been established.

Page 5.3-25, the following change is made to Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(c):

Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(c): Extend Limitations on Ridgeline Development within Scenic Corridors or Identified Viewing Locations to Include All Development

Revised Policy 2.6.1.5: All development on ridgelines shall be reviewed by the County for potential impacts on visual resources. Visual impacts will be assessed and may require methods such as setbacks, screening, low-glare or directed lighting, automatic light shutoffs, and external color schemes that blend with the surroundings ~~or other methods~~ in order to avoid visual breaks to the skyline.

Page 5.3-25, the following text is added under Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(b) of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative after the last word on the page:

Additionally, add the following new implementation measure:

New Implementation Measure: Pursuant to the California Department of Transportation procedures, prepare documentation in support of having that segment of SR 49 within El Dorado County identified as a State Scenic Highway.

Page 5.3-26, the following change is made to Mitigation Measure 5.3-1(c):

> …and off-premise sign amortization. Discretionary projects reviewed prior to the adoption of the Scenic Corridor Ordinance that would be visible from any of the important public scenic viewpoints identified in Table 5.3-1 and Exhibit 5.3-1 of the El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report shall be subject to design review, and all policies relating to the protection of scenic corridors shall be applicable to such projects until scenic corridors have been established. [Policies LU-6a, LU-6b, LU-6c, and LU-6d]

Page 5.3-39, Mitigation Measure 5.3-3(b) is revised as follows:

> The County shall revise Policy LU-6f as follows:
>
> **Revised Policy LU-6f:** Development shall limit excess nighttime light and flare from parking area lighting, signage, and buildings. Consideration will be given to design features, namely directional shielding for street lighting, parking lot lighting, sport field lighting, and other significant light sources, that could reduce effects from nighttime lighting. In addition, consideration will be given to the use of automatic shutoffs or motion sensors for lighting features in rural areas to further reduce excess nighttime light.

Page 5.4-9, the second paragraph is revised as follows:

> Commercial bus service is provided by ~~Greyhound and~~ Amtrak~~. Greyhound services Placerville customers with pickups and drop-offs~~ at the Placerville Station on Mosquito Road~~. Greyhound will stop~~ by reservation only ~~on the way to and from Lake Tahoe. Amtrak also services customers at the Placerville Station~~ for customers who need to catch a bus to the Amtrak station in Sacramento~~, also by reservation only~~.

Page 5.4-10, the first paragraph under "Nonmotorized Transportation System" is revised as follows:

> The nonmotorized transportation system in El Dorado County is composed of local and regional bikeways and trails. ~~Bicycles and other forms of nonmotorized transportation have not been widely used as a transportation mode for commuting in the county, except by students commuting to school~~. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, approximately 2.5 percent of all trips from home to work are made by bicycling or walking in El Dorado County. The Census also indicates that the number of trips to work in the county by bicyclists and pedestrians dropped from 2,160 in 1990 to 1810 in 2000. This decline ~~is likely~~ may be a result of the county's low-density development pattern in the north, east and southern portions of the county and related lack of investment in bicycle and pedestrian facilities. It may also be due to safety issues that are perceived as a result of increased traffic due

to population growth in denser portions of the County. Most bicycling and walking in the county takes place for recreational or social purposes…

Page 5.4-13, the third paragraph under "Regional" is revised as follows:

"~~Because of fiscal constraints, s~~ Some major transportation projects identified in the proposed General Plan circulation diagrams for each alternative are not included in the MTP and RTP due to various factors including funding constraints, environmental concerns or impacts, political support, and uncertainty related to the need for the improvement. After adoption of the General Plan, transportation projects that are not in the current MTP will need to be added at a future ~~the next~~ MTP update.

Page 5.4-15, the first full paragraph is revised as follows:

The *Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor ~~Draft~~ Master Plan* (El Dorado County Transportation Commission ~~2002~~ 2003) outlines a strategy for interim and long-term uses for the former Sacramento-Placerville railroad corridor…The ~~draft~~ master plan identifies multiple uses including excursion trans, trails and utility easements.

Page 5.4-25, the first paragraph, second sentence, is revised as follows:

…On a county-wide average, ~~M~~most new development will be ~~very~~ low density (less than one unit per acre) ~~and will not be conducive to travel by bicycle, on foot or via transit~~.

Page 5.4-38, the second paragraph is revised as follows:

A review of the Circulation Elements for each General plan alternative did not reveal potential internal policy inconsistencies or inconsistencies with other adopted plan or programs supporting the provision of nonmotorized transportation facilities or services in El Dorado County. ~~In general, bikeway, trail and equestrian plans prepared for the county recognized its low-density development patterns and recommendations have been developed for facilities that are consistent with this pattern.~~ None of the proposed General Plan alternatives would preclude attainment of the objectives of these plans…

Page 5.4-44, the following change is made to Mitigation Measure 5.4-1:

Mitigation Measure 5.4-1—No Project Alternative

The County shall implement one or more of the following mitigation measures:

- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(a): Amend the Circulation Diagram to Include a New Arterial Roadway from El Dorado Hills Business Park to U.S. 50

- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b): Add New Growth Control Implementation Measure

- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c): Modify LOS Policies and Expand List of Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F

- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(d): Amend the Circulation Diagram to Include a Frequent Transit Service on Exclusive Right-of-Way to the El Dorado Hills Business Park

- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(e): Amend Traffic and Circulation Element to establish alternative LOS Policies to take effect in 2009 if proposed policies are not approved by the voters

Page 5.4-46, the first line is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c): Modify LOS Policies and Expand List of Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F.

Page 5.4-46, Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(d) of the No Project Alternative is revised to include:

New Implementation Measure: Identify any right-of-way that may be needed for establishment of a frequent transit service operating on exclusive right-of-way to the El Dorado Hills Business Park from residential communities in El Dorado County and from the City of Folsom. Modify Circulation Map to include the identified right-of-way.

Page 5.4-46, the following text is added at the end of the page:

Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(e): Amend the General Plan Circulation Element in each of the General Plan alternatives to: (1) apply Measure Y policies through 2008; (2) provide for the possible readoption of those policies in 2008; (3) provide alternative level of service and concurrency policies that will take effect in 2009 if the Measure Y policies are not extended; and (4) require a detailed traffic monitoring and development review program to ensure that new development does not lead to traffic levels that violate the applicable level of service standards.

New Policy: In the Goals and Policies section (beginning on page 50), delete policies 3.2.1.5, 3.2.2.4, 3.2.2.5, 3.5.1.6.1, and 3.5.1.6.2.

Insert the following after Policy 3.5.1.7 (on page 57):

LEVELS OF SERVICE AND CONCURRENCY

In 1998 El Dorado County voters adopted an initiative measure known as Measure Y, the "Control Traffic Congestion Initiative." The initiative added several policies to the former General Plan intended to require new development to fully pay its way to prevent traffic congestion from worsening in the County. The initiative provided that the new policies should remain in effect for ten years and that the voters should be given the opportunity to readopt those policies for an additional 10 years. The policies in this section reflect the voters' intent in adopting Measure Y by (1) applying the Measure Y policies through 2008, (2) providing for the possible readoption of those policies in 2008, and (3) providing alternative policies that will take effect in 2009 if the Measure Y policies are not extended.

GOAL 3.X: To coordinate planning and implementation of roadway improvements with new development to maintain adequate levels of service on County roads.

Policy 3.X.1.1a The following policies shall remain in effect until December 31, 2008 unless extended by the voters prior to that time

1. Traffic from residential development projects of five or more units or parcels of land shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county.

2. The County shall not add any additional segments of U.S. Highway 50, or any other highways and roads, to the County's list of roads (shown in the Table in Policy 3.X.1.6) that are allowed to operate at Level of Service F without first getting the voters' approval.

3. Developer-paid traffic impact fees shall fully pay for building all necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development upon any highways, arterial roads and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county.

4. County tax revenues shall not be used in any way to pay for building road capacity improvements to offset traffic impacts from new development projects. Exceptions are allowed if county voters first give their approval.

5. Before giving approval of any kind to a residential development project of five or more units or parcels of land, the County shall make a finding that the project complies with the policies above. If this finding cannot be made, then the County shall not approve the project in order to protect the public's health and safety as provided by state law to assure that safe and adequate roads and highways are in place as such development occurs.

Policy 3.X.1.6 TABLE
El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F[1]

Road Segment(s)		Max. V/C[2]
Cambridge Road	Country Club Drive to Oxford Road	1.07
Cameron Park Drive	Robin Lane to Coach Lane	1.11
Missouri Flat Road	U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive	1.12
	Mother Lode Drive to China Garden Road	1.20
Pleasant Valley Road	El Dorado Road to State Route 49	1.28
U.S. Highway 50	Canal Street to junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street)	1.25
	Junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street) to Coloma Street	1.59
	Coloma Street to Bedford Avenue	1.61
	Bedford Avenue to beginning of freeway	1.73
	Beginning of freeway to Washington overhead	1.16
	Ice House Road to Echo Lake	1.16
State Route 49	Pacific/Sacramento Street to new four-lane section	1.31
	U.S. Highway 50 to State Route 193	1.32
	State Route 193 to county line	1.51

Policy 3.X.1.6 TABLE **El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F[1]**	
Road Segment(s)	**Max. V/C[2]**
Notes: [1]Roads improved to their maximum width given right-of-way and physical limitations. [2]Volume to Capacity ratio.	

Policy 3.X.1.1b To ensure that potential development in the County does not exceed available roadway capacity, the County shall:

A. Prepare an annual Capital Improvement Program (CIP) specifying roadway improvements to be completed within the next 10 years to ensure compliance with all applicable level of service and other standards in this plan, identifying improvements expected to be required within the next 20 years, and specifying funding sources sufficient to develop the improvements identified in the 10 year plan;

B. Annually monitor traffic volumes on the county's major roadway system depicted in the Circulation Diagram; and

C. Review development proposals to ensure that the development would not generate traffic in excess of that contemplated by the Capital Improvement Program for the next ten years or cause levels of service on any affected roadway segments to fall below the levels specified in this plan.

Policy 3.X.1.1c The following policies shall take effect upon the expiration of the policies in Policy 3.X.1.1a

1. Traffic from residential development projects shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county except as specified in the Table in Policy 3.X.1.1c.

2. Additional segments of U.S. Highway 50 and other highways and roads may be added to the Table in Policy 3.X.1.1c only upon approval of a majority of the Board of Supervisors.

3. Developer-paid traffic impact fees shall pay for the portion of road capacity improvements, which would not be paid for through other County revenue sources, necessary to offset and mitigate the traffic impacts reasonably attributable to new development upon any highways, arterial roads and

their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county

Policy 3.X.1.1c TABLE El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service E[1]		
Road Segment(s)		**Max. V/C[2]**
Latrobe Road	Carson Creek to White Rock Road	1.21
	White Rock Road to U.S. Highway 50	1.18
White Rock Road	County Line to Latrobe Road	1.18
U.S. Highway 50	Canal Street to junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street)	1.13
	Bedford Avenue to beginning of freeway	1.04
	Beginning of freeway to Washington overhead	1.07

Notes:

[1]Roads improved to their maximum width given right-of-way and physical limitations.

[2]Volume to Capacity ratio.

Policy 3.X.1.1d Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions except as specified in Table shown in the Table in Policy 3.X.1.6 or, after December 31, 2008, the Table in Policy 3.X.1.1c. The volume to capacity ratio of the roadway segments listed in Tables shown in the Table in Policy 3.X.1.6 and the Table in Policy 3.X.1.1c as applicable shall not exceed the ratio specified in that table. Level of Service will be as defined in the latest edition of the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council) and calculated using the methodologies contained in that manual. Analysis periods shall be based on the professional judgment of the Department of Transportation which shall consider periods including, but not limited to, Weekday Average Daily Traffic (ADT), AM Peak Hour, and PM Peak hour traffic volumes.

Policy 3.X.1.1e For the purposes of this Transportation and Circulation Element, "worsen" is defined as any of the following number of project trips using a road

facility at the time of issuance of a use and occupancy permit for the development project:

a. a 2 percent increase in traffic during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour, or daily, or
b. the addition of 100 or more daily trips, or
c. the addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour.

Policy 3.X.1.1f Prior to issuance of any building permits for development that worsens traffic on the County road system, the developer shall do one of the following: (1) construct all road improvements necessary to regional and local roads needed to maintain or attain Level of Service standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element; or (2) ensure adequate funding is encumbered for the necessary road improvements and those projects are programmed. The determination of compliance with this requirement shall be based on existing traffic plus traffic generated from the project and from other reasonably foreseeable projects.

Policy 3.X.1.1g Each development project shall dedicate right-of-way and construct or fund improvements necessary to mitigate the effects of traffic from the project. The County shall require an analysis of impacts of traffic from the development project, including impacts from truck traffic, and require dedication of needed right-of-way and construction of road facilities as a condition of the development. For road improvements that provide significant benefit to other development, the County may allow a project to fund its fair share of improvement costs through traffic impact fees or receive reimbursement from impact fees for construction of improvements beyond the project's fair share. The amount and timing of reimbursements shall be determined by the County.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(e) would reduce this impact to a less-than- significant level.

Page 5.4-47, the following change is made to Mitigation Measure 5.4-1:

Mitigation Measure 5.4-1—Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative

The County shall implement one or more of the following mitigation measures:

- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(a): Amend the Circulation Diagram to Include a New Arterial Roadway from El Dorado Hills Business Park to U.S. 50

- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b): Add New Growth Control Implementation Measure

- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c): Expand List of Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F

- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(d): Amend the Circulation Diagram to Include a Frequent Transit Service on Exclusive Right-of-Way to the El Dorado Hills Business Park

- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(e): Amend Traffic and Circulation Element to establish alternative LOS Policies to take effect in 2009 if proposed policies are not approved by the voters

These mitigation measures are described below.

Page 5.4-47, the paragraph following Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(a) is revised as follows:

Please refer to the proposed Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(a) for the No Project Alternative. Additionally, add the following new implementation measure:

New Implementation Measure: Work with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), Sacramento County and the City of Folsom to identify potential alignments for a new arterial roadway from the west side of El Dorado Hills Business Park to U.S. Highway 50.

With construction of the proposed new arterial, the projected LOS inconsistencies…

Page 5.4-47, the "New Implementation Measure" following Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b) is revised as follows:

New Implementation Measure: The County shall implement a growth control mechanism for all new discretionary and ministerial development (which includes approved development that has not yet been built) that would access Latrobe Road or White Rock Road. This mechanism shall be designed to ensure that the 2025 p.m. peak-hour volumes on El Dorado Hills Boulevard, Latrobe Road, and White Rock Road do not exceed the minimum acceptable LOS thresholds defined in Policies ~~3.5.1.1, 3.5.1.6, and 3.5.1.6.2~~ TC-1c, TC-1d, and TC-1f with the circulation diagram improvements assumed in place. As such, the measure should consider a variety of methods that control or limit growth and the resulting traffic including, but not limited to, the acquisition of development rights, incentives or disincentives not to travel during peak hours on affected roadways, and changes in allowed development intensities. The County shall monitor peak-hour traffic volumes and LOS beyond 2025 and, if necessary, shall implement growth control mechanisms in any part of the county where the LOS thresholds defined in the General Plan policies listed above cannot be maintained.

Page 5.4-48, Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c): ~~***Modify LOS Policies*****: Implement Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) in the No Project Alternative to modify segments allowed to operate at cost.~~ ***Expand List of Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F***

New Implementation Measure: Amend Table TC-2 to include the following roadway segments, which are projected to operate at LOS F in 2025:

U.S. Highway 50 Westbound (AM Peak Hour)

Cambridge Road to Bass Lake Road (Max V/C 1.03)
Bass Lake Road to El Dorado Hills Boulevard (Max V/C 1.09)
El Dorado Hills Boulevard to El Dorado/Sacramento County Line (Max V/C 1.22)

U.S. Highway 50 Eastbound (PM Peak Hour)

El Dorado/Sacramento County Line to El Dorado Hills Boulevard (Max V/C 1.15)
El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Bass Lake Road (Max V/C 1.10)
Bass Lake Road to Cambridge Road (Max V/C 1.09)

Latrobe Road (PM Peak Hour)

Carson Creek to White Rock Road (Max V/C 1.21)
White Rock Road to U.S. Highway 50 (Max V/C 1.15)

White Rock Road (PM Peak Hour)

Manchester Drive to Latrobe Road (Max V/C 1.13)

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) would not improve traffic flow …

Page 5.4-48, the following text is added at the end of the page:

Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(e): Amend the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element in each of the General Plan alternatives to: (1) apply Measure Y policies through 2008; (2) provide for the possible readoption of those policies in 2008; (3) provide alternative level of service and concurrency policies that will take effect in 2009 if the Measure Y policies are not extended; and (4) require a detailed traffic monitoring and development review program to ensure that new development does not lead to traffic levels that violate the applicable level of service standards.

New Policy: In the Goals and Policies section (beginning on page 54), delete policies TC-1c through TC-1k.

Insert the following after policy TC-1u (on page 59):

LEVELS OF SERVICE AND CONCURRENCY

In 1998 El Dorado County voters adopted an initiative measure known as Measure Y, the "Control Traffic Congestion Initiative." The initiative added several policies to the former General Plan intended to require new development to fully pay its way to prevent traffic congestion from worsening in the County. The initiative provided that the new policies should remain in effect for ten years and that the voters should be given the opportunity to readopt those policies for an additional 10 years. The policies in this section reflect the voters' intent in adopting Measure Y by (1) applying the Measure Y policies through 2008, (2) providing for the possible readoption of those policies in 2008, and (3) providing alternative policies that will take effect in 2009 if the Measure Y policies are not extended.

GOAL TC-X: To coordinate planning and implementation of roadway improvements with new development to maintain adequate levels of service on County roads.

Policy TC-Xa The following policies shall remain in effect until December 31, 2008 unless extended by the voters prior to that time

1. Traffic from residential development projects of five or more units or parcels of land shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county.

2. The County shall not add any additional segments of U.S. Highway 50, or any other highways and roads, to the County's list of roads (shown in Table TC-2) that are allowed to operate at Level of Service F without first getting the voters' approval.

3. Developer-paid traffic impact fees shall fully pay for building all necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development upon any highways, arterial roads and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county.

4. County tax revenues shall not be used in any way to pay for building road capacity improvements to offset traffic impacts from new development projects. Exceptions are allowed if county voters first give their approval.

5. Before giving approval of any kind to a residential development project of five or more units or parcels of land, the County shall make a finding that the project complies with the policies above. If this finding cannot be made, then the County shall not approve the project in order to protect the public's health and safety as provided by state law to assure that safe and adequate roads and highways are in place as such development occurs.

TABLE TC-2
El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F[1]

Road Segment(s)		Max. V/C[2]
Cambridge Road	Country Club Drive to Oxford Road	1.07
Cameron Park Drive	Robin Lane to Coach Lane	1.11
Missouri Flat Road	U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive	1.12
	Mother Lode Drive to China Garden Road	1.20
Pleasant Valley Road	El Dorado Road to State Route 49	1.28
U.S. Highway 50	Canal Street to junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street)	1.25
	Junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street) to Coloma Street	1.59
	Coloma Street to Bedford Avenue	1.61
	Bedford Avenue to beginning of freeway	1.73
	Beginning of freeway to Washington overhead	1.16
	Ice House Road to Echo Lake	1.16
State Route 49	Pacific/Sacramento Street to new four-lane section	1.31
	U.S. Highway 50 to State Route 193	1.32
	State Route 193 to county line	1.51

TABLE TC-2 El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F[1]	
Road Segment(s)	**Max. V/C[2]**
Notes: [1]Roads improved to their maximum width given right-of-way and physical limitations. [2]Volume to Capacity ratio.	

Policy TC-Xb To ensure that potential development in the County does not exceed available roadway capacity, the County shall:

A. Prepare an annual Capital Improvement Program (CIP) specifying roadway improvements to be completed within the next 10 years to ensure compliance with all applicable level of service and other standards in this plan, identifying improvements expected to be required within the next 20 years, and specifying funding sources sufficient to develop the improvements identified in the 10 year plan;

B. Annually monitor traffic volumes on the county's major roadway system depicted in the Circulation Diagram; and

C. Review development proposals to ensure that the development would not generate traffic in excess of that contemplated by the Capital Improvement Program for the next ten years or cause levels of service on any affected roadway segments to fall below the levels specified in this plan.

Policy TC-Xc The following policies shall take effect upon the expiration of the policies in Policy TC-Xa

1. Traffic from residential development projects shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county except as specified in Table TC-3.

2. Additional segments of U.S. Highway 50 and other highways and roads may be added to Table TC-3 only upon approval of a majority of the Board of Supervisors.

3. Developer-paid traffic impact fees shall pay for the portion of road capacity improvements, which would not be paid for through other County revenue sources, necessary to offset and mitigate the traffic impacts reasonably attributable to new development upon any highways, arterial roads and

their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county

TABLE TC-3
El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service E[1]

Road Segment(s)		Max. V/C[2]
Latrobe Road	Carson Creek to White Rock Road	1.21
	White Rock Road to U.S. Highway 50	1.15
White Rock Road	County Line to Latrobe Road	1.13
U.S. Highway 50	County Line to El Dorado Hills Boulevard	1.22 westbound
		1.15 eastbound
	El Dorado Hills Boulevard to Bass Lake Road	1.09 westbound
		1.10 eastbound
	Bass Lake Road to Cambridge Road	1.03 westbound
		1.09 eastbound
	Canal Street to junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street)	1.13
	Bedford Avenue to beginning of freeway	1.06
	Beginning of freeway to Washington overhead	1.06

Notes:

[1]Roads improved to their maximum width given right-of-way and physical limitations.

[2]Volume to Capacity ratio.

Policy TC-Xd Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions except as specified in Table TC-2 or, after December 31, 2003, Table TC-3. The volume to capacity ratio of the roadway segments listed in Tables TC-2 and TC-3 as applicable shall not exceed the ratio specified in that table. Level of Service will be as defined in the latest edition of the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council) and calculated using the methodologies contained in that manual. Analysis periods shall be

based on the professional judgment of the Department of Transportation which shall consider periods including, but not limited to, Weekday Average Daily Traffic (ADT), AM Peak Hour, and PM Peak hour traffic volumes.

Policy TC-Xe For the purposes of this Transportation and Circulation Element, "worsen" is defined as any of the following number of project trips using a road facility at the time of issuance of a use and occupancy permit for the development project:

b. a 1 percent increase in traffic during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour, or daily, or
c. the addition of 50 or more daily trips, or
d. the addition of 5 or more trips during the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour.

Policy TC-Xf Prior to issuance of any building permits for development that worsens traffic on the County road system, the developer shall do one of the following: (1) construct all road improvements necessary to regional and local roads needed to maintain or attain Level of Service standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element; or (2) ensure adequate funding is encumbered for the necessary road improvements and those projects are programmed. The determination of compliance with this requirement shall be based on existing traffic plus traffic generated from the project and from other reasonably foreseeable projects.

Policy TC-Xg Each development project shall dedicate right-of-way and construct or fund improvements necessary to mitigate the effects of traffic from the project. The County shall require an analysis of impacts of traffic from the development project, including impacts from truck traffic, and require dedication of needed right-of-way and construction of road facilities as a condition of the development. For road improvements that provide significant benefit to other development, the County may allow a project to fund its fair share of improvement costs through traffic impact fees or receive reimbursement from impact fees for construction of improvements beyond the project's fair share. The amount and timing of reimbursements shall be determined by the County.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(e) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Page 5.4-49, the following change is made to Mitigation Measure 5.4-1:

Mitigation Measure 5.4-1—Environmentally Constrained Alternative

The County shall implement one or more of the following mitigation measures:

- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(a): Amend the Circulation Diagram to Include a New Arterial Roadway from El Dorado Hills Business Park to U.S. 50
- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b): Add New Growth Control Implementation Measure
- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c): ~~Modify LOS Policies~~ Expand List of Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F
- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(d): Amend the Circulation Diagram to Include a Frequent Transit Service on Exclusive Right-of-Way to the El Dorado Hills Business Park
- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(e): Amend Traffic and Circulation Element to establish alternative LOS Policies to take effect in 2009 if proposed policies are not approved by the voters

Page 5.4-49, the text below Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(a) of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is revised as follows:

Please refer to Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(a) for the No Project Alternative and for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. With construction of the proposed arterial…

Page 5.4-49, Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c): ~~Modify LOS Policies~~ Expand List of Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F

Please refer to the proposed Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c) for the No Project Alternative above. Additionally, add the following implementation measure for this alternative:

New Implementation Measure: Amend Table TC-2 to include the following roadway segments, which are projected to operate at LOS F in 2025:

Latrobe Road (PM Peak Hour)

Carson Creek to White Rock Road (Max. V/C 1.19)
White Rock Road to U.S. Highway 50 (Max V/C 1.20)

White Rock Road (PM Peak Hour)

Manchester Drive to Latrobe Road (Max V/C 1.13)

Implementation of this mitigation measure would not improve traffic flow, but it would…

Page 5.4-50, the following text is added immediately following the discussion of Mitigation Measure 5.1-4(d):

Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(e): Amend the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element in each of the General Plan alternatives to: (1) apply Measure Y policies through 2008; (2) provide for the possible readoption of those policies in 2008; (3) provide alternative level of service and concurrency policies that will take effect in 2009 if the Measure Y policies are not extended; and (4) require a detailed traffic monitoring and development review program to ensure that new development does not lead to traffic levels that violate the applicable level of service standards.

New Policy: In the Goals and Policies section (beginning on page 56), delete policies TC-1c through TC-1j (including Table TC-2).

Insert the following after policy TC-1t (on page 61):

LEVELS OF SERVICE AND CONCURRENCY

In 1998 El Dorado County voters adopted an initiative measure known as Measure Y, the "Control Traffic Congestion Initiative." The initiative added several policies to the former General Plan intended to require new development to fully pay its way to prevent traffic congestion from worsening in the County. The initiative provided that the new policies should remain in effect for ten years and that the voters should be given the opportunity to readopt those policies for an additional 10 years. The policies in this section reflect the voters' intent in adopting Measure Y by (1) applying the Measure Y policies through 2008, (2) providing for the possible readoption of those policies in 2008, and (3) providing alternative policies that will take effect in 2009 if the Measure Y policies are not extended.

GOAL TC-X: To coordinate planning and implementation of roadway improvements with new development to maintain adequate levels of service on County roads.

Policy TC-Xa The following policies shall remain in effect until December 31, 2008 unless extended by the voters prior to that time

1. Traffic from residential development projects of five or more units or parcels of land shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county.

2. The County shall not add any additional segments of U.S. Highway 50, or any other highways and roads, to the County's list of roads (shown in Table TC-2) that are allowed to operate at Level of Service F without first getting the voters' approval.

3. Developer-paid traffic impact fees shall fully pay for building all necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development upon any highways, arterial roads and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county.

4. County tax revenues shall not be used in any way to pay for building road capacity improvements to offset traffic impacts from new development projects. Exceptions are allowed if county voters first give their approval.

5. Before giving approval of any kind to a residential development project of five or more units or parcels of land, the County shall make a finding that the project complies with the policies above. If this finding cannot be made, then the County shall not approve the project in order to protect the public's health and safety as provided by state law to assure that safe and adequate roads and highways are in place as such development occurs.

TABLE TC-2
El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F[1]

Road Segment(s)		Max. V/C[2]
Cambridge Road	Country Club Drive to Oxford Road	1.07
Cameron Park Drive	Robin Lane to Coach Lane	1.11
Missouri Flat Road	U.S. Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive	1.12
	Mother Lode Drive to China Garden Road	1.20
Pleasant Valley Road	El Dorado Road to State Route 49	1.28

TABLE TC-2 El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service E[1]		
Road Segment(s)		**Max. V/C[2]**
U.S. Highway 50	Canal Street to junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street)	1.25
	Junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street) to Coloma Street	1.59
	Coloma Street to Bedford Avenue	1.61
	Bedford Avenue to beginning of freeway	1.73
	Beginning of freeway to Washington overhead	1.16
	Ice House Road to Echo Lake	1.16
State Route 49	Pacific/Sacramento Street to new four-lane section	1.31
	U.S. Highway 50 to State Route 193	1.32
	State Route 193 to county line	1.51
Notes: [1]Roads improved to their maximum width given right-of-way and physical limitations. [2]Volume to Capacity ratio.		

Policy TC-Xb To ensure that potential development in the County does not exceed available roadway capacity, the County shall:

A. Prepare an annual Capital Improvement Program (CIP) specifying roadway improvements to be completed within the next 10 years to ensure compliance with all applicable level of service and other standards in this plan, identifying improvements expected to be required within the next 20 years, and specifying funding sources sufficient to develop the improvements identified in the 10 year plan;

B. Annually monitor traffic volumes on the county's major roadway system depicted in the Circulation Diagram; and

C. Review development proposals to ensure that the development would not generate traffic in excess of that contemplated by the Capital Improvement

Program for the next ten years or cause levels of service on any affected roadway segments to fall below the levels specified in this plan.

Policy TC-Xc The following policies shall take effect upon the expiration of the policies in Policy TC-Xa

1. Traffic from residential development projects shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county except as specified in Table TC-3.

2. Additional segments of U.S. Highway 50 and other highways and roads may be added to Table TC-3 only upon approval of a majority of the Board of Supervisors.

3. Developer-paid traffic impact fees shall pay for the portion of road capacity improvements, which would not be paid for through other County revenue sources, necessary to offset and mitigate the traffic impacts reasonably attributable to new development upon any highways, arterial roads and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county.

TABLE TC-3
El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F[1]

Road Segment(s)		**Max. V/C[2]**
Latrobe Road	Carson Creek to White Rock Road	1.19
	White Rock Road to U.S. Highway 50	1.20
White Rock Road	County Line to Latrobe Road	1.13
U.S. Highway 50	Canal Street to junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street)	1.23
	Bedford Avenue to beginning of freeway	1.13
	Beginning of freeway to Washington overhead	1.13
	Ice House Road to Echo Lake	1.03

TABLE TC-3 **El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service E[1]**	
Road Segment(s)	**Max. V/C[2]**
Notes: [1]Roads improved to their maximum width given right-of-way and physical limitations. [2]Volume to Capacity ratio.	

Policy TC-Xd Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions except as specified in Table TC-2 or, after December 31, 2003, Table TC-3. The volume to capacity ratio of the roadway segments listed in Tables TC-2 and TC-3 as applicable shall not exceed the ratio specified in that table. Level of Service will be as defined in the latest edition of the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council) and calculated using the methodologies contained in that manual. Analysis periods shall be based on the professional judgment of the Department of Transportation which shall consider periods including, but not limited to, Weekday Average Daily Traffic (ADT), AM Peak Hour, and PM Peak hour traffic volumes.

Policy TC-Xe For the purposes of this Transportation and Circulation Element, "worsen" is defined as any of the following number of project trips using a road facility at the time of issuance of a use and occupancy permit for the development project:

(1) a 2 percent increase in traffic during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour, or daily, or
(2) the addition of 100 or more daily trips, or
(3) the addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour.

Policy TC-2f Prior to issuance of any building permits for development that worsens traffic on the County road system, the developer shall do one of the following: (1) construct all road improvements necessary to regional and local roads needed to maintain or attain Level of Service standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element; or (2) ensure adequate funding is encumbered for the necessary road improvements and those projects are programmed. The determination of compliance with this requirement shall be based on existing traffic plus traffic generated from the project.

Policy TC-Xg Each development project shall dedicate right-of-way and construct or fund improvements necessary to mitigate the effects of traffic from the project. The County shall require an analysis of impacts of traffic from the development project, including impacts from truck traffic, and require dedication of needed right-of-way and construction of road facilities as a condition of the development. For road improvements that provide significant benefit to other development, the County may allow a project to fund its fair share of improvement costs through traffic impact fees or receive reimbursement from impact fees for construction of improvements beyond the project's fair share. The amount and timing of reimbursements shall be determined by the County.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(e) would reduce this impact to a less-than- significant level.

Page 5.4-50, the following change is made to Mitigation Measure 5.4-1:

Mitigation Measure 5.4-1— 1996 General Plan Alternative

The County shall implement one or more of the following mitigation measures:

- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(a): Amend the Circulation Diagram to Include a New Arterial Roadway from El Dorado Hills Business Park to U.S. 50
- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(b): Add New Growth Control Implementation Measure
- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(c): Expand List of Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F
- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(d): Amend the Circulation Diagram to Include a Frequent Transit Service on Exclusive Right-of-Way to the El Dorado Hills Business Park
- Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(e): Amend Traffic and Circulation Element to establish alternative LOS Policies to take effect in 2009 if proposed policies are not approved by the voters

Page 5.4-51, the following text is added immediately following the discussion of Mitigation Measure 5.1-4(d):

Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(e): Amend the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element in each of the General Plan alternatives to: (1) apply Measure Y policies through 2008; (2) provide for the possible readoption of those policies in 2008; (3) provide alternative level of service and concurrency policies that will take effect in 2009 if the Measure Y policies are

not extended; and (4) require a detailed traffic monitoring and development review program to ensure that new development does not lead to traffic levels that violate the applicable level of service standards.

Please see Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(e) for the No Project Alternative except that the following table shall be used instead of the Policy 3.X.1.1c Table:

Policy 3.6.1.1c TABLE El Dorado County Roads Allowed to Operate at Level of Service F[1]		
Road Segment(s)		**Max. V/C[2]**
Latrobe Road	Carson Creek to White Rock Road	1.30
	White Rock Road to U.S. Highway 50	1.23
Missouri Flat Road	Mother Lode Drive to China Garden Road	1.10
White Rock Road	County Line to Latrobe Road	1.22
U.S. Highway 50	Canal Street to junction of State Route 49 (Spring Street)	1.22
	Bedford Avenue to beginning of freeway	1.12
	Beginning of freeway to Washington overhead	1.12
	Ice House Road to Echo Lake	1.03
Notes: [1]Roads improved to their maximum width given right-of-way and physical limitations. [2]Volume to Capacity ratio.		

Page 5.4-54, Mitigation Measure 5.4-2 is revised to delete the reference to 5.4-1(c) as follows:

Mitigation Measure 5.4-2: Implement No Project Alternative Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(a), 5.4-1(b), ~~5.4-1(c),~~ or 5.4-1(d)

Page 5.4-55, Mitigation Measure 5.4-2 is revised as shown:

~~Mitigation Measure 5.4-2—Roadway~~ Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative

The County shall implement ~~one of~~ the following mitigation measure~~s~~:

Page 5.4-55, Mitigation Measure 5.4-2 is revised to delete the reference to 5.4-1(c) as follows:

Mitigation Measure 5.4-2: Implement Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" Alternative Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(a), 5.4-1(b), ~~5.4-1(c),~~ or 5.4-(d)

Page 5.4-56, Mitigation Measure 5.4-2 (Environmentally Constrained Alternative) is revised to delete the reference to 5.4-1(c) as follows:

Mitigation Measure 5.4-2: Implement Environmentally Constrained Alternative Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(a), 5.4-1(b), ~~5.4-1(c),~~ or 5.4-1(d)

Page 5.4-56, the text under Mitigation Measure 5.4-2 is revised as follows:

Implementation of one of these mitigation measure options would reduce this impact. However, the mitigation would not eliminate the increase in traffic or provide LOS C operation and uncertainty exists associated with implementation of some of the options as discussed under Mitigation Measures 5.4-1 ~~(a through d)~~ (a, b, and d). Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Page 5.4-56, Mitigation Measure 5.4-2 (1996 General Plan Alternative) is revised to delete the reference to 5.4-1(c) as follows:

Mitigation Measure 5.4-2: Implement 1996 General Plan Alternative Mitigation Measure 5.4-1(a), 5.4-1(b), ~~5.4-1(c),~~ or 5.4-1(d)

Page 5.4-64, in the discussion of revised Implementation Measure TC-B, the reference in the fifth line to Policy TC-1j is changed to Policy TC-1i as follows:

Revised Implementation Measure TC-B: The County shall revise and adopt traffic impact fee program(s) for unincorporated areas of the county and adopt additional funding mechanisms necessary to ensure that improvements contained in the fee programs are fully funded and capable of being implemented concurrently with new development as defined by Policy TC-1j~~i~~. The traffic fees should be designed to achieve the adopted level of service standards and preserve the integrity of the circulation system.

Page 5.4-64, Environmentally Constrained Alternative, Mitigation Measure 5.4-3 is revised as follows:

> Please refer to the proposed Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(a) for the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" Alternative and Mitigation Measure 5.4-3(b) for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of ~~one of~~ these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level.

Page 5.4-65, Mitigation Measure 5.4-3 for the 1996 General Plan Alternative is revised as follows:

> Mitigation Measure 5.4-3 – 1996 General Plan Alternative
>
> Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of ~~one o~~f these mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level.

Page 5.4-68, Mitigation Measure 5.4-4 is revised as follows:

> **New (Replacement) Policy 3.9.1.3:** The County…

Page 5.5-2, the following change is made to the first full paragraph:

> One of the primary purposes of the General Plan is to designate land uses and define related policies from which future population and economic growth may be forecasted. EDCWA is responsible for providing overall county-wide water resources planning. Specifically, EDCWA complies with Ordinance 4325 (El Dorado County Public Water Supply Planning Ordinance) which requires, among other things:
>
> - An inventory of the projects and parcels being processed by the county, within each water district, and estimates of their public water needs,
> - An inventory of all existing unserved parcels and projects within each public water district, and estimates of their public water needs, and
> - A water availability assessment for each public water district that determines the adequacy of existing and planned future public water supplies to meet existing and planned future demand over the next twenty (20 years, for all types of growth and development - residential, commercial, and agricultural.
>
> It is the role of the county's water purveyors, with assistance from EDCWA, to provide surface water to the surface water users (customers) within their respective service areas…

Page 5.5-7, the last sentence in the first paragraph under the Carson Creek heading is revised as follows:

> Bass Lake and Sly Park Reservoir (EID) are located in the ~~Carson Creek~~ Cosumnes River watershed.

Page 5.5-11, first paragraph under *El Dorado County Environmental Health Division* is revised as follows:

> The County Environmental Health Division performs a number of public health services related to water supply, including regulating construction and destruction ~~the drilling~~ of groundwater wells ~~through a well permit system~~. The Division is also responsible for enforcing the County's Well Standards Ordinance, which helps protect groundwater quality and public health ~~by, among other things, including certain requirements related to monitoring wells and other protective measures~~. The Division also regulates the County's small water systems and monitors small water systems water quality data for compliance with Safe Drinking Water Act requirements.

Page 5.5-11, second sentence in the first paragraph under El Dorado Irrigation District is revised as follows:

> Currently EID serves a population of ~~87,000~~ 97,000 people through more than 30,896 active residential and commercial service connections (EID 2001a).

Page 5.5-18, the third sentence in the paragraph under the EID and GDPUD Use of Central Valley Project Water heading is revised as follows:

> The CVP, initiated by USBR in 1935, stores and distributes millions of acre-feet of water each year for a variety of beneficial uses, including agriculture, urban, wildlife, and fishery uses. The CVP includes Folsom Dam and Reservoir. Section ~~206(e)(1)~~ 206(b)(1)(B) of PL 101-514 directs USBR to enter into a long-term municipal and industrial water supply contract with EDCWA for diversion from Folsom Reservoir.

Page 5.5-18, the sixth and seventh sentences in the paragraph under the EID and GDPUD Use of Central Valley Project Water heading are revised as follows:

> The environmental impact statement (EIS)/EIR study for the EDCWA PL 101-514 Water Services Contract was initiated by EDCWA and USBR shortly after passage of the law. The public draft EIS/EIR has not been published; ~~but has been put on hold by these agencies because the EDCWA water planners need to ascertain whether this project remains a preferred option for EID and GDPUD to pursue among the other alternatives being assessed. In addition, it was felt that the~~

~~County~~ EDCWA determined that the General Plan should be adopted first in order to help determine potential county water demands and needs into the future.

Page 5.5-18, the third sentence of the first paragraph under El Dorado Irrigation District Hydroelectric Project 184 (FERC Project 184-065) is revised as follows:

This potential new water source is one of the alternative water supply sources being assessed for EID in the EDCWA water planning process summarized above. ~~Assuming that the final EDCWA Water Plan verifies that this water supply option should still be pursued by EID,~~ EID expects to be able to use ~~some of~~ the water from this project for consumptive purposes.

Page 5.5-25, the following is added to the seventh line:

Because EID's customers use less water in dry years, less treated water is available for recycling. Supply available in dry years is also lower than in normal years due to lower infiltration and inflow rates into the wastewater collection system. Supply available in wet years is correspondingly greater than normal years. If EID adds new storage, pumping, and conveyance facilities for recycled water, as described in the Recycled Water Master Plan discussed earlier in this section, EID's projected supply of recycled water in 2025 would be approximately 9,553 afy during a dry year, 10,510 afy during a normal year, and 11,469 afy during a wet year (EID 2002).

Page 5.5-47, Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) is revised as shown:

Therefore, the County shall implement the following new policy.

New Policy: Prior to granting any ~~discretionary~~tentative map or ~~ministerial land use~~building permit approval in an area served by a public water purveyor or an approved private water system, the applicant must ~~demonstrate~~provide a Water Supply Assessment that meets the criteria of Water Code section 10910 and the County must ~~confirm~~find that the ~~surface~~ water supply from existing water supply facilities is adequate and physically available to meet the highest projected demand that could be permitted by the approval on the lands in question. ~~"Adequate and physically available" means existing supply sources, for which the applicable water supplier has a present legal entitlement, with sufficient capacity to serve new development at the time the approval takes place, and where there are no impediments to the use of those existing supply sources.~~ A water supply is ~~"sufficient"~~"adequate" if the total entitled water supplies available during normal, single dry, and multiple dry years within a 20-year projection will meet the ~~highest projected~~ demand associated with the ~~proposed project~~approval, in addition to existing and planned future uses within the area served by the water supplier, including, but not limited to, agricultural and industrial uses. A water supply is "physically available" if sufficient infrastructure is in place to deliver adequate water

supplies to the project or will be in place and the applicant has received a water meter by the time the first grading or building permit is issued in connection with the approval. ~~An applicant must obtain a will serve letter from the applicable water supplier demonstrating that the supplier has an adequate and physically available water supply and can and will serve the proposed project from that supply.~~

Page 5.5-48, insert the following text immediately preceding the last paragraph on the page:

This new policy should be accompanied by an implementation program that directs the County to:

(1) Work with all water purveyors to develop and implement a program for application of water conservation Best Management Practices already being implemented by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) and in compliance with the related criteria established by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR); and

(2) Develop and implement a water use efficiency program for application to existing and new municipal residential, commercial/industrial, and agricultural water users for those areas not served by a water purveyor with an existing water use efficiency program. The program shall include identification of the types of programs that must utilize reclaimed water and address the feasibility of such use; and

(3) Amend the County Code to include water use efficiency requirements, which may include:

- Water-conserving design and equipment in new construction, including single-family residential developments;
- Water-conserving landscaping and other conservation measures for new residential development;
- Retrofitting existing development with water conserving devices; and
- Water-conserving agricultural irrigation practices; and
- Provide information/educational materials regarding water usage and conservation to the public.
- Program development will require coordination with water service providers.

Page 5.5-49: Under Mitigation Measure 5.5-1 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, revise text as follows:

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measures for the No Project Alternative above. Additionally, revise Measure PS-E as part of Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b):

Revised Measure PS-E: Work with the Water Agency and water service providers to establish a process to review discretionary project applications reliant upon surface or groundwater for the ability to be adequately served by the proposed water system. Process to include development of:

A. ~~Water~~ demand standards based on types and sizes of uses to serve as a basis for determining the adequacy of a proposed water supply for new development.;

~~B. Method to evaluate/determine potential impact on other water users; and~~

~~C. Procedure to determine sustainability.~~

And add the following as implementation for Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(c):

New Implementation Measure: The County shall work with all water purveyors to develop and implement a program for application of water conservation Best Management Practices already being implemented by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) and in compliance with the related criteria established by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR).

Revised Measure PS-C: Develop and implement a water use efficiency program for application to existing and new ~~municipal~~ residential, commercial/industrial, and agricultural water users for those areas not served by a water purveyor with an existing water use efficiency program. The program shall include identification of the types of programs that must utilize reclaimed water and address the feasibility of such use. Amend the County Code to include water use efficiency requirements, which may include:

- Water-conserving design and equipment in new construction, including single-family residential developments;
- Water-conserving landscaping and other conservation measures for new residential development;
- Retrofitting existing development with water conserving devices; ~~and~~
- Water-conserving agricultural irrigation practices; and
- Provide information/educational materials regarding water usage and conservation to the public.
- Program development will require coordination with water service providers.

With the implementation of these measures, Impact 5.5-1 would remain significant and unavoidable.

Page 5.5-49: Revise the text of mitigation Measure 5.5-1(b) for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative as follows:

> Please refer to proposed mitigation measure 5.5.-1(b) for the ~~No Project~~ Roadway Constrained Alternative above.

Page 5.5-49: Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(c) of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is revised as follows:

> **New Policy:** The County shall support water conservation programs and projects that can reduce future water demand consistent with the policies of this General Plan. The County will develop and implement a water use efficiency program for existing and new residential, commercial/industrial, and agricultural uses for those areas not served by a water purveyor with all existing water use efficiency programs. The County shall encourage all water purveyors to implement the water conservation Best Management Practices already being implemented by EID and in compliance with the related criteria established by USBR.
>
> **New Implementation Measure:** The County shall work with all water purveyors to develop and implement a program for application of water conservation Best Management Practices already being implemented by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) and in compliance with the related criteria established by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR).
>
> **Revised Measure PS-C:** Develop and implement a water use efficiency program for application to existing and new ~~municipal~~ residential, commercial/industrial, and agricultural water users for those areas not served by a water purveyor with an existing water use efficiency program. The program shall include identification of the types of programs that must utilize reclaimed water and address the feasibility of such use. Amend the County Code to include water use efficiency requirements, which may include:
>
> - Water-conserving design and equipment in new construction, including single-family residential developments;
> - Water-conserving landscaping and other conservation measures for new residential development;
> - Retrofitting existing development with water conserving devices; ~~and~~
> - Water-conserving agricultural irrigation practices; and
> - Provide information/educational materials regarding water usage and conservation to the public.
> - Program development will require coordination with water service providers.

For the reasons described under the No Project Alternative, implementation of the three mitigation measures above would not lower Impact 5.5-1 to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, Impact 5.5-1 would remain significant and unavoidable.

Page 5.5-61, at the top of the page, Mitigation Measure 5.5-2 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is revised as follows:

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measure for the No Project Alternative above. Additionally, refer to the Implementation Measure proposed for Mitigation Measure 5.5-7 for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. The impacts of new water supply and related infrastructure projects cannot be definitively determined, but clearly have the potential to be significant, and mitigation effectiveness cannot be tested or definitively determined at this time…

Page 5.5-61, the second paragraph, Mitigation Measure 5.5-2 of the Environmentally Constrained Alternative, is revised as follows:

Please refer to the proposed mitigation measure for the No Project Alternative above. Additionally, refer to the Implementation Measure proposed for Mitigation Measure 5.5-7 for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable for the same reasons as stated above for the Roadway Constrained 6 Lane “Plus” Alternative.

Page 5.5-63, the eighth and ninth bullets are revised as shown:

- The County has adopted a Well Standards Ordinance that requires a County well permit for all well digging, boring, drilling, deepening, modifying, repairing or destroying (County Ordinance 4110 §1 (part) 1990). Licensed professionals must perform all well drilling and other well modifications after receiving a well permit from the county and must ~~report in~~ submit a ~~Report of Well Production~~ State Well Completion Report (well log) on how the well produces.

- While the County requires ~~testing of groundwater well production~~ a Report of Well Production before ~~well~~ building permits are issued, such testing may not be indicative of a well's long-term production potential. (The Report of Well Production documents only the results of an initial 4 hour test).

Page 5.5-64, the first full paragraph after bulleted statements is revised as follows:

While it is not known how much groundwater is available for future growth in the county, it is clear that the new development associated with all four of the equal-weight alternatives would lead to lager increases in the demand for groundwater. Table ~~5.5-13~~ 5.5-1 summarizes existing and projected groundwater demand in

areas not served by public water purveyors. These areas are referred to in Table 5.5-1 as "other County Areas—West Slope" and are outside the service-area boundaries of surface water purveyors EID, GDPUD, and GFCSD. This is where most of the groundwater demand would be located, and is also where most of the county's existing groundwater users are located. The information included in Table ~~5.5-13~~ 5.5-1 was prepared using the more detailed water demand estimates found in EPS 2003 and Wood Rodgers 2003 (see Appendix E).

The increase in groundwater demand shown in Table ~~5.5-13~~ 5.5-1 has the potential to cause a number of significant impacts. As groundwater demand increases…

Page 5.5-65, the fourth paragraph is revised as follows:

No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

As shown in Table ~~5.5-13~~ 5.5-1, development under this alternative at 2025 in areas not served by water purveyors would lead to an increase in total groundwater demand of about ~~33,775~~ 8,952 afy. This represents a percentage change of 121%. In the predominantly rural…

Page 5.5-66, the third paragraph is revised as follows:

No Project Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

As shown in Table ~~5.5-13~~ 5.5-1, buildout of the county under this alternative is projected to cause a substantial increase in the demand for county groundwater (estimated to be an increase of about ~~56,595~~ 19,542 afy). The percent change in total west-slope groundwater demand under this alternative at buildout could thus be approximately ~~271%~~ 264 percent. This substantial increase in groundwater demand…

Page 5.5-67, the first paragraph is revised as follows:

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

As shown in Table ~~5.5-13~~ 5.5-1, this alternative at 2025 would likely cause a substantial increase in the demand for county groundwater (estimated to be a total increase of about ~~34,535~~ 9,780 afy). The percent change in groundwater demand under this alternative at 2025 would thus be approximately ~~126%~~ 132 percent. This substantial increase in groundwater demand…

Page 5.5-68, the first paragraph is revised as follows:

Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

This alternative at buildout is projected to cause a substantial increase in the demand for county groundwater (estimated to be a total increase of about ~~60,276~~ 22,018 afy; see Table ~~5.5-13~~ 5.5-1). The percent change in groundwater demand under this alternative at buildout could thus be approximately ~~295%~~ 297 percent. This substantial increase in groundwater demand…

Page 5.5-68, the third paragraph is revised as follows:

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

As shown in Table ~~5.5-13~~ 5.5-1, this alternative at 2025 would likely cause a substantial increase in the demand for county groundwater (estimated to be a total increase of about ~~37,367~~ 10,367 afy). The percent change in groundwater demand under this alternative at 2025 would thus be approximately ~~145%~~ 140 percent. This substantial increase in groundwater demand…

Page 5.5-68, the fourth paragraph is revised as follows:

Environmentally Constrained Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion
This alternative at buildout is projected to cause a substantial increase in the demand for county groundwater (estimated to be a total increase of about ~~54,674~~ 21,009 afy; see Table ~~5.5-13~~ 5.5-1). The percent change in groundwater demand under this alternative at buildout could thus be approximately ~~258%~~ 284 percent. This substantial increase in groundwater demand…

Page 5.5-69, the third paragraph is revised as follows:

1996 General Plan Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion

As shown in Table ~~5.5-13~~ 5.5-1, this alternative at 2025 would likely cause a substantial increase in demand for county groundwater (estimated to be a total increase of about ~~37,390~~ 10,840 afy). The percent change in groundwater demand under this alternative at 2025 would thus be approximately ~~351%~~ 146%. This substantial increase in groundwater demand…

Page 5.5-69, the fourth paragraph is revised as follows:

1996 General Plan Alternative (Buildout)—Impact Discussion

This alternative at buildout is projected to cause a substantial increase in demand for county groundwater (estimated to be a total increase of about ~~60,276~~ 27,332 afy; Table ~~5.5-13~~ 5.5-1). The percent change in groundwater demand under this alternative could thus be approximately ~~126%~~ 369 percent. This substantial increase in groundwater demand…

Page 5.5-70: the following sentence is added after revised Policy PS-2d:

Additionally, revise Implementation Measure PS-E as outlined above under Mitigation Measure 5.5-1—Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative.

Page 5.5-72, the second sentence under Wastewater Treated by Wastewater Treatment Plants is revised as follows:

EID currently treats wastewater from approximately 11,700 parcels, including 6,008 active sewer accounts that are served by the El Dorado Hills WWTP and another 7,538 ~~5,662~~ active sewer accounts served by the Deer Creek WWTP (EID 2001b). The remaining parcels on the west slope use OWTS.

Page 5.5-75, the paragraph under Deer Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant is revised as follows:

The Deer Creek WWTP service area encompasses ~~24~~ 47 square miles. Wastewater generated by ~~5,662~~ 7,538 active accounts is conveyed by ~~95~~ 148 miles of pipelines to the Deer Creek WWTP, which is located 2 miles south of U.S. 50 in the Cameron Park area. The Deer Creek WWTP was expanded in 1996 to an ADWF capacity of 3.6 mgd. However, a cease-and-desist order from the Central Valley RWQCB has limited the permitted capacity of this WWTP to 2.5 mgd. The status of RWQCB and EID efforts to resolve water-quality issues involving this plant's discharges is summarized in Section 5.5.3. Under existing conditions, this WWTP treats approximately 2.4 mgd of wastewater. The plant was issued a permit in 1996 for expansion to 3.6 mgd. During construction the RWQCB added new requirements for additional tertiary filtration. Because the new requirements were contested, the filtration capacity was not installed. In December 2002, a new 3.6 mgd permit was granted by the RWQCB providing capacity for an additional 15,000 equivalent dwelling units. Additional plant expansion is not expected to be required until 2025. The Deer Creek WWTP has primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment capabilities, and treated water is discharged to Deer Creek or used for irrigation and dust control (EID 2001b). Sewage sludge generated by the Deer Creek WWTP is taken to Silva Farms, a permitted land disposal site.

Page 5.5-77, the following paragraph is inserted after the third paragraph:

> California Water Code (CWC) Section 13260(a) requires any person discharging waste or proposing to discharge waste within any region that could affect the quality of the waters of the State, other than a community sewer system, to file a Report of Waste Discharge (RWD) with the appropriate Regional Water Quality Control Board. The RWD must contain information and data regarding the discharge as may be required by the Regional Board. Small food processors, including wineries, must submit a RWD to the Central Valley RWQCB. Wineries that crush less than 80 tons of grapes per year may receive a formal waiver notification ("Small Food Processor Waiver"), which allows (1) application of wastewater to cropland at agronomic rates or (2) temporary storage in tanks and disposal at a regulated facility after removal from the winery. The Small Food Processor Waiver became effective in July 2003 and expires in July of 2008, unless terminated of renewed by the RWQCB.

Page 5.5-77, the fourth paragraph is revised as follows:

> The County operates the Union Mine Septage Treatment and Disposal Facility. This Facility accepts septage from OWTS throughout the county, treats it, and disposes the waste byproducts. The septage is comprised of material contained within septic tanks and is a small fraction of the total wastewater treated by septic tanks and dispersed of in leach fields. Individual property owners (except City of Placerville and Tahoe Basin residents) pay an annual County fee used for facility operating expenses. The Facility also collects tipping fees from commercial septage haulers that use the facility. ~~with OWTS pay the County a fee to use the facility once a year.~~ Within the next two years, ~~and~~ to accommodate growth and the acceptance of winery waste, the County plans to almost double the capacity of the treatment facility to a maximum capacity of approximately 30,000 gallons per day (gpd) (Johnston, pers. comm., 2003). After being treated at the treatment facility, sludge is disposed of at the site (a former landfill), and the remaining wastewater is disposed of via spraying at the facility's spray field and via injection into the landfill gas flare. County staff plan to expand the spray field by 2 acres to accommodate growth, but have concluded that the sludge disposal site has adequate capacity to handle future growth under the 1996 General Plan (Johnston, pers. comm., 2003). Expansion of this facility will require compliance with CEQA and an amended permit with the RWQCB. (Please see the discussion of sludge disposal capacity at Union Mine Landfill in Section 5.6.)

Page 5.5-85, the second sentence of the first full paragraph is revised as follows:

> As discussed in Existing Conditions, the treatment capacity of the plant is planned to be doubled to accommodate future treatment needs of OWTS, including ~~inducing~~ winery waste.

Page 5.5-88, Mitigation Measure 5.5-4 of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is revised as follows:

> Please refer to the proposed mitigation measure for the No Project Alternative above. Additionally, refer to Mitigation Measure 5.5-7 for the new Implementation Measure that accompanies the new policy outlined under the No Project Alternative above. With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts would be reduced, but not to a less than significant level. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Page 5.5-90, the last paragraph under Confined Animals is revised to read:

> According to the County's 2001 Annual Crop Report, El Dorado County had 4,530 head of cattle, 510 sheep, and 730 hogs. Information on the number of horses is not available; there is no record keeping authority for horses in the county. This suggests a very modest amount of livestock in the county.

Page 5.5-92, the first paragraph is revised as shown:

> The cease-and-desist order reduces the ~~allowable~~ permitted capacity at the plant to 2.5 mgd (compared to the plant's 3.6-mgd maximum capacity) pending resolution of the compliance issues. The cease and desist order requires compliance with pH, temperatures, and turbidity standard by December 2003. The cease-and-desist order's terms focus primarily on providing feedback on the nature of the problem and resolving compliance issues…

Page 5.5-99, the third paragraph is revised as follows:

> The most recently approved (1998) Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for California identifies the various waterways throughout the state that are water quality impaired for a number of constituents. None of the waterways listed are ~~in~~ along the west slope of El Dorado County. Lake Tahoe, however, is listed as impaired with respect to high levels of phosphorus, nitrogen, and sediment/siltation. This is addressed further in Section 5.14 of the DEIR. The state is currently undergoing…

Page 5.5-105, the fourth sentence in the first paragraph under Sewer, Septic Tank, and Drain Standards is revised as shown:

> County regulations for the proper design and installation of onsite systems have been adopted by the County Board of Supervisors and have been reviewed ~~and accepted~~ by the RWQCB. The County's regulations are consistent with the Basin Plan Guidelines (Morgan, pers. comm., 2003).

Page 5.5-107, the first full paragraph is revised as follows:

> The County's OWTS siting and redundancy criteria provide the principal means of ensuring that the systems provide reliable performance and protection from contamination of groundwater aquifers. The criteria include minimum disposal area requirements that are based on the percolation rate of the soil and projected septage flow for the project. One of the problems with septic systems is leach field failures. As a result, the ordinance requires a replacement field area equal to the current leach field area for residential uses and three times the size of the leach field area for commercial/industrial uses. Geotechnical design and testing is required to ensure adequate separation (a minimum of 5 feet) of groundwater from all new septic systems, including digging a backhoe trench as deep as possible and at least 5 feet below the leach line locations to ensure adequate soil depth and the separation of groundwater. All new septic systems are required to install a riser pipe with a porthole in the leach field to allow for visual inspection of leach-field performance. Three inspections by EMD are required before the operation of each septic system: when a test trench is excavated, during construction when open trenches are excavated, and following construction. As built plans are required so that any future construction activities, such as pool installation, will avoid contact with the leach field. Where a lot has insufficient lot area or improper soil conditions for adequate sewage disposal, EMD is authorized to prohibit development; it has done so on a number of occasions. According to the Board of Supervisors action in April 1990, lot size for well and septic is 4.5 acres minimum (personal communication with Gerri Silva, Environmental Management Department, December 2003). For existing parcels less than 4.5 acres, an evaluation of parcel creation stipulation and effective date of that creation must be completed by the Environmental Health Division ~~Finally, if a lot is smaller than 5 acres, it is considered too small to provide adequate separation between domestic wells and septic systems and a domestic well is not allowed on such a site.~~ Further, when older systems fail, they are required to come into conformance with Ordinance 4542.

Page 5.5-127, the following change is made to Mitigation Measure 5.5.7:

> **New Policy:** The County shall work with EID to support the continued and expanded use of recycled water, including wet-season use and storage, in new subdivisions served by the Deer Creek and El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plants. To avoid construction impacts of installing recycled water facilities, the County shall encourage the construction of distribution lines at the same time as other utilities are installed. Facilities to consider are recycled water lines for residential landscaping, ~~all front yards~~, parks, schools, and other irrigation needs, and if feasible, wet-irrigation-season storage facilities.

Page 5.5-154 is revised to delete Table 5.5-13 due to errors in the table with respect to future potential groundwater use on the west slope of the county. Table 5.5-1 in the DEIR

contains the correct information on potential future groundwater use on the west slope of the county.

Page 5.6-16, the fifth sentence of the second paragraph under County Waste Collection, Recycling, and Disposal Program is revised as shown:

> Within the city of South Lake Tahoe ~~Placerville~~, El Dorado Hills Community Services District, and Cameron Park Community Services District franchise areas, residential pickup is mandatory.

Page 5.6-19, the first full paragraph is revised as follows (beginning with the third sentence):

> This is less than the 50 percent diversion rate mandated by the California Integrated Waste Management Act. The CIWMB has approved an extension of the 50 percent diversion rate deadline to 2004 ~~2005~~ for the County (CIWMB 2002). The County is required to take further steps to achieve the mandated 50 percent recycling rate. Additional infrastructure, such as the potential Georgetown Divide transfer station, enhanced public education, implementation of a three cart system for separate curbside collection of refuse, green waste, and recyclable materials, and more aggressive recycling are expected to ~~implemented to~~ meet the mandate (EMD 2002a).

Page 5.6-19, the following paragraph is inserted between first full paragraph and second full paragraph:

> Construction and demolition debris are a major barrier to achieving the 50 percent diversion requirement. El Dorado County is one of the fastest growing counties in California. This rapid growth has resulted in a tremendous construction and demolition (C&D) waste stream. An estimated 15 percent to 20 percent of the county's disposed waste stream consists of C&D materials (i.e., lumber, concrete, rock, and soil). The County has adopted a C&D diversion ordinance, in order to assist in reaching the required 50 percent diversion.

Page 5.6-19, the first paragraph under Material Recovery Facilities is revised as follows:

> El Dorado County contains two MRFs…In the last quarter of 2002, there were incidences of received tonnage exceeding the permitted daily tonnage (Willett, pers. comm., 2003). In 2002, Waste Management Inc., the owner of this MRF, began transferring recyclable materials ~~solid wastes~~ from the county to a MRF located in the City of Lodi in San Joaquin County (CIWMB 2003b).

Page 5.6-28, the first sentence of the first full paragraph is revised as follows:

> Sorting activities associated with waste recycling on the west slope are currently conducted at the El Dorado Disposal MRF located in Diamond Springs, with some single stream recyclable materials ~~solid waste~~ transported to another MRF located in San Joaquin County for sorting and processing.

Page 5.6-28, the following paragraph is inserted between the first and second full paragraphs:

> Debris from construction and demolition is a major barrier to achieving the 50 percent diversion requirement. El Dorado County is one of the fastest growing counties in California. The county's population increased nearly 25 percent from 1990 to 2000. This rapid population growth has resulted in a tremendous construction and demolition waste stream. An estimated 15-20 percent of the county's disposed waste stream consists of construction and demolition materials (i.e., lumber, concrete, rock, and soil). The County intends to increase the diversion of construction and demolition materials by implementing the recently adopted Construction and Demolition Ordinance (Silva, pers. comm., 2003). The ordinance will assist the County in reaching the required 50 percent diversion.

Page 5.6-28, the first sentence of the second full paragraph is revised as shown:

> Table ~~5.2-6~~ 5.6-2 provides a calculation of expected waste diversion by 2025 and buildout.

Page 5.6-32, the following sentence is added to the end of the New Policy under Mitigation Measure 5.6-3:

> The County shall encourage a higher rate of diversion.

Page 5.6-34, the second sentence of the second paragraph is revised as follows:

> Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generators (CESQGs) generate small amounts of hazardous waste ~~materials, most of which are used up onsite~~.

Page 5.6-35, the third sentence of the second paragraph is revised as follows:

> The hazardous wastes collected, stored, recycled, and reused include car batteries, automotive oil, oil filters, ~~expired or banned pesticides,~~ herbicides, solvents, ~~old~~ paint, paint strippers, computer monitors…

Page 5.6-45, the text under ***Electricity Supplier*** is revised as follows:

> …Electricity on the west slope of El Dorado County is supplied by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). PG&E owns and operates electricity infrastructure in the county and throughout northern California that includes power lines, powerhouses, and substations. In El Dorado County, the PG&E powerhouse ~~Powerhouses are~~ is located at Chili Bar on the South Fork of the American River ~~and at Forebay Reservoir in Pollock Pines~~. A total of…

DEIR VOLUME 2, Section 5.7 through Chapter 9 and Appendix A

Page 5.7-11, the first paragraph under Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative (2025) – Impact Discussion is revised as follows:

> Under the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, 64,601 new residents would be added to the county's existing population. EDSO has indicated that this population growth may require new facilities in the El Dorado Hills/Cameron Park area, ~~the Georgetown Divide area,~~ and south county, as well as the replacement of the existing Placerville facility with a larger facility….

Page 5.7-27, the following change is made to Impact 5.7-2 within the table:

> 5.7-2: Potential Land Use Incompatibility Associated with Development and Expansion of Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services and Facilities

Page 5.7-35, Exhibit 5.7-3 is revised to show both proposed and approved school sites (please refer to Appendix C of this Response to Comments document).

Page 5.7-81, the following text is inserted before the last three lines on the page:

> **New Implementation Measure:** Develop and implement a parks and recreation fee program that addresses the following:
>
> A. For projects subject to Quimby Act requirements, additional fees for the actual construction and maintenance of parks and recreation facilities;
>
> B. For projects not subject to Quimby Act requirements, fees for the acquisition of park land and for the construction and maintenance of parks and recreation facilities; and
>
> C. Coordination with local parks and recreation providers regarding fee collection and disbursement to those providers.

Page 5.7-82, the second sentence of Impact 5.7-6 is revised as shown:

> The greatest amount of parkland would be required under the 1996 General Plan Alternative, followed by the Environmentally Constrained, Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus," and No Project alternatives (see Impact 5.7-~~6~~ 5).

Page 5.7-83, in the table on this page, the text under "Mitigation" in the left-hand column is revised as follows:

> 5.7-6(a), Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b); and 5.7-6(b), Implement Mitigation Measure ~~5.3-1(d)~~ 5.1-3(d)

Page 5.7-83, the first sentence under ***No Project Alternative (2025)—Impact Discussion*** is revised to read:

> The analysis of future parkland needs across alternatives is presented in Impact 5.7-~~6~~ 5 above.

Page 5.8-2, the second sentence of the third paragraph under Hazardous Waste Generated by Small Business, Industry, and Government heading is revised as follows:

> Hazardous waste contingency plans are collected from all generators, and generators storing more than 55 gallons, 500 pounds, or 200 cubic feet of hazardous waste ~~must also submit inventories~~. Hazardous waste generators must also supply inventories.

Page 5.8-4, the second sentence of the first full paragraph is deleted as shown:

> ~~These facilities accept uncommon items such as expired or banned pesticides, herbicides, solvents, and paint strippers.~~

Page 5.8-4, the last footnote in Table 5.8-1 is revised as shown:

> ~~3~~4

Page 5.8-5, the second sentence of the third paragraph under ***Hazardous Materials Transport and Disposal*** heading is revised as follows:

> DTSC lists five currently active hazardous waste transporters that operate ~~are based~~ in El Dorado County (DTSC 2003a).

Page 5.8-6, the fifth sentence of the first paragraph is revised as follows:

> It should be noted that this includes a range of activities, including the improper disposal of ~~empty~~ containers of common household products containing hazardous substances (e.g., cleansers) and batteries.

Page 5.8-15, the following text is added as a second paragraph under the heading *Assembly Bill 2185 (1987)*:

> AB 2185 authorizes local government agencies (in El Dorado County, the Environmental Management Department) to oversee emergency planning and community right-to-know programs related to hazardous substances, materials, and waste. Statewide information collected through required reporting programs is compiled by DTSC into several lists and databases that are available for review or can be consulted by the public (e.g., Cortese List, CalSites database). Information about the locations of specific sites that use, contain, or generate these materials

can be obtained from a variety of sources, including the County Planning Department, DTSC, OES, and often realtors.

Page 5.8-44, Mitigation Measure 5.8-3 is revised as follows:

5.8-3: Implement Mitigation Measure 5.10-1~~2~~(b)

Page 5.8-51, the reference to "qualified assessor" in Revised Policy HS-7b is changed to "Registered Environmental Assessor or other persons experienced in identifying potential waste".

Page 5.8-54, the paragraph under Seiche is revised as follows:

A seiche is an earthquake-generated wave in an enclosed body of water, such as a lake, reservoir, or bay. A small (0.4-foot) wave surge was reported in Lake Tahoe during the 1966 Truckee earthquake, which had a Richter Scale magnitude of between 6.0 and 6.9. In addition, there is also evidence of tsunami waves greater than 30 feet in height on the shoreline of Lake Tahoe (Ichinose, Anderson, Satake, Schweikert, and Lahren 2000).

Page 5.8-74, the text under **Mitigation Measure 5.8-6—Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative** is revised as follows:

The County shall implement ~~both of~~ the following measure~~s~~:

Page 5.8-75, the first paragraph under 5.8.3 Electromagnetic Fields is revised as follows:

Electric and magnetic fields are invisible lines that surround any electrical device, including ~~wireless phone facilities and~~ electrical transmission lines. Together these fields are called electromagnetic fields (EMFs). Electric and magnetic energy travels in a wave that is commonly referred to as electromagnetic radiation or radiofrequency radiation. EMF indicates the presence of electromagnetic or radiofrequency energy. Another form of electromagnetic energy, radio frequency (RF) radiation, is produced by wireless phone facilities. RF radiation has a different frequency than EMFs and does not necessarily produce biological effects in the same manner as EMFs. For ease of discussion, however, the term "EMF" is used in this EIR to include RF radiation from wireless phone facilities.

Page 5.8-91, Table 5.8-8 is revised to read as follows:

Table 5.8-8
Areas More Likely to Contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos

Market Area	Areas Likely to Contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos (acres)	Percentage of Market Area	Percentage of Total Naturally Occurring Asbestos
1: El Dorado Hills	~~2,763.9~~ 2,764	9.8%	8.5%
2: Cameron Park/Shingle Springs/Rescue	~~4,419.4~~ 4,419	10.8%	13.6%
3: Diamond Springs	~~365.4~~ 365	1.2%	1.1%
4: Placerville/Camino	~~256.0~~ 256	1.0%	0.8%
5: Coloma/Gold Hill	~~4,600.1~~ 4,600	17.6%	14.1%
6: Pollock Pines	0	0%	0%
7: Pleasant Valley	~~4265.5~~ 4,266	1.0%	1.3%
8: Latrobe	~~5,650.7~~ 5,651	16.0%	17.3%
9: Somerset	0	0%	0%
10: Cool/Pilot Hill	~~4,766.0~~ 4,766	10.5%	14.6%
11: Georgetown/Garden Valley	~~9,035.8~~ 9,036	6.7%	27.7%
12: Lake Tahoe Basin [1]	—	—	—
13: American River [1]	—	—	—
14: Mosquito	~~322.6~~ 323	2.1%	1.0%
TOTAL	~~32,605.3~~ 32,606	N/A	100%

[1] Not evaluated in the study.

Source: Department of Conservation 2000; EDAW 2003.

Page 5.8-92, the paragraph under ***Naturally Occurring Asbestos and Dust Protection Ordinance*** is revised as follows:

~~In response to the two ATCMs established by CARB, the~~ County ~~enacted~~ Ordinance No. 4548 (Naturally Occurring Asbestos and Dust Protection)~~, which~~

established Chapter 8.44, Title 8, of the County Code. The ordinance requires ~~asbestos~~ testing of ~~surface~~ serpentine materials or rock containing asbestos materials, and submittal/approval of a Contingent Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan for grading/mining activities ~~in areas identified on the Potential Asbestiform Minerals Map~~.

Page 5.8-96, Table 5.8-9, the row for "RRL (Rural Residential Low)" is removed.

Page 5.8-105, Mitigation Measure 5.8-9(b) is revised as follows:

New Policy: The County shall require that all projects requiring a ~~building or~~ grading permit, or a building permit that would result in earth disturbance, that are located in areas likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos (based on mapping developed by the DOC) have a California registered geologist knowledgeable about asbestos containing formations inspect the project area for the presence of asbestos using appropriate test methods. The County shall amend the Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance to include a section that addresses the reduction of thresholds to an appropriate level for grading permits in areas likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos (based on mapping developed by the California Department of Conservation). DOT and the County Air Quality Management District shall consider the requirement of posting a "Hazardous Conditions" sign at the work site if the site has been determined to contain harmful levels of asbestos material.

Page 5.8-119, the title of Exhibit 5.8-4 is revised as follows:

Fire Hazard Classifications of State Responsibility ~~Responsible~~ Areas

Page 5.9-5, the paragraph under *Seismic Ground Shaking* is revised as follows:

~~Potential ground shaking intensities are depicted in probabilistic seismic hazard maps. The potential intensity of seismic events varies across El Dorado County, generally increasing from west to east, with the highest potential ground shaking intensity located in the Lake Tahoe Basin (DOC 1996).~~ Expected ground shaking is measured using probabilistic seismic hazard maps. These maps use Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis (PSHA) techniques to identify potential ground shaking events that could occur in a particular region. It is probabilistic in the sense that the analysis takes into consideration the uncertainties in the size and location of earthquakes and the resulting ground motions that can affect a particular location. The maps are typically expressed in terms of probability of exceeding a certain peak ground acceleration (PGA) within a defined time period, where PGA is measured by percent g (gravity). Probabilistic ground shaking contour maps have been developed for California, which depict the 10 percent probability of exceeding a certain PGA in 50 years, assuming a uniform soft rock site condition.

The probabilistic seismic hazard maps for California indicate that the western two-thirds of El Dorado County has a relatively low potential PGA (up to 20 percent g); the potential PGA increases as you move east in the County (to 20-30 percent g), and ultimately to 30-40 percent g in the Lake Tahoe Basin (DOC 2003).

Page 5.9-10, the text under ***Avalanche*** is revised as follows:

An A snow avalanche is a type of landslide involving unstable snowpack fall or slide of a large mass of snow down a slope (mountainside). Such slides may include debris but are primarily comprised of snow and ice. The most common and destructive type of avalanche is the "slab" avalanche…

Page 5.9-30, the heading and paragraph for California Uniform Building Code is revised to read:

California Uniform Building Code

The State of California provides minimum standards for building design through the California UBC (California Code of Regulations [(CCR]) Title 24) (the California Building Code). The California UBC Building Code is based on the UBC Uniform Building Code, which is used widely throughout the United States (generally adopted on a state-by-state or district-by-district basis), and has been modified for conditions within California. For the purposes of this analysis, the California UBC will be referred to as the UBC. State regulations and engineering and design standards related to geology, soils, and seismicity in the UBC California Building Code (2001) are reflected in the County Building Code requirements. The UBC California Building Code includes a seismic zone map to determine applicable seismic standards for proposed structures. Seismic zones range from 0 to 4, with Zone 0 being the least active and Zone 4 the most active. All of El Dorado County is located in Seismic Zone 3 (El Dorado County 2003). All structures built in the county must company with UBC California Building Code requirements for this zone. In addition, there are certain provisions of CCR Title 24 that impose specific requirements on schools and hospitals, and these must be adhered to.

Page 5.9-35, the paragraph under the ***Federal Management of Mineral Resources*** is replaced with the following paragraph:

Federal lands within El Dorado County managed by BLM, BOR, and USFS are subject to the mining law of 1872 unless the lands are set aside for an alternate public purpose. Mining claims exist on portions of these lands and mining activities are regulated under federal law, including 43 CFR 3809 by the appropriate federal

agency. However, mining operations on federal land is subject to the reclamation requirements of SMARA.

Pg. 5.9-61, Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(c) is amended as follows:

The County shall adopt the following supplemental policy and implementation measure:

New Policy: The County shall require agricultural grading activities that ~~turn over~~ convert one acre or more of ~~soil~~ undisturbed vegetation to agricultural cropland to obtain a grading permit. All erosion control measures included in the grading permit would be implemented.

Page 5.9-64, the following change is made to Mitigation Measure 5.9-5(a) in the table:

5.9-5(a): Restrict Land Use Designations in Areas that May Contain Important Mineral Resources and 5.9-5(b): Amend General Plan Land Use Maps to Remove Designated Land Uses Incompatible with Mineral Resource Overlay Areas

Pages 5.9-72 and 5.9-73, Mitigation Measure 5.9-5(a) for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the third sentence from Revised Policy CO-2b is deleted as follows:

Revised Policy CO-2b: Application of the Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay designation and the extraction of mineral resources shall be considered appropriate only on lands having the Natural Resource, Open Space, and, Industrial, ~~Commercial, Rural Lands, and Public Facilities~~ designations. All other General Plan land use designations are considered incompatible with mining. ~~If additional -MR overlay lands are identified and the base land use designation is incompatible, a General Plan amendment must be approved to change the base land use designation at the time the -MR overlay is applied.~~ If an -MR overlay is placed on lands with an incompatible land use designation, a General Plan Amendment must be processed to change the base land use designation to one compatible with the -MR overlay within a reasonable time. Industrial uses shall be limited to those uses compatible with mineral exploration.

Page 5.10-42, under “Mitigation Measure – Roadway Constrained 6-Lane “Plus” Alternative”, delete the text in that paragraph and replace it with the following:

The Roadway Constrained Six-Lane Plus Alternative includes Policy HS-14d which replicates Policy 6.5.2.3 from the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives as revised above. No further mitigation is available. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Page 5.10-42, under "Mitigation Measure – Environmentally Constrained Alternative", delete the text in that paragraph and replace it with the following:

> The Environmentally Constrained Alternative includes Policy HS-14d which replicates Policy 6.5.2.3 from the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives as revised above. No further mitigation is available. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Page 5.11-1, the paragraph under **PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT** is revised as follows:

> Air quality conditions in an area are determined by such natural factors as topography, meteorology, and climate, coupled with atmospheric stability conditions and the presence of inversions. Air quality is a growing concern in El Dorado County. The County is in nonattainment with ozone and particulate matter standards. El Dorado County has two distinct air quality environments, which have been recognized formally by division of the county into two separate air basins, the Mountain Counties Air Basin (MCAB) and the Lake Tahoe Air Basin (LTAB), as shown in Exhibit 5.11-1.

Page 5.11-4, the following text is added after the fifth sentence of the third paragraph under ***Ozone***:

> According to the EPA, multi-hour (prolonged) exposure to ozone can substantially increase health effects even at moderate levels of exertion. In response, the EPA set a new 8-hour ozone NAAQS on July 18, 1997 to provide more protection for children, the elderly, and other vulnerable populations from the dangers posed by ozone.

Page 5.11-6, the first sentence of the second paragraph under ***Particulate Matter*** is revised as follows:

> The adverse health effects associated with PM_{10} ~~depend on the specific composition of the particulate matter.~~are not fully understood and may not only depend on the composition of the particulate matter, but also on other variables such as the number of particles being deposited into the respiratory system.

Page 5.11-9, the following text is added at the top of the page at the end of line two:

> The CARB 2002 California Almanac of Emissions and Air Quality includes information for ten TACs: acetaldehyde, benzene, 1,3-butadiene, carbon tetrachloride, chromium (hexavalent), *para*-dichlorobenzene, formaldehyde, methylene chloride, perchloroethylene, and diesel particulate matter. These ten compounds pose the greatest risk, statewide, based primarily on air quality data. It is important to note that other TACs such as dioxins may also pose a significant health risk, but sufficient data are not yet available. The County emissions for the

ten TACs are as follows: 84 tons/year of acetaldehyde, 124 tons/year of benzene, 23 tons/year of 1,3-butadiene, 0 tons/year of carbon tetrachloride, <.01 tons/year of chromium (hexavalent), 7 tons/year of *para*-dichlorobenzene, 153 tons/year of formaldehyde, 16 tons/year of methylene chloride, 68 tons/year of perchloroethylene, and 56 tons/year of diesel particulate matter. It is important to note that even though diesel particulate matter only constitutes approximately 10 percent of the total emissions above, with respect to health risk diesel particulate matter contributes approximately 70 percent of the total cancer risk.

Page 5.11-9, the first paragraph under ***Asbestos*** is revised as follows:

Asbestos is listed as a TAC by CARB and as an HAP by EPA. Asbestos is of special concern in El Dorado County because it occurs naturally in surface deposits of several types of ultramafic minerals as described in the next paragraph. Asbestos emissions can result from the sale or use of asbestos-containing materials, road surfacing with such materials, grading activities, and surface mining (AQMD 2002). The risk of disease is dependent upon the intensity and duration of exposure. When inhaled, asbestos fibers may remain in the lungs and with time may be linked to such diseases as asbestosis, lung cancer, and mesothelioma (CARB 2002a).

Page 5.11-9, the following paragraph is inserted between the first and second paragraphs under ***Asbestos***:

According to the California Geological Survey (formerly the Division of Mines and Geology), the rocks in the Sierra Nevada Foothills of western El Dorado County are predominantly metamorphic rocks created at high pressures and temperatures at depth by recrystallization of sedimentary rocks (shales, limestones, and sandstones) and igneous rocks (derived from melts). Numerous small irregularly distributed natural occurrences of chrysotile and tremolite/actinolite asbestos occur in these metamorphic rocks, especially near faults. Most often, these asbestos occurrences are associated with metamorphosed igneous rock serpentinite (often called serpentine). Metamorphism of any of several related high-magnesium and high-iron igneous rock types, collectively called ultramafic rocks, may result in the formation of serpentinite. Depending on its metamorphic history, serpentinite may contain chrysotile and or tremolite/actinolite asbestos. Tremolite/actinolite asbestos also may occur less commonly in certain other metamorphic rocks, especially near faults. However, it is important to note that not all serpentinite or fault zones contain asbestos. The known occurrences of tremolite/actinolite are not in areas mapped by the 1974 Soil Survey as serpentine in origin. However, currently available information and knowledge of asbestos occurrence in El Dorado County allow the identification of areas where geologic conditions appear to be favorable for the formation of asbestos materials. Areas more likely to contain natural occurrences of asbestos in western El Dorado County are shown on a 1:100,000-scale map available from the Department of Conservation (California

Geological Survey). Not all areas where conditions appear favorable will actually contain asbestos and available information and knowledge is not sufficient to allow prediction of asbestos occurrences at specific locations within these areas.

Page 5.11-9, the second paragraph under ***Asbestos*** is revised as follows:

The AQMD is responsible for implementing and enforcing Title 17, Section 93105 ~~93106~~ of the California Code of Regulations, Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations~~—Asbestos-Containing Serpentine~~. The AQMD is also responsible for implementing and enforcing Title 17, §93106 of the California Code of Regulations, Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measures for Surfacing Applications. The County, along with other state and federal agencies, are taking measures to define the locations of asbestos-bearing serpentine rock, the potential for public exposure, and procedures to minimize the impacts of naturally occurring asbestos (AQMD 2003). The best available information concerning areas where geologic conditions favor the formation of asbestos bearing materials is a report and accompanying map produced by the California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology (DOC), entitled *Areas More Likely to Contain Natural Occurrences of Asbestos in Western El Dorado County, California,* 2000 (Open-File Report 2000-02). This report is the result of a pilot project to compile an environmental-asbestos map for western El Dorado County that is intended to provide information to local, state and federal agencies and the public as to where geologic conditions appear favorable for the formation of asbestos minerals. Most asbestos materials found in El Dorado County are found in conjunction with serpentinite rock formations. However, tremolite/actinolite is known to be found in other formations as well. Discussion and general locations of both serpentinite and non-serpentinite based asbestos bearing minerals, all of which are mainly located along fault zones, is provided. The map is not intended to identify whether or not these materials are present or absent within a particular parcel of land. This determination can only be made during a detailed site-specific examination of the property. Please refer to Section 5.8.4, Human Health and Safety, for a discussion of this impact.

Page 5.11-10, the fourth sentence of the second paragraph under **Federal** is revised as follows:

The CAA also required states exceeding NAAQS to prepare SIPs showing how the standards would be met by July 1975 ~~December 1987~~.

Page 5.11-14, fifth sentence of the second full paragraph is deleted as shown:

~~Further, the inputs to the SIP are not parallel with the projections in the General Plan.~~

Page 5.11-16, the following text is added after the fifth sentence of the first full paragraph on page:

> The responsible person shall take precautions determined by the County AQMD to be necessary to prevent such a nuisance. If construction occurs in an area likely to contain asbestos, the responsible person must submit an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan to the AQMD and must comply with the County ordinance and Title 17, §93105 of the California Code of Regulations. Rule 224 states that a person shall not manufacture for sale…

Page 5.11-18, the fifth full sentence is deleted as shown:

> Concentrations of sulfates, lead, and hydrogen sulfide are, consequently, not monitored by the ambient air quality monitoring stations in El Dorado County. ~~CARB does not yet have a measuring method with enough accuracy or precision to designate areas in the state as either "attainment" or "nonattainment."~~ The entire state is considered "unclassified" for visibility- reducing particulate matter (AQMD 2003, CARB 2003).

Page 5.11-24, the following text is inserted at the beginning of Revised Policy 6.7.7.1:

> **Revised Policy 6.7.7.1**: The County shall consider air quality when planning the land uses and transportation systems to accommodate expected growth, and ~~the~~ ~~County~~ shall use the recommendations…

Page 5.11-25, the following text is inserted at the end of Revised Policy 6.7.7.1:

> The County shall encourage actions (i.e. use of light-colored roofs and retention of trees) to help mitigate heat island effects on air quality.

Page 5.11-25, the following text is inserted at the end of Revised Policy HS-10c:

> The County shall develop language to be included in County contract procedures to give preference to contractors that utilize low-emission heavy-duty vehicles.

Page 5.11-25, the following text is added at the end of Revised Policy HS-10c:

> The County shall encourage actions (i.e., use of light colored roofs and retention of trees) to help mitigate heat island effects on air quality.

Page 5.11-27, the table is revised to reflect the relevant edits through page 5.11-38 shown hereafter.

Page 5.11-36, Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(d) is revised as shown:

- Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(d): Regulate ~~Prohibit~~ Wood-Burning ~~Open-Masonry~~ Fireplaces and Stoves in New Development

Page 5.11-36, the following text is inserted at the end of the New Policy at the bottom of the page:

> The County shall develop language to be included in County contract procedures to give preference to contractors that utilize low-emission heavy-duty vehicles.

Page 5.11-37, the following change is made to the sixth line:

> ***Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(d): Regulate ~~Prohibit~~ Wood-Burning ~~Open-Masonry~~ Fireplaces and Stoves in New Development***
>
> The County shall implement the following new policy:
>
> **New Policy**: The County shall regulate ~~prohibit~~ wood-burning ~~open masonry~~ fireplaces and stoves in all new development. ~~Fireplaces with EPA-approved inserts~~, EPA-approved stoves~~,~~ and fireplaces burning natural gas are allowed. The County shall require replacement of non-certified wood heaters upon sale of any residential, commercial or industrial property before the completion of escrow and developers of subdivisions shall retrofit non-certified wood heaters in an equal number of homes with EPA certified units. The County shall restrict the sale and installation of used wood heaters. The County shall discourage the use of non-certified wood heaters and fireplaces during periods of unhealthy air quality.

Page 5.11-37, the following text is inserted at the beginning of the New Policy listed under Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(e):

> The County shall inform the public regarding the air quality effects associated with the use of wood for home heating. The program should address proper operation and maintenance of wood heaters, proper wood selection and use, the health effects of wood smoke, weatherization methods for homes, and determining the proper size of heater needed before purchase and professional installation. The County shall develop…

Page 5.11-37: Under Mitigation Measure 5.11-2—Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative, the list of Mitigation Measures is revised as follows:

- Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(a): Implement Mitigation Measure 5.11-1
- Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(b): Encourage Use of Alternative-Fuel Vehicles

- Mitigation Measure 5.11-2~~(b)~~(d): Regulate ~~Prohibit~~ Wood-Burning ~~Open-Masonry~~ Fireplaces and Stoves in New Development
- Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(e): Develop Incentive Program to Encourage Use of Newer Cleaner-Burning EPA-Certified Wood Stoves
- Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(f): Synchronize Signalized Intersections
- Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(g): Include Pedestrian Bike Paths Connecting to Adjacent Development

Page 5.11-38: the following text is inserted after the fourth line:

Implement Mitigation Measure5.11-2(b) for the No Project Alternative.

Page 5.11-38, the text beginning on the fifth line of the page is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(~~b~~d): Regulate ~~Prohibit~~ Wood-Burning ~~Open-Masonry~~ Fireplaces and Stoves in New Development

Page 5.11-38, the following text is inserted after the eighth line:

Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(e): Develop Incentive Program to Encourage Use of Newer Cleaner-Burning EPA-Certified Wood Stoves

Please refer to the proposed Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(e) under the No Project Alternative above.

Page 5.11-38; Mitigation Measure 5-11.2(g) is revised as follows:

New Policy: Within Community Regions and Rural Centers, all development shall include pedestrian/bike paths connecting to adjacent development and to schools, parks, commercial areas and other ~~common~~ facilities where feasible. In Rural Regions, pedestrian/bike paths shall be considered as appropriate.

Page 5.11-40, the fifth sentence of the first paragraph is revised as shown:

Activities involving the long-term use of diesel-powered equipment and heavy duty trucks, such as gravel mining and landfilling activities are, therefore, of particular concern. Post-construction exposure to asbestos due to soil-disturbing activities is also a concern.

Page 5.11-43, the first sentence under Mitigation Measure 5.11-3—Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is revised as follows:

> Please refer to the proposed Mitigation Measures 5.1-3(a), 5.1-3(b), and 5.1-3(c) for the No Project Alternative above.

Page 5.11-50, the first sentence under the **Mitigation Measure—No Project Alternative** heading is revised as follows:

> The County shall implement Mitigation Measure 5.11-2(f) ~~5.11-2~~(e) for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative described above.

Page 5.12-10, the second paragraph under the Fisheries heading is revised as follows:

> Introduced fishes are most prevalent in reservoirs or lakes where stocking occurs for sportfishing. In El Dorado County, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) ha an active trout stocking program in hydroelectric and water supply reservoirs and publicly accessible reaches of the South and Silver Forks of the American River~~the high mountain lakes and large reservoirs in or near wilderness areas, primarily on National Forest lands~~. Non-native gamefish in El Dorado County include brook trout, brown trout, kokanee salmon, and lake trout. Lahontan cutthroat trout, a native species, is also stocked by CDFG to sustain its population. Rainbow trout populations in El Dorado County are derived from mixed hatchery and native origin.

Page 5.12-11, the second paragraph is revised as shown:

> Currently, waterway obstructions limit movement by resident fishes within El Dorado County but are not impediments to fish migration. Historically, both chinook salmon and steelhead trout occurred in El Dorado County. Historical accounts describe salmon and steelhead being caught as far upstream as the current Slab Creek Reservoir, and possibly as far upstream as Eagle Rock (approximately 12 miles downstream of Strawberry). Spring-run chinook migrated up the Middle Fork American River to the confluence of the Rubicon River. Steelhead have been documented between 4 and 5 miles upstream of the mouth of the Rubicon River. Future restoration efforts may target reestablishment of one or more of these runs (Roscoe, pers. comm., 2003). ~~Historically, steelhead and other anadromous fishes were prevented from upstream migration on the South Fork of the American River above Salmon Falls and, later Folsom Dam.~~ Important habitat for anadromous fishes on the Cosumnes River is located downstream of the section of the river that flows through El Dorado County…

Page 5.12-14, the following changes are made to Table 5.12-2:

Species	Habitat	CNPS [1]	CDFG [2]	USFWS [3]
Layne's butterweed *Senecio layneae*	Chaparral, cismontane woodland/serpentinite or gabbroic, rocky; elevation 700-3,300 feet	1B	--	~~--~~ FT
Oval-leaved viburnum *Viburnum ellipticum*	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, lower montane coniferous forest; elevation 700-4,600 feet	2	--	--
El Dorado mule-ears *Wyethia reticulata*	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, lower montane coniferous forest/clay or gabbroic; elevation 600-2,100 feet	1B	--	--

[1] California Native Plant Society (CNPS)
1B Plants Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California and elsewhere
2 Plants Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California, but more common elsewhere

[2] California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
CE State listed as Endangered
CR State listed as Rare

[3] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
FE Federally listed as Endangered
FT Federally listed as Threatened
FC Federal Candidate for listing as Threatened or Endangered

Sources: CNDDB 2002, EDAW 2003

Page 5.12-17, the first sentence of the paragraph under ***Special-Status Wildlife*** is revised as shown:

> A total of 52 ~~51~~ special-status wildlife species are known to occur in El Dorado County (Table 5.12-3).

Page 5.12-28, the second paragraph under ***California Endangered Species Act*** is revised as shown:

> As under federal law, listed plants have considerably less protection than fish and wildlife under California state law. The California Native Plant Protection Act (Fish and Game Code §1900 et seq.) allows landowners to take listed plant species, provided that the owner first notifies CDFG and gives the agency at least 10 days to come and retrieve (and presumably replant) the plants before they are plowed under or otherwise destroyed. State protection for state-listed plants differs from that provided to state-listed wildlife species because of legislation that predated CESA. The first law that provided legal protection for special-status plants in California was the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA) of 1977 (Fish and Game Code Section 1900-1913). This law directed CDFG to preserve, protect, and enhance rare and endangered plants in California. The NPPA gave the California

Fish and Game Commission the power to designate native plants as "endangered" or "rare" and protected endangered and rare plants from take.

CESA expanded upon the original NPPA and enhanced legal protection for plants, but the NPPA remains part of the Fish and Game Code. To align with ESA regulations, CESA created the categories of threatened and endangered species. All "rare" animals were categorized as threatened species under CESA but the status of "rare" plants did not change. Thus, there are three listing categories for plants in California: rare, threatened, and endangered.

CDFG requires a CESA Section 2081 (a) permit for take of candidate or listed threatened and endangered plants for scientific, educational, or management purposes, and a CESA 2081 (b) permit for incidental take of listed threatened and endangered plants from all activities, except those specifically authorized by NPPA.

Page 5.12-30, the following paragraph is inserted between the first and second paragraphs:

In 2002, an amendment to the Wildlife Conservation Law of 1947 called the Oak Woodland Conservation Act became effective. The Act establishes a program in California for investing in the conservation of oak woodlands through conservation easement purchase, annual payments, and restoration. To be eligible for state funding allocated as a result of this Act, a county must adopt an oak woodland management plan that addresses oak woodland mitigation measures, tree inventory, canopy retention, and monitoring. El Dorado County has yet to adopt such a plan.

Page 5.12-31, the following text inserted between the first and second full paragraphs:

Noxious Weeds

The introduction and spread of noxious weeds is a source of habitat degradation in the County and elsewhere. Invasive weeds can replace native plants and reduce the quality of habitat for wildlife. Yellow star-thistle, an invasive weed found in a number of habitats including annual grassland, is one of the most prevalent invasive plant species found in El Dorado County. Statewide, this species has infested as many as 15 million acres. Yellow-star thistle infestations can reduce wildlife habitat and forage, displace native plants, and decrease native plant and animal diversity. Because of its spiny nature, livestock and wildlife avoid grazing in heavily infested areas. Human activities are the primary mechanisms for the long distance movement of yellow star-thistle seed. Many other noxious weeds are also prevalent in El Dorado County.

Page 5.12-38, the note at the bottom of Table 5.12-4 is revised as shown:

> Bold numbers are used when the combination of ~~low~~ high and medium land use intensity exceeds 50 percent. Although the No Project and 1996 General Plan Alternatives have the same land use designations, residential development intensity would differ. Under the No Project Alternative, development would generally be restricted to one DU/parcel regardless of size. Accordingly, intensity under the No Project Alternative would generally be lower than the designated intensity. Subdivision would be allowed under the 1996 General Plan Alternative.

Page 5.12-56, the first line of New Policy 7.4.2.8 is revised as follows:

> **New Policy 7.4.2.8:** Develop within five years and implement…

Page 5.12-57, the following text is inserted at the end of item B (Habitat Protection Strategy):

> Consideration of wildlife movement will be given by the County on all future 4- and 6-lane roadway construction projects. When feasible, natural undercrossings along proposed roadway alignments that could be utilized by terrestrial wildlife for movement will be preserved and enhanced.

Page 5.12-60, the following new paragraph is added to Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(e), following the first paragraph on the page:

> For all grading projects that will result in the conversion of one or more acres of important habitat to agriculture, the County shall require mitigation in the form of a fee in support of the County's conservation fund. When less than 10 acres of important habitat would be removed, the fee shall be sufficient to acquire, restore, and manage one acre of equivalent habitat for every acre of loss. When 10 acres or more of important habitat will be removed, the fees shall be sufficient to acquire, restore, and manage two acres for every acre of loss.

Page 5.12-61, the following row is added to the bottom of the table under Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(f) Option A:

1-9 (for parcels 1 acre or more only)	90% of existing canopy

Page 5.12-61, the following change is made to Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(f):

> Option B
>
> The project applicant shall provide sufficient funding to the County's INRMP's conservation fund, described in Mitigation Measures 5.12-1(d), to fully compensate

for the impact to oak woodland habitat. To compensate for fragmentation and as well as habitat loss, the preservation ~~replacement~~ mitigation ratio shall be 2:1 ~~and~~ based on the total woodland acreage onsite ~~(not just the area affected)~~ directly impacted by habitat loss and indirectly impacted by habitat fragmentation. The costs associated with acquisition, restoration, and management of the habitat protected shall be included in the mitigation fee. Impacts to woodland habitat and mitigation requirements shall be addressed in a Biological Resources Study and Important Habitat Mitigation Plan as described in Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(d).

Page 5.12-62, the second sentence under "A. Oak Tree Removal Permit Process" is revised as follows:

Special exemptions when a tree removal permit is not needed shall include tree removal of trees less than 36 inches in diameter at breast height on all single family residential lots of one acre or less that cannot be further subdivided and when written approval has been received from the County Planning Department…

Page 5.12-62, the fifth sentence under "A. Oak Tree Removal Permit Process" is revised as shown:

The replacement requirement shall be calculated based upon an inch-for-inch replacement of removed oaks.~~and shall consist of a minimum 15-gallon tree.~~

Page 5.12-66, the following text is inserted as part of Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(k) below New Policy CO-6c:

Revised Measure CO-J: Develop and adopt an Oak Resources ~~Woodland~~ Management Plan. The plan shall address ~~should contain~~ the following:

A. Mitigation ~~Canopy protection~~ standards outlined in Policy CO-6c;

B. Thresholds of significance for the loss of oak woodlands;

C. Requirements for tree surveys and mitigation plans for discretionary projects;

D. Replanting and replacement standards; ~~and~~

E. Heritage/landmark tree protection standards; and

F. An Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance as outlined in Policy CO-7a.

Page 5.12-67, Environmentally Constrained Alternative Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(k) is revised as shown:

> Replace Policy CO-6c with Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(f) of the No Project Alternative. Additionally, revise Implementation Measure CO-J as outlined under Mitigation Measure 5.12-1(k) of the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative.

Page 5.12-74, the following sentence is added to the end of Note 1 in Table 5.12-5:

> CNDDB does not make specific information regarding California red-legged frog occurrences public. High- and medium-intensity designations within the red-legged frog recovery area are shown on Exhibits 5.12-17 through 5.12-19.

Page 5.12-100, the fifth sentence of the second paragraph is revised to read:

> However, the effectiveness of these measures is limited by existing parcel sizes, which cannot be ~~reduced~~ increased, as well as existing patterns of development.

Page 5.12-112, the first sentence in the last paragraph is revised as follows:

> The Zoning Ordinance shall be amended to provide buffers and special setbacks for the protection of riparian areas and wetlands.

Page 5.12-113, Mitigation Measure 5.12-4(b) is revised by adding the following after the second paragraph:

> Until standards for buffers and special setbacks are established in the Zoning Ordinance, the County shall apply a minimum setback of 100 feet from all perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and 50 feet from intermittent streams and wetlands. These interim standards may be modified in a particular instance if more detailed information relating to slope, soil stability, vegetation, habitat, or other site- or project-specific conditions supplied as part of the review for a specific project demonstrates that a different setback is necessary or would be sufficient to protect the particular riparian area at issue.

Page 5.12-114, Mitigation Measure 5.12-4 for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative is revised as follows:

> The County shall implement ~~Please refer to the proposed~~ Mitigation Measure 5.12-4(a) for the No Project Alternative above. Implementation Measure CO-E shall be modified to include the following paragraph after the first sentence:
>
> > Until standards for buffers and special setbacks are established in the Zoning Ordinance, the County shall apply a minimum setback of 100 feet

from all perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and 50 feet from intermittent streams and wetlands. These interim standards may be modified in a particular instance if more detailed information relating to slope, soil stability, vegetation, habitat, or other site- or project-specific conditions supplied as part of the review for a specific project demonstrates that a different setback is necessary or would be sufficient to protect the particular riparian area at issue.

With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts would be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level because future development would eliminate a substantial amount of sensitive habitat and feasible opportunities to mitigate this impact would be limited.

Page 5.12-114, the first sentence of Mitigation Measure 5.12-14 for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative is revised as follows:

Please refer to the proposed Mitigation Measure 5.12-4 for the Roadway Constrained Six-Lane "Plus" Alternative~~(a) for the No Project Alternative~~ above.

Page 5.13-1, the following changes are made beginning with the third paragraph:

~~A discipline frequently associated with cultural sites and artifacts is paleontology.~~ Paleontology is the study of the remains, typically fossilized, of various plant or animal species such as dinosaurs and early mammals. While it is frequently associated with cultural sites and artifacts, paleontology does not encompass the study of traces of human cultural activity or human remains themselves. Paleontological remains may be found in numerous types of rock formations. However, vertebrate fossils are most commonly recovered from sedimentary and some volcanic rock formations, and can also be found in re-deposited stream and river gravels. ~~El Dorado County's geology is predominantly igneous (volcanic) in nature and the type of sedimentary deposits where such remains might be present are virtually nonexistent.~~ Although no comprehensive paleontological studies have been conducted within the county, the paleontological sensitivity of rock units can be generally assessed based on the density of fossil remains previously documented within the rock unit and based on known unique, scientifically important fossils produced from that rock unit. ~~and, as a result, no information is available regarding the sensitivity of While paleontological finds could occur in river and stream gravel deposits within the county, this possibility would not be expected and is remote. Consequently, paleontology is an area of research and concern generally not applicable to the county.~~

El Dorado County geology is fairly complex, with documented formations ranging from the Paleozoic era, dating to as early as 350 million years ago (Ma), to stream and gravel deposits still being deposited in recent times. Paleontological finds within most of these formations have been limited, with the exception of certain

limestone cave deposits. Seven such localities have been discovered and recorded, mostly during the early 20th century, and consist of Pleistocene-age (1.8 Ma to 10 thousand years ago) vertebrates from caves near the town of Cool and along the Cosumnes River in the southern portion of the County.

Other geological contexts from which a few vertebrate fossils have been discovered in the County include the Mehrten formation and Pleistocene channel deposits. The Mehrten is exposed in areas immediately surrounding Placerville to the north, south, and east. Pleistocene channel deposits occur in river tributaries in El Dorado County, and may appear underlying deposits mapped as Quaternary alluvium at shallow depth. While Quaternary alluvium is not prevalent in El Dorado County, primarily because of the topography, localized deposits are found within the County in stream and river channels, on the surface of valleys, and as alluvial fans.

Due to the localized nature of Pleistocene channel deposits, they have not been mapped but are found in tributaries throughout the county. Exhibits 5.13-1, 5.13-2 and 5.13-3 depict the location of the Merhten formation in relation to the land use maps of each of the alternatives.

Page 5.13-2, the second sentence of the first full paragraph is revised as shown:

~~Eleven~~ Eight of these resources, including individual buildings, sites and Historic Districts, are currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and California Register of Historic Places (CRHR)…

Page 5.13-10, the paragraph under **County Cultural Resource Management** has been revised as follows:

Numerous County and private organizations and commissions have endeavored to heighten public awareness of El Dorado County's prehistoric and historic cultural heritage and to preserve and manage numerous cultural resource sites in the area. These include the County Historical Museum, County Historical Society, and the El Dorado County Pioneer Cemeter~~y~~ ies Commission (a California 501(3)(c) Non-Profit Public Benefit Corporation, not affiliated with the County of El Dorado), and other countywide and area-specific historical groups. An eleven-member Cemetery Advisory Committee was created in 2001 by the Board of Supervisors to deal with County cemeteries issues. These organizations and commissions serve in an advisory capacity to the county and contributed to some of the policies discussed in this document….

Page 5.13-11, the following change is made to Impact 5.13-1 in the significance table:

5.13-1: Destruction or Alteration of ~~Documented and Undocumented~~ Known and Unknown Prehistoric and Historic Sites, Features, Artifacts, and Human Remains

Page 5.13-12, the following change is made to Mitigation Measure 5.13-1(a) in the significance table:

> 5.13-1(a), Implement Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(a); 5.13-1(b), Treat Significant Resources in Ministerial Development in Accordance with CEQA Standards; 5.13-1(c), Adopt a Cultural Resources Ordinance; 5.13-1(d), Define Historic Design Control Districts; 5.13-1(e), Prohibit Alteration or Destruction of NRHP/CRHR listed Properties; 5.13-1(f), Compile and Provide Access to Cultural Resource Data Not Documented in NCIC Files; and 5.13-1(g), Ensure that Proposed Projects Do Not Disturb Human Interments

Page 5.13-23, the following change is made to Mitigation 5.13-1(b):

> The County shall implement the following new policy:
>
> > **New Policy:** The County shall treat any significant cultural resources (i.e., those determined CRHR/NHRP eligible and unique paleontological resources), documented as a result of a conformity review for ministerial development, in accordance with CEQA standards.

Page 5.13-24, the following change is made to Mitigation 5.13-1(c) for the No Project Alternative:

> The County shall replace Policy 7.51.1 with the following:
>
> > **New Policy 7.5.1.1:** The County shall establish a Cultural Resources Ordinance. This ordinance shall provide a broad regulatory framework for the mitigation of impacts on cultural resources (including historic, prehistoric and paleontological resources) by discretionary projects. This Ordinance should include (but not be limited to) and provide for the following:
> >
> > - Appropriate (as per guidance from the Native American Heritage Commission) Native American monitors to be notified regarding projects involving significant ground-disturbing activities that could affect significant resources
> > - A 100-foot development setback in sensitive areas as a study threshold when deemed appropriate.
> > - Identification of appropriate buffers, given the nature of the resources within which ground-disturbing activities should be limited.
> > - A definition of cultural resources that are significant to the County. This definition shall conform to (but not necessarily be limited to)

the significance criteria used for the NRHP and the CRHR, and the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology.

- Formulation of project review guidelines for all development projects.
- Development of a cultural resources sensitivity map of the County.

This mitigation measure would contribute to reducing impacts on undocumented and documented cultural resources to a less-than-significant level. These provisions would serve to protect undocumented prehistoric resources in particular, which tend to exist in the vicinity of water sources covered under the setback considerations; to provide suitable buffers around documented resources; and to provide an opportunity for the Native American community to comment on potential impacts of development on important cultural sites, and to protect undocumented paleontological resources which have the potential to be found in the Mehrten formation, Pleistocene channel deposits, and Pleistocene cave deposits.

Page 5.13-25, Item B of Mitigation Measure 5.13-1(d) is revised as shown:

New buildings and structures and reconstruction/restoration of historic (historic as per NRHP and CRHR criteria) buildings and structures shall generally conform to styles of architecture ~~and construction~~ prevalent during the latter half of the 19th century into the first decade of the 20th century.

Pages 5.13-27, the following change is made to Mitigation 5.13-1(c) for the Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" Alternative:

The County shall revise Policy CO-8a as follows:

Revised Policy CO-8a: The County shall adopt a Cultural Resources Preservation Ordinance to address the inventory, preservation, protection, and management of prehistoric and historic resources and to establish procedures for the review of and comment on projects that may affect cultural resources (including historic, prehistoric and paleontological resources). This Ordinance should include (but not be limited to) and provide for the following:

- Appropriate (as per guidance from the Native American Heritage Commission) Native American monitors to be notified regarding projects involving significant ground-disturbing activities that would affect significant resources.

- A 100-foot development setback in sensitive areas as a study threshold when deemed appropriate.
- Identification of appropriate buffers, given the nature of the resources within which ground-disturbing activities should be limited.
- A definition of cultural resources that are significant to the County. This definition shall conform to (but not necessarily be limited to) the significance criteria used for the NRHP and the CRHR, and the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology.
- Formulation of project review guidelines for all development projects.
- Development of a cultural resources sensitivity map of the county.

Page 5.14-20, the last sentence in the first paragraph is revised as follows:

However, even if STPUD could provide only the minimum water supply currently available due to, the MTBE contamination (6,143 million gallons), this amount substantially exceeds STPUD's projected 2020 demand of 3,080 million gallons.

Page 7-4, the fifth sentence of the second paragraph is revised as follows:

Based on consultation with USFS staff, the issue of concern regarding cumulative impacts is fire management in what is termed the "urban intermix zone," areas developing at a density of generally one unit per 5 acres or more dense (although parcels smaller than 40 acres are also considered an indicator of "urbanizing" land use) adjacent to National Forest land (Pollock Pines, Grizzly Flat Flats, Volcanoville, Kyburz Kiburz, etc.).

Page 7-26, the following change is made to Impact 5.5-1:

Impact 5.5-1: Increased Water Demand and Likelihood of Surface Water Shortages Resulting from Expected Development. Applies to all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Page 7-27, the following change is made to Impact 5.6-7:

Impact 5.6-7: Potential for Impacts Associated with New and Expanded Communications Infrastructure. Applies to all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Page 7-27, the following change is made to Impact 5.7-3:

Impact 5.7-3: Potential Land Use Incompatibility Associated with Development and Expansion of Public School Facilities. Applies to all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Page 7-28, the following correction is made to Impact 5.11-1 and 5.11-2:

Impact 5.11-1: Construction Emissions of ROG, NO_X, and ~~PM10~~ PM_{10}. Applies to all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Impact 5.11-2: Long-Term Operational (Regional) Emissions of ROG, NO_X, and ~~PM10~~ PM_{10}. Applies to all four of the equal-weight General Plan alternatives.

Page 7-29, the following change is made to the bullet list:

The following topics are issues in which each of the equal-weight general plan alternatives would contribute considerably to a cumulatively significant and unavoidable impact.

- Land Use and Housing
- Agriculture and Forestry
- Visual Resources
- Traffic and Circulation
- Water Resources
- Utilities
- Public Services
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Lake Tahoe Basin (traffic, recreation, noise, air quality, and biological resources)
- Growth Inducement