

DRAFT

## **Initial Study/**

# **Mitigated Negative Declaration**

for the

## **Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road Intersection Improvements Project**

**CEQA Lead Agency**  
El Dorado County  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667



**December 2008**



## Table of Contents

|          |  |           |
|----------|--|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1      | California Environmental Quality Act.....                        | 1         |
| 1.2      | Document Organization.....                                       | 2         |
| <b>2</b> | <b>INITIAL STUDY FINDINGS.....</b>                               | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>3</b> | <b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....</b>                                  | <b>7</b>  |
| 3.1      | Project Location and Land Use Designations.....                  | 7         |
| 3.2      | Project Purpose and Objectives.....                              | 7         |
| 3.3      | Proposed Improvements.....                                       | 7         |
| 3.3.1    | Roadway Modifications.....                                       | 7         |
| 3.3.2    | Pedestrian, Bicycle and Transit Facilities.....                  | 8         |
| 3.3.3    | Lighting, Utilities and Drainage Facilities.....                 | 9         |
| 3.3.4    | Tree Removal and Revegetation.....                               | 9         |
| 3.3.5    | Right-of-Way Requirements.....                                   | 9         |
| 3.3.6    | Project Construction.....  | 10        |
| 3.3.7    | Construction Schedule.....                                       | 11        |
| 3.4      | Permits and Regulatory Approvals.....                            | 12        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>INITIAL STUDY CHECKLISTS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION. 13</b> |           |
| 4.1      | Aesthetics.....  | 15        |
| 4.2      | Agricultural Resources.....                                      | 17        |
| 4.3      | Air Quality.....   | 19        |
| 4.4      | Biological Resources.....  | 29        |
| 4.5      | Cultural Resources.....  | 37        |
| 4.6      | Geology and Soils.....   | 41        |
| 4.7      | Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....                             | 47        |
| 4.8      | Hydrology and Water Quality.....                                 | 51        |
| 4.9      | Land Use and Planning.....                                       | 57        |
| 4.10     | Mineral Resources.....   | 59        |
| 4.11     | Noise.....   | 61        |
| 4.12     | Population and Housing.....                                      | 65        |
| 4.13     | Public Services.....   | 67        |
| 4.14     | Recreation.....  | 69        |
| 4.15     | Transportation/Traffic.....                                      | 71        |
| 4.16     | Utilities and Service Systems.....                               | 75        |
| 4.17     | Mandatory Findings of Significance.....                          | 79        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES.....</b>                       | <b>87</b> |

## List of Figures

|          |   |                  |
|----------|---|------------------|
| Figure 1 | Project Location .....  | Follows Page 8   |
| Figure 2 | Proposed Project.....   | Follows Figure 1 |
| Figure 3 | Preliminary Jurisdictional Wetland Delineation Map .....                          | Follows Page 30  |
| Figure 4 | Occurrences of Special-Status Species Within<br>One-Mile of the Project Area..... | Follows Figure 3 |

## List of Tables

|           |  |         |
|-----------|--|---------|
| Table 3-1 | Potential Permits and Regulatory Approvals Required<br>for the Project ..... | Page 12 |
| Table 4-1 | Federal and State Air Quality Standards.....                                 | Page 22 |
| Table 4-2 | Estimated Construction Emissions.....  | Page 25 |
| Table 4-3 | Carbon Monoxide Concentration and Significance Determination ...             | Page 25 |
| Table 4-4 | Regional Species and Habitats of Concern.....                                | Page 31 |
| Table 4-5 | Soil Map Units within the Project Area.....                                  | Page 44 |

## Appendices

|            |                            |
|------------|----------------------------|
| Appendix A | Mitigation Monitoring Plan |
|------------|----------------------------|

## 1 Introduction

The El Dorado County Department of Transportation is proposing to complete improvements at the Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road intersection in the community of Cameron Park (see **Figure 1** following Page 8). The County has prepared this Initial Study to consider the potential for the project to result in one or more significant impacts to the environment pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.). The County is the CEQA lead agency for the project and this document has been prepared based on the requirements of the state CEQA Guidelines (14 California Administrative Code, Section 14000 et seq.).

### 1.1 California Environmental Quality Act

This document is an Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) prepared in accordance with CEQA, Public Resources Code §21000 et seq., and the State CEQA Guidelines, Title 14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15000 et seq. The purpose of this IS/MND is to: (1) determine whether project implementation would result in potentially significant or significant effects to the environment, and (2) incorporate mitigation measures into the project design, as necessary, to eliminate the project's potentially significant or significant project effects or reduce them to a less-than-significant level. An IS/MND presents the environmental analysis and substantial evidence supporting its conclusions regarding the significance of environmental impacts. Substantial evidence may include expert opinion based on facts, technical studies, or reasonable assumptions based on facts. An IS/MND is not intended nor required to include the level of detail used in an environmental impact report (EIR).

CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects they propose to carry out, or over which they have discretionary authority, before implementing or approving those projects. As specified in State CEQA Guidelines §15367, the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project is the lead agency for CEQA compliance. El Dorado County has principal responsibility for carrying out the proposed project and is therefore the CEQA lead agency for this IS.

As specified in State CEQA Guidelines §15064(a), if there is substantial evidence (such as the results of an initial study) that a project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, the lead agency must prepare an EIR. The lead agency may instead prepare a negative declaration if it determines there is no substantial evidence that the project may cause a significant impact on the environment. The lead agency may prepare a MND if, in the course of the initial study analysis, it is recognized that the project may have a significant impact on the environment but that implementing specific mitigation measures (i.e., incorporating revisions into the project) would reduce any such impacts to a less-than-significant level (State CEQA Guidelines

§15064[f]). Based on the results of this Initial Study, the County has determined that the project could have a significant effect on the environment, but mitigation has been identified that would reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, with a commitment to implement the mitigation measures identified herein, the County may complete the project CEQA review with a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND).

## **1.2 Document Organization**

This document is divided into the following sections:

- **Section 2, Initial Study Findings**—Provides the County’s CEQA findings pursuant to this Initial Study;
- **Section 3, Project Description**—Provides a detailed description of the project;
- **Section 4, Initial Study Checklists and Supporting Documentation**—Provides CEQA Initial Study resource impact checklists and supporting documentation; and
- **Section 5, Supporting Information Sources**—Provides a listing of sources of information used for the preparation of this document.
- **Appendix A, Mitigation Monitoring Plan**—Contains the Mitigation Monitoring Plan prepared for the proposed project. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan includes a list of required mitigation measures and includes information regarding the County’s policies and procedures for implementation and monitoring of the mitigation measures.

## 2 Initial Study Findings

**1. Project Title:**

Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road Intersection Improvements Project

**2. Lead agency name and address:**

El Dorado County, Department of Transportation  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667

**3. Contact person and phone number:**

Janet Postlewait (530) 621-5900

**4. Project location:**

The intersection of Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road in the community of Cameron Park approximately 3.0 miles north of U.S. Highway 50. (See **Figure 1** in **Section 3** of this Initial Study)

**5. Project sponsor's name and address:**

N/A

**6. General Plan designation:**

El Dorado County General Plan:  
Commercial, High Density Residential  
and Multi-Family Residential

**7. Pre-zoning:**

N/A

**8. Description of project:**

The proposed project involves the development of intersection improvements at the intersection of Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road in the community of Cameron Park. The proposed project would include development of left-turn lanes and right-turn pockets within the project area. The project limits begin approximately 715 feet south of Cameron Park Drive's intersection with Green Valley Road and extend to approximately 200 feet north of Green Valley Road. The east-west project boundary would extend approximately 2,300 feet west on Green Valley Road and approximately 800 feet east on Green Valley Road. A more detailed project description is included in **Section 3** of this Initial Study. **Figure 2** in **Section 3** shows the project area and proposed improvements.

**9. Surrounding land uses and setting:**

The project area is located within the community of Cameron Park. The project area intersection is located within an area with developed commercial and residential pockets approximately 3.0 miles north of U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50). The four quadrants of the intersection are flanked by commercial uses, while other portions of the project area are designated as Multi-Family Residential and High Density Residential in the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan. The Cameron Airpark is located approximately 3,960 feet south of the project intersection.

Additional information concerning surrounding land uses within and adjacent to the project area is included **Section 3** of this Initial Study.

**10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

The project may require permits or approvals from the following agencies:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Nationwide Section 404 Discharge Permit

California Department of Fish and Game – Lake/Streambed Alteration Agreement

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board – General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity; Water Quality Certification

California Department of Transportation – Encroachment Permit

El Dorado County Air Quality Management District – Dust Mitigation Plan



**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

This Initial Study has determined that in the absence of mitigation the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts associated with the factors checked below. Mitigation measures are identified in this Initial Study that would reduce all potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

|   |                               |   |                                    |  |                        |
|---|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
|   | Aesthetics                    |   | Agricultural Resources             |  | Air Quality            |
| ✓ | Biological Resources          | ✓ | Cultural Resources                 |  | Geology/Soils          |
|   | Hazards & Hazardous Materials |   | Hydrology/Water Quality            |  | Land Use/Planning      |
|   | Mineral Resources             |   | Noise                              |  | Population/Housing     |
|   | Public Services               |   | Recreation                         |  | Transportation/Traffic |
|   | Utilities/Service Systems     |   | Mandatory Findings of Significance |  |                        |

**INITIAL STUDY DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.  |
| ✓ | I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.   |
|   | I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.   |
|   | I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. |
|   | I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.                                   |

Signature

Date

Name and Title: Janet Postlewait, Principal Planner

Department of Transportation

This page left intentionally blank.

### **3 Project Description**

#### **3.1 Project Location and Land Use Designations**

The Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road Intersection Improvement Project (proposed project) is located in the community of Cameron Park, in western El Dorado County (see **Figure 1**). The project area is located approximately 3.0 miles north of U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50) at the intersection of Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road. The project limits begin approximately 715 feet south of Cameron Park Drive's intersection with Green Valley Road and extend to approximately 200 feet north of this location. The east-west project boundary would extend approximately 2,300 feet west on Green Valley Road and approximately 800 feet east on Green Valley Road. The full length of the project is approximately 0.60 miles.

Cameron Park is a suburban community comprising high-density and multifamily residential development surrounding a general aviation airport, with a large retail center at U.S. 50. In the immediate vicinity of the proposed project, there are developed residential parcels surrounding the project area roadways and commercial development surrounding the intersection. Land Use Designations, pursuant to the El Dorado County 2004 General Plan include Commercial, High Density Residential (1 to 5 dwelling units per acre), and Multi-Family Residential (5 to 24 dwelling units per acre) designations.

#### **3.2 Project Purpose and Objectives**

The project area has been identified by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation in the Proposed 2008 Capital Improvement Program as requiring operational and safety modifications to accommodate traffic anticipated within the 2004 County General Plan. The objective of the Proposed Project is:

*To accommodate traffic anticipated within the 2004 County General Plan at the intersection of Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road and roadways within the project area.*

#### **3.3 Proposed Improvements**

##### **3.3.1 Roadway Modifications**

The proposed project involves roadway alignment and intersection improvements along Cameron Park Drive, Green Valley Road and Starbuck Drive. Roadway modifications along Cameron Park Drive include widening to accommodate the extension of a two-way left turn lane from Winterhaven Drive to Green Valley Road. A second left-turn lane would be developed on northbound Cameron Park Drive for motorists turning onto westbound Green Valley Road. Additionally, left-turn access from southbound Cameron Park Drive to the commercial development on the southeast corner of the intersection

would be restricted. Right-in and right-out access from northbound Cameron Park Drive would be retained.

Proposed roadway modifications along Green Valley Road include the widening of Green Valley Road from Cambridge Road to Cameron Park Drive and the development of a right-turn pocket on eastbound Green Valley Road for motorists turning onto southbound Cameron Park Drive. Widening of Green Valley Road would provide one through lane each in the east and westbound directions and a center median would be installed. Turn lanes along Green Valley Road would be provided at roadway intersections.

Starbuck Drive would be two lanes consisting of one left-turn lane and one through/right-turn lane. Starbuck Drive would consist of one lane in the northbound direction with shoulders. All through lanes within the project area would be 12 feet wide, while turn lanes would vary between 12 feet and 14 feet in width. Paved road shoulders within the project area would be approximately 5 to 8 feet wide. Concrete curb and gutter would be added to both sides of the roadways where the existing roadway is adjacent to developed properties; however, curb, gutter and sidewalk development would not occur adjacent to undeveloped properties, but would be the responsibility of the property developer upon application approval and completion of the development project CEQA review.

### **3.3.2 Pedestrian, Bicycle and Transit Facilities**

Currently, there is an existing crosswalk facility located at the Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road intersection. The proposed project does not include the striping of additional crosswalk facilities. The proposed project includes the development of sidewalks adjacent to roadways that front currently developed parcels. It will be the responsibility of the future developers of currently undeveloped parcels to install sidewalk facilities adjacent to the roadways within the project area. Handicapped-accessible ramps would be installed at all four corners of the intersection.

The 2005 El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan identifies Class II bicycle lanes along Cameron Park Drive through the project area as a Tier 1 (highest priority) project, while the Plan identifies Class II bicycle lanes along Green Valley Road through the project area as a Tier 2 project. The Plan does not identify any proposed or future bicycle facilities along Starbuck Drive. Currently, there are no designated bicycle lanes or routes through the project area. The Proposed Project includes Class II bicycle lanes consistent with the 2025 improvements identified in the County General Plan. Class II bicycle lanes with widths varying from 5- to 8-feet would be striped in the north- and southbound directions along Cameron Park Drive, and in the east- and westbound directions along Green Valley Road.

The proposed project also provides space for a potential bus turnout on the north side of Green Valley Road approximately 300 feet west of the Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road intersection.

### **3.3.3 Lighting, Utilities and Drainage Facilities**

Existing lighting within the project area consists of light standards adjacent to the southeast and southwest corners of the project intersection. These lights are currently maintained by the Cameron Park Community Services District (CSD). No modifications to the existing lighting features would be necessary and no additional light standards would be installed in association with the proposed project.

The proposed project would require that several utility boxes, water valves and manholes would be raised to grade or realigned/resituated within the roadway right-of-way; however, no utility relocations would be necessary outside of the project area. Coordination with the appropriate utility service provider would be conducted prior to utility relocation to minimize utility service disruption.

On-site drainage modification for the proposed project would include extension of an existing cross culvert on Cameron Park Drive (located approximately 550 feet south of the intersection within the project area) and installation of curbs and gutters where there are none currently in place, with the exception of APN's 102:110:20, 116:301:01 and 083:031:13. These properties are expected to construct curbs, gutters and sidewalks as a part of future or on-going on site development. The existing drainage ditch located along the east side of Cameron Park Drive would be removed with the roadway widening would be replaced with underground storm drainpipes. (See **Figure 2.**) The proposed project involves the installation of approximately 200 feet of new underground culvert and the replacement of approximately 700 feet of existing underground culvert.

### **3.3.4 Tree Removal and Revegetation**

Development of the proposed project would require the removal of four pine trees, three ornamental trees, and six live oak trees located adjacent to project roadway alignments. In the event that construction activities and development of the proposed project require additional tree removal, Section 4.4 of this IS/MND provide further discussion.

### **3.3.5 Right-of-Way Requirements**

The proposed project would require permanent right-of-way acquisition to accommodate the roadway widening and the acquisition of additional drainage easements and temporary construction easements from adjacent properties. Permanent right-of-way acquisitions would be negotiated with property owners who would be compensated for their acquired property. The County would obtain temporary easements from adjacent parcels to accommodate vehicle and equipment operations during construction. Temporary easements would be negotiated with property owners who would be compensated for the use of easement areas.

### **3.3.6 Project Construction**

The El Dorado County DOT will retain a construction contractor to construct the proposed improvements. The contractor would be responsible for compliance with all applicable rules, regulations and ordinances associated with construction activities and for actual implementation of the construction-related mitigation measures to be adopted for the project. DOT will provide construction contractor oversight and management and will be responsible for verifying mitigation measure implementation. The proposed project will be constructed in accordance with the Public Contracts Code of the State of California, the State of California Department of Transportation Standard Plans and Standard Specifications, and the Contract, Project Plans, and Project Special Provisions under development by the County of El Dorado Department of Transportation. The general public would be precluded from access to the trail during construction activities. The following are a combination of standard and project-specific procedures/requirements applicable to project construction:

- Construction contract special provisions will require that a traffic management plan be prepared. The traffic management plan will include construction staging schedules and traffic control measures to be implemented during construction to maintain and minimize impacts to traffic during construction. Minor traffic stoppages or delays may be allowed if necessary during project construction. Full roadway closures will be avoided during project construction and provisions for emergency vehicle movement through the project area will be provided at all times during construction;
- Contract special provisions will require compliance with EDCAQMD Rules 223, 223-1, and 223-2 to minimize fugitive dust emissions and the potential for risk of disturbance to naturally occurring asbestos;
- Compliance with the California Air Resources Board Airborne Toxic Control Measure at Title 17 Section 93105 addressing Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining activities and with the Asbestos ATCM for Surfacing Applications (California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Section 93106);
- Contract provisions will require notification of DOT and compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 et seq., regarding the discovery and disturbance of human remains should any human remains be discovered during project construction;
- Contract provisions will require compliance with the El Dorado County Grading Ordinance and Storm Water Management Plan for Western El Dorado County and implementation of Best Management Practices as identified in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit and/or Storm Water Management Plan;
- DOT or its construction contractors will conduct early coordination with utility service providers, law enforcement and emergency service providers to ensure minimal disruption to service during construction;

- DOT and its construction contractors will comply with the State of California Standard Specifications (May 2006), written by the State of California Department of Transportation, for public service provision;
- Access to adjacent residential properties will remain open at all times during the construction period; and
- The project would comply with General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11 pertaining to construction noise.

### **3.3.7 Construction Schedule**

Construction of the proposed project is proposed to commence in 2013, but may be constructed sooner depending on available funding and would require approximately six months to complete.

### 3.4 Permits and Regulatory Approvals

Table 3-1 provides a preliminary listing of the potential permits or other regulatory approvals that may be required for the project.

**Table 3-1. Potential Permits and Regulatory Approvals Required for the Project**

| Approving Agency  | Required Permit/Approval  | Required For   |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Federal Agencies</b>   |   |  |
| Army Corps of Engineers   | <b>Nationwide Section 404 Discharge Permit.</b> (Clean Water Act, 33 USC 1341)  | Discharge of dredge/fill material into "Waters of the United States," including wetlands.  |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  | <b>Biological Opinion.</b>  | Minimization of impacts to listed species.   |
| <b>State Agencies</b>   |   |  |
| State Water Resources Control Board, Regional Water Quality Control Board | <b>General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit. Notice of Intent.</b> (40 CFR Part 122)<br><b>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit.</b> (Clean Water Act, 33 USC 1251 <i>et seq.</i> )<br><b>Waste Discharge Requirements.</b> (Water Code 13000 <i>et seq.</i> )<br><b>Water Quality Certification</b> (Clean Water Act), if project requires Army Corps of Engineers 404 permit. | Storm water discharges associated with construction activity.<br>For storm water discharges associated with industrial activity, unless covered by individual NPDES permit.<br>Discharge of waste that might affect groundwater quality.                                   |
| Department of Fish and Game   | <b>Lake/Streambed Alteration Agreement.</b> (Fish and Game Code 1603)   | Discharge into "Waters of the U.S.," including wetlands (see Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit above).<br>Change in natural state of river, stream, lake (includes road or land construction across a natural streambed) which affects fish or wildlife resource. |
| <b>Local Agencies</b>   |   |  |
| El Dorado County Air Quality Management District                          | <b>Dust Mitigation Plan</b>   | Minimization of construction emissions associated with construction of the proposed project.   |



#### **4 Initial Study Checklists and Supporting Documentation**

The resource-specific checklists and supporting discussion have been prepared based on the review of the project area and existing site conditions, review of relevant literature (as cited herein), consideration of the design plans for the proposed project, and discussions with County staff and agencies.

The following provides issue-specific checklists identifying the project's potential to result in significant impacts. Each checklist is followed by a description of the environmental setting within the project area relevant to the issues in each checklist and a discussion of each environmental issue/question in the checklist.

This page is left intentionally blank.

## 4.1 Aesthetics

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project:   |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                    |                                |   |                              | ✓         |

### 4.1.1 Environmental Setting

The project area includes the Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road intersection and adjacent areas which are comprised of residential development, commercial development and undeveloped lands. The majority of the existing landscape adjacent to the project-area roadways is residential and commercial landscaping with varying amounts of dense vegetation. No unique scenic resources, notable vistas or other positive visual attributes are present within the project area.

### 4.1.2 Potential Environmental Effects

- a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

**No Impact.** The Proposed Project would result in a relatively minor physical change to the visual characteristics of the immediate project area by widening roadways, restriping traffic lanes and removal of 11 trees within the project area. These features would result in a slight noticeable change in the character; however, there are no identified scenic vistas within or in the vicinity of the project site, and therefore, the proposed project would have no substantial adverse effects on a scenic vista.

- b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

**No Impact.** The nearest scenic highway designation is along U.S. 50 between and within the City of Placerville and the Tahoe Basin. This designation occurs approximately 10.0 miles east of the proposed project area. As such, the project would not affect aesthetic resources within the proximity of a State scenic highway.

- c) *Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

**Less Than Significant.** As discussed above, the project would result in a relatively minor physical change to the visual characteristics of the immediate project area by widening roadways and installing traffic control signals. These features would result in a slight noticeable change in the character; however, the addition of the proposed project features is not anticipated to substantially degrade the visual quality of the project area and this impact is therefore considered less than significant.

The proposed project would result in the removal of four pine trees (*Pinus* spp.), three ornamental trees, and six live oak trees (*Quercus virginiana*). Although development of the proposed project would result in the removal of up to 13 trees within the project area, this change would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the project site. This impact, therefore, is considered less than significant.

- d) *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not include the development and installation of lighting features nor the modification of existing features; therefore, the project would not introduce substantial new sources of light and glare, or adversely affect nighttime views in the project area.

**4.2 Agricultural Resources**

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| <p>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:</p> |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?   |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?   |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |

**4.2.1 Environmental Setting**

The California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program “El Dorado County Important Farmland 2006” map identifies the project area with classifications of “Urban and Built-Up Land” and “Farmland of Local Importance”. The Farmland of Local Importance is located adjacent to Green Valley Road, immediately south of the Green Valley Road/Cambridge Drive intersection. No *Prime Farmland*, *Unique Farmland*, or *Farmland of Statewide Importance* or lands under Williamson Act contracts are present within the project area.

**4.2.2 Potential Environmental Effects**

- a) *Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*

**No Impact.** No *Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance* would be affected by the project.

- b) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

**No Impact.** No lands either zoned for agricultural uses or subject to a Williamson Act contract exist within or adjacent to the project area. The proposed project would not disrupt agricultural activities, and does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

- c) *Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use?*

**No Impact.** No Farmland is present within the project area, and the project would not result in or create a situation that would contribute to conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use.

### 4.3 Air Quality

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:   |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?   |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?   |                                |   | ✓                            |           |

#### 4.3.1 Environmental Setting

The project area is located within the Mountain Counties Air Basin (MCAB) and under the jurisdiction of the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (EDCAQMD). The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin and the Sacramento Valley Air Basin lay to the west, and the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin is located to the south.

#### Air Pollutant Sources and Ambient Air Quality

The EDCAQMD regulates air quality through its permit authority for most types of stationary emission sources, and through its planning and review activities for other sources.

Federal and California ambient air quality standards have been established for the following five critical pollutants: ozone, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and sulfur dioxide.

Sources of Pollutants

In general, there are five major sources of air pollutant emissions in the air basin, including motor vehicles, industrial plants, agricultural activities, construction activities, and residential burning activities. Motor vehicles account for a significant portion of regional gaseous and particulate emissions. Industrial facilities can also generate substantial gaseous and particulate emissions. In addition, construction, agricultural activities, and the burning of wood in fireplaces for residential heat can generate significant temporary gaseous and particulate emissions (dust, ash, smoke, etc.).

Ozone

Ozone pollution is the most conspicuous type of air pollution, and is often characterized by visibility-reducing haze, eye irritation, and high oxidant concentrations (i.e., “smog”). Ozone is a pollutant of particular concern in El Dorado County and in the Sacramento Valley. Ozone, which is classified as a “regional” pollutant, often afflicts areas downwind of the original source of precursor emissions. Ozone is produced in the atmosphere through photochemical reactions involving reactive organic compounds (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>). Numerous small sources throughout the region are responsible for most of the ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions in the Basin. Ozone can be easily transported by winds from a source area. Winds from the west transport ozone from the Bay Area and the Sacramento Valley Air Basin to the Sierra Nevada foothills. Ozone precursor transport depends on daily meteorological conditions. In the summer, air flowing into the Mountain Counties Air Basin from the Central Valley to the west transports ozone precursors and ozone generated in the Bay Area and the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys into the MCAB. These transported pollutants predominate as the cause of ozone in the air basin and are largely responsible for the exceedance of the state and federal ozone standard in the air basin (El Dorado County Air Quality Management District, 2002).

Particulate Matter (PM)

Particulate matter is another pollutant of concern in the MCAB. Particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>) and less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) refers to substances that can be inhaled into lungs and can potentially cause serious health problems. Common particulate matter sources include construction and demolition activities, agricultural operations, burning, and diesel-fueled vehicle and equipment emissions.

Carbon Monoxide (CO)

Carbon monoxide (CO) is emitted primarily by motor vehicles. Non-reactive, ambient CO concentrations normally follow the spatial and temporal distributions of vehicular traffic. CO concentrations are also influenced by meteorological factors such as wind speed and atmospheric mixing. High levels of CO can impair the transport of oxygen in the bloodstream and thereby aggravate cardiovascular disease and cause fatigue,



headaches, and dizziness. CO may form high concentrations when wind speed is low. Cold temperatures and calm conditions increase the likelihood of a climate conducive to high, localized CO concentrations.

*Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>)*

The major sources of nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), essential to the formation of photochemical smog, are vehicular, residential, and industrial fuel combustion. NO<sub>2</sub> is the brown colored gas evident during periods of heavy air pollution. NO<sub>2</sub> increases respiratory disease and irritation and may reduce resistance to certain infections.

*Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>)*

The major source of sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) is the combustion of high-sulfur fuels for electricity generation, petroleum refining, and shipping. In humid atmospheres, sulfur oxides can react with vapor to produce sulfuric acid, a component of acid rain. SO<sub>2</sub> can irritate the lungs, damage vegetation and materials, and reduce visibility.

*Lead (Pb)*

Gasoline-powered automobile engines are a major source of airborne lead, although the use of leaded fuel is being reduced. Lead can cause blood effects such as anemia and the inhibition of enzymes involved in blood synthesis. Lead may also affect the central nervous and reproductive systems. Ambient lead levels have dropped dramatically as the percentage of motor vehicles using unleaded gasoline continues to increase.

*Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA)*

NOA is known to be present within El Dorado County. Disturbance of serpentine or ultramafic rock has the potential to release NOA into the air. Serpentine rock does not pose a health risk unless it is disturbed in such a manner that causes asbestos-containing particulate matter to be released from the rock into the air creating a health risk. EDCAQMD has adopted an El Dorado County Naturally Occurring Asbestos Review Area Map which identifies those areas more likely to contain NOA. Ground disturbance activities within these areas are subject to additional County regulatory requirements to minimize human exposure potential. The project area is not located within an area identified on the most recent Naturally Occurring Asbestos Review Area Map as being "More Likely to Contain Asbestos" (July 22, 2005).

*Ambient Air Quality Standards*

Applicable Federal and State standards for each regulated pollution category is provided in **Table 4 -1**.

**Table 4-1  
Federal and State Air Quality Standards**

| Pollutant         | Averaging Time               | Federal Standard            | State Standard              |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ozone             | 1-Hour                       | --                          | 0.09 ppm                    |
|                   | 8-Hour                       | 0.08 ppm                    | --                          |
| Carbon Monoxide   | 1-Hour                       | 35.0 ppm                    | 20.0 ppm                    |
|                   | 8-Hour                       | 9.0 ppm                     | 9.0 ppm                     |
| Nitrogen Dioxide  | Annual                       | 0.05 ppm                    | --                          |
|                   | 1-Hour                       | --                          | 0.25 ppm                    |
| Sulfur Dioxide    | Annual                       | 0.03 ppm                    | --                          |
|                   | 24-Hour                      | 0.14 ppm                    | 0.05 ppm                    |
|                   | 1-Hour                       | --                          | 0.25 ppm                    |
| PM <sub>10</sub>  | 24-Hour                      | 150 µg/m <sup>3</sup>       | 50 µg/m <sup>3</sup>        |
| PM <sub>2.5</sub> | Annual                       | 15 µg/m <sup>3</sup>        | --                          |
|                   | 24-Hour                      | 65 µg/m <sup>3</sup>        | --                          |
| Lead              | 30-Day Avg.<br>Month Average | --<br>1.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup> | 1.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup><br>-- |

ppm = parts per million

µg/m<sup>3</sup> = Micrograms per Cubic Meter

Source: Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, July 2004,

Federal Standards

The 1977 Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) required the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to identify National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) to protect public health and welfare. NAAQS have been established for the six criteria air pollutants. (These are included in **Table 4-1**.)

In June of 1997, the EPA adopted new ozone and PM<sub>10</sub> standards. The EPA has replaced its previous 1-hour ozone standard of 0.12 ppm and replaced it with an 8-hour standard of 0.08 ppm. The EPA also adopted an additional standard for PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

Pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the Federal CAA, the EPA has classified air basins (or portions thereof) as either “attainment” or “non-attainment” for each criteria air pollutant, based on whether or not the NAAQS have been achieved. El Dorado County is designated as non-attainment for the federal ozone standard.

State Standards

In 1988, the State of California passed the California Clean Air Act (CCAA, State 1988 Statutes, Chapter 1568) that established more stringent State ambient air quality standards, and set forth a program for their achievement. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) implements State ambient air quality standards, as required in the CCAA, and cooperates with the Federal government in implementing pertinent federal requirements. Further, CARB has responsibility for reviewing and permitting stationary and mobile source air pollutant emissions throughout the state. Like its Federal counterpart, the CCAA designates areas as attainment or non-attainment, with respect to the state AAQS. Under the state AAQS and based on 2004 designations, El Dorado County is designated non-attainment for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>.

Two State of California regulations for asbestos control are applicable within El Dorado County and enforced by the EDCAQMD. These include (1) Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying and Surface Mining Operations (California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Section 93105) and (2) Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Surfacing Applications (California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Section 93106).

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) mandates significant reductions in greenhouse gases (GHG) by the year 2020; passage of that law has highlighted the need to consider the impacts of GHG emissions from projects that are subject to CEQA review. This bill charged the CARB to develop regulations on how the state would address global climate change due to GHG emissions. There are currently no thresholds or recommended methodologies for determining the significance of a project's potential cumulative contribution to global climate change in CEQA documents.

Local Standards

Local air quality regulations are established and regulated by the EDCAQMD. The EDCAQMD Board of Directors adopted amended and new fugitive dust rules on July 19, 2005. These rules would be applicable to the proposed project and include:

- Rule 223 Fugitive Dust – General Requirements
- Rule 223-1 Fugitive Dust – Construction Requirements
- Rule 223-2 Fugitive Dust - Asbestos Hazard Mitigation (if certain conditions are found to be present, this rule may apply)

The EDCAQMD rules listed above regulate fugitive dust (including that potentially containing NOA) generated by construction activities and require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts. The project will also be subject to AQMD Rule 224, which prohibits the use of “cutback asphalt”, which is asphalt cement that has been liquefied by blending with petroleum solvents.

EDCAQMD's Guide to Air Quality Assessment (2002) specifies specific daily emissions thresholds that can be used to determine the significance of project emissions. Thresholds of significance for specific pollutants of concern are as follows:

- ROG: 82 lbs/day
- NO<sub>x</sub>: 82 lbs/day
- CO: AAQS
- PM<sub>10</sub>: AAQS

#### **4.3.2 Potential Environmental Effects**

The project would result in short-term, temporary air pollutant emissions from construction activities. Several of the checklist responses and discussion provided below are dependent upon potential impacts associated with construction emissions. As such, a discussion of construction emissions estimates and significance is provided here to serve as the basis for discussion that follows. Construction emissions were estimated for the project using the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's *Road Construction Emissions Model, Version 5.2* as recommended in the EDCAQMD *Guide to Air Quality Assessment*. As shown in **Tables 4-2** and **4-3**, none of the criteria pollutants are anticipated to exceed the daily emissions thresholds and project-related construction emissions are therefore considered less than significant.

| Project Phases                      | ROG<br>(lbs/day) | CO<br>(lbs/day)   | NO <sub>x</sub><br>(lbs/day) | PM <sub>10</sub><br>(lbs/day) | Exhaust<br>PM <sub>10</sub><br>(lbs/day) | Fugitive<br>Dust PM <sub>10</sub><br>(lbs/day) |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Grubbing/Land Clearing</b>       | 8                | 33                | 33                           | 12                            | 2  | 10   |
| <b>Grading/Excavation</b>           | 9                | 34                | 35                           | 12                            | 2  | 10   |
| <b>Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade</b> | 9                | 34                | 37                           | 12                            | 2  | 10   |
| <b>Paving</b>                       | 3                | 14                | 17                           | 1                             | 1  | 0  |
| <b>Maximum (pounds/day)</b>         | 9                | 34                | 37                           | 12                            | 2  | 10   |
| <b>Significance Criteria</b>        | 82               | AAQS <sup>1</sup> | 82                           | AAQS <sup>1</sup>             | N/A                                      | N/A  |
| <b>Significant</b>                  | No               | No <sup>1</sup>   | No                           | No                            | N/A                                      | N/A  |

Source: ESP, 2008

Notes:  
<sup>1</sup> As noted in the EDCAQMD CEQA Guide, CO and PM<sub>10</sub> Total Average Daily Emissions are calculated in lbs/day when using the Roadway Construction Emissions Model and must be converted to ambient concentrations. See **Table 4-3** for CO Concentration and Significance Determination.  
 Data entered to emissions model: Project Start Year: 2010; Project Length (months): 6; Total Project Area (acres): 10.3; Total Soil Imported/Exported (yd<sup>3</sup>/day): 50. Miles per round trip for soil hauling activities: 30 miles; Number of round trips per day: 3.  
 PM<sub>10</sub> estimates assume 50% control of fugitive dust from watering and associated dust control measures.  
 Total PM<sub>10</sub> emissions are the sum of *exhaust* and *fugitive dust* emissions.  
 Source: Emissions estimated using Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's Road Construction Emissions Model, Version 5.2

| Concentration  | 1-Hour      | 8-Hour |
|--|-------------|--------|
| Background Concentration   | 1.32 (2010) | 0.00   |
| Project-Related Pollutant Concentration                                  | 1.1         | 1.1    |
| Anticipated Total Concentration  | 2.42        | 1.1    |
| Ambient Air Quality Standard <sup>1</sup>                                | 20.0        | 9.0    |
| Project Variance from AAQS   | -17.58      | -7.9   |
| Significance Determination (Significant if project variance is positive) | No          | No     |

Source: ESP, 2008

<sup>1</sup> The Ambient Air Quality Standard referenced in the table above, is the California AAQS, as it is more stringent than the federal AAQS (35.0 ppm).

Note: The above calculations assume project-related CO concentration levels associated with additional peak-hour trips are based on a conservative assumption that the project would result in 300 additional peak-hour trips during construction.

Chapter 4 of the EDCAQMD *Guide to Air Quality Assessment* references that average daily construction emissions for CO and PM<sub>10</sub> must be converted from lbs/day to ambient

concentrations for comparison to the AAQS. **Table 4-3** shows the calculations for CO concentrations resulting from project construction activities. Though the modeling techniques described in the EDCAQMD Guide are intended for operation emissions calculations, the above conversions were utilized to determine the project's construction-related CO emission concentrations, as recommended in the Guide. As discussed in Chapter 6 of the EDCAQMD Guide, PM<sub>10</sub> emissions associated with projects can be considered less than significant if the projects are below the established thresholds for ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. Because ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions would be less than significant for the proposed project (as discussed above), it can be concluded that PM<sub>10</sub> emissions would also be less than significant and PM<sub>10</sub> conversion calculations were not evaluated.

- a) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

**Less Than Significant.** The proposed project would result in temporary emissions of particulate matter, carbon monoxide, reactive organic compounds (ROG), and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) during construction as a result of ground disturbance activities and the operation of construction vehicles and equipment. These impacts would be minimal due to the limited nature of the project and short-term construction period and have been determined less than significant based on the information presented above. These short-term construction emissions are, therefore, not anticipated to affect applicable air quality planning.

The proposed project is not capacity increasing (i.e., the project would improve traffic operations, but would not result in an increase additional motor vehicle trips), and therefore would not result in increased operational air quality emissions. The project would provide operational and safety improvements and would not support increased use of the roadway, and any new long-term impacts to air quality are not expected. The project is consistent with all applicable air quality attainment plans.

- b) *Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?*

**Less Than Significant.** El Dorado County is in non-attainment status for both federal and state ozone standards and for the state PM<sub>10</sub> standard. Construction activities would result in short-term increases in emissions from the use of heavy equipment that generate dust, exhaust, and tire-wear emissions and from paints and coatings. As discussed above and presented in **Table 4-2**, project construction would create short-term increases in fugitive dust and both ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from vehicle and equipment operation. Although the project area is designated non-attainment for PM<sub>10</sub> and ozone, the PM<sub>10</sub> and ozone precursor (ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions estimated for the project have been determined to be less than significant based on EDCAQMD thresholds which have been developed in consideration of the region's air quality standards attainment status.

The proposed project would result in short-term construction emissions (including GHG emissions) that may contribute to global climate change. During the construction phase of the project, there is the potential to contribute to the generation of GHG emissions. El Dorado County adopted Resolution No. 29-2008, which identifies the County's goals in regards to reduction in GHG emissions. The Resolution identifies a goal of promoting pedestrian and bicycle commuting, which would be accomplished by the proposed project through the development of Class II Bicycle Lanes along Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road. Although construction activities would result in short-term construction GHG emissions, the project would promote bicycle commuting in the long-term. Additionally, the Resolution identifies the goal of expansion of transit opportunities. The proposed project identifies a potential bus turnout site that may be developed, therefore, potentially expanding transit opportunities. Because the project would encourage bicycle use and has the potential to expand transit opportunities, this impact is considered less than significant.

- c) *Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?*

**Less than Significant.** Refer to response b) above. While the project would generate short-term air quality impacts as a result of construction activities, because the proposed project does not involve new uses or an expansion of use along Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road, the proposed project would not result in long-term or cumulatively considerable increases in air quality pollutant emissions for which El Dorado County is currently in non-attainment (ozone precursors, NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG, and PM<sub>10</sub>). The project would not result in increased traffic or a long-term increase in air pollutant emissions. The methodology and impact significance criteria for review of project-specific impacts associated with construction emissions considers the existing air quality of the project area and, as such, determines impact significance based on cumulative air quality considerations. The air pollutant emissions increase associated with construction activities was determined to be less than significant and would result in less than significant contributions to cumulative pollutant increases in the region.

- d) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

**Less Than Significant.** "Sensitive receptors" to air quality issues are considered residences, schools, parks, hospitals, or other land uses where children or the elderly congregate, or where outdoor activity is the primary land use. The nearest school is Green Valley Elementary School which is located at 2380 Bass Lake Road, approximately 0.25 miles southwest of the project area. Multiple residences are adjacent to the project area along both Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road, and adjacent residences have the potential to be exposed to pollutant concentrations.

The proposed project could result in temporary emissions of particulate matter, carbon monoxide, ROG, and NO<sub>x</sub> during construction as a result of ground disturbance activities and the operation of construction vehicles and equipment. These impacts would be less than significant due to the limited nature of the project and short-term construction period.

The proposed project area is located outside of areas identified on the most recent Naturally Occurring Asbestos Review Area Map as being “More Likely to Contain Asbestos” (July 22, 2005); therefore, the proposed project would have no impact of exposing receptors to naturally occurring asbestos.

With the implementation of standard air quality emission abatement measures identified in Section 3 of this IS/MND, construction and operational activities associated with the proposed project are not anticipated to expose sensitive receptors within the project vicinity to substantial pollutant concentrations.

- e) *Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

***Less Than Significant.*** Construction activities would involve the use of a variety of gasoline or diesel powered equipment that emit exhaust fumes and asphalt paving which has a distinctive odor during application. These emissions would occur intermittently throughout the workday and the associated odors are expected to dissipate rapidly within the immediate vicinity of the work area. Persons within proximity to the construction work area may find these odors objectionable. However, the limited number of receptors, infrequency of the emissions, rapid dissipation of the exhaust into the air, and short-term nature of the construction activities would result in a less than significant impact associated with construction odors.



**4.4 Biological Resources**

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project:   |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |                                | ✓   |                              |           |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?   |                                | ✓   |                              |           |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?   |                                | ✓   |                              |           |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?   |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   |                                |   | ✓                            |           |

#### 4.4.1 Environmental Setting

The project site occurs primarily within a commercially developed area. Elevation of the project site ranges from 1,300 to 1,400 feet, mean sea level (msl). The cover types observed include: Non-Native Annual Grassland and Ruderal Lands, Oak Woodland, Emergent Wetlands, and Developed Lands.

The various vegetative cover types along the project alignment provide habitat for resident and migratory wildlife species. The composition, density, distribution, and physical characteristics of these vegetative communities determine the variety and population of wildlife species residing in the survey area.

The project area supports four channels: Channel 1 is located north of and adjacent to Green Valley Road in the western portion of the project alignment (**Figure 3**). The channel supports a dominance of upland vegetation consisting of ripgut brome, wild oat, Italian ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum*), bindweed (*Convolvulus arvensis*), and cutleaf geranium (*Geranium dissectum*).

Channel 2 flows through the project site and is a tributary to Deer Creek. Channel 2 flows east to west and crosses under Cameron Park Drive through a six-foot culvert (**Figure 3**). Channel 2 supports emergent wetland vegetation within the channel. On the east side of Cameron Park Drive Channel 3 flows adjacent to the roadway and flows into Channel 2 (**Figure 3**). Channel 3 is unvegetated throughout its length. On the west side of Cameron Park Drive Channel 4 flows adjacent to the roadway and flows into Channel 2 (**Figure 3**). Channel 4 supports emergent wetland vegetation within the channel.

Channels 2, 3, and 4 are tributaries to Deer Creek. Channel 2 and its tributaries (Channels 3 and 4) flow to a reservoir on Deer Creek just west of the Cameron Park Airport approximately 1.8 miles south of the project site. A review of the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) map indicates that Channel 2 is a palustrine emergent, seasonally flooded, excavated (PEMCx) channel in the project area and a palustrine, shrub scrub, seasonally flooded (PSSC) channel just prior to the reservoir. Channel 1 is not included on the NWI map. All channels within the project site may be considered jurisdictional Waters of the United States (WoUS) regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

The results of the CNDDDB query indicate that there are nine occurrences of four species within one-mile of the proposed project site (**Figure 4**). All of these occurrences are plants belonging to a group of eight plant species collectively known as the “Pine Hill endemics”. This group includes El Dorado bedstraw (*Galium californicum* ssp. *sierrae*), Layne's ragwort (*Senecio layneae*), Pine Hill ceanothus (*Ceanothus roderickii*), Pine Hill flannel bush (*Fremontodendron decumbens*), Stebbins' morning-glory (*Calystegia stebbinsii*), Bisbee Peak rush rose (*Helianthemum suffrutescens*), El Dorado County mule ears (*Wyethia reticulata*), and Red Hills soaproot (*Chlorogalum grandiflorum*). The Pine Hill endemics are extremely rare and restricted primarily to El Dorado County. Of the

eight plant species, four are listed as Endangered and one is listed as Threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act. Additionally, one of these species is listed as Endangered and four are listed as Rare under the California Endangered Species Act.

Within one mile of the proposed project intersection there are four occurrences of Layne's ragwort, three occurrences of El Dorado County mule ears, one occurrence of Pine Hill flannelbush, and one occurrence of Pine Hill ceanothus. The project site is approximately one mile from the Pine Hill Preserve where the majority of these plants are known to occur. No special-status species were observed during surveys of the site; however, protocol surveys were not conducted and reconnaissance field surveys were conducted late in the blooming season beyond the blooming period for the majority of the Pine Hill endemic plant species. Several of these plant species may not have been identifiable at the time of the field surveys.

#### **4.4.2 Potential Environmental Effects**

- a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

***Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.*** Based on a records search of the CNDDDB (Padre, 2008), several special-status plant and wildlife species have the potential to occur onsite or in the project vicinity. Field observations and literature review were conducted to determine the potential for these special-status species to occur within the project area. Based on the reviews, there are nine occurrences of four species within one-mile of the proposed project site.

The proposed project occurs approximately one mile south of the Pine Hill area, the primary known habitat for the Pine Hill endemic plant species. The project area has been developed for commercial and residential land uses; however, there are some remnant native habitats occurring on the project site in undeveloped lots or corridors between developed areas and the road that would be considered potential habitat for rare plants. Due to the presence of gabbro soils on the project site and the occurrence of listed and rare plants in the vicinity of the project site, there is potential for the occurrence of Pine Hill endemic plant species to occur within the project site. The County has mitigated for impacts to Pine Hill Endemic plant species by creating the Pine Hill Preserve, which currently protects more than 3,900 acres within El Dorado County. If plants are identified during the pre-construction survey, development projects are required to pay an in-lieu fee, pursuant to the Ecological Preserve Program. The fee calculation is based upon the location of the parcel and the number of residential units or commercial square footage. Road projects were not anticipated in the original fee calculation process. As a result, if the endemic plant species are found, DOT will coordinate with the County Planning Department and U.S. Fish and Wildlife

Service to determine comparable payment for adequate mitigation. **Mitigation Measure 1** would be implemented to identify Pine Hill Endemics within the project area.

Tree removal and/or ground clearing activities have the potential to impact listed bird species and bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). The MBTA prevents the removal of trees, shrubs, and other structures containing active nests of migratory bird species that may result in the loss of eggs or nestlings.

Trees located within and adjacent to the project site provide potential nesting habitat for birds protected by MBTA. Removal of trees and/or construction activities conducted in the vicinity of potential nest trees in the adjacent riparian area, or ground-clearing activities could potentially impact tree and ground-nesting bird species that are protected under the MBTA and CDFG codes (Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3800). The laws and regulations prohibit the take, possession, or destruction of birds, their nests, or eggs. Disturbance that causes nest abandonment and/or loss of reproductive effort could be considered a “take”. Project plans do not identify the removal of trees; however, if tree removal is required for the development of the proposed project, implementation of **Mitigation Measure 2** would reduce this impact to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure 1.** A pre-construction survey to determine the presence of Pine Hill Endemic plant species within the project area shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the plants’ flowering period (April/May to June) and prior to any construction activity. If special-status plant species are found, those individuals or populations shall be avoided to the maximum degree possible. The County’s Pine Hill Preserve system has been developed to mitigate impacts from development projects’ (including roadway projects) impacts on Pine Hill Endemic plant species. Although removal of such species may occur from areas not within the preserve system, documentation of these species presence within a project area must be performed prior to the removal of individual plants. Additionally, pursuant to Resolution 205-98 of the Pine Hill Preserve Program, this project is located in Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1. If a rare, threatened, or endangered plant (or rare plant community) is identified during preconstruction surveys, the appropriate documentation consisting of location, plant type, etc. shall be completed and kept on file at the County along with payment of the appropriate in-lieu fee in place at the time, in coordination with the County Planning Services. Plant removal may proceed following the full documentation of the species presence and payment of appropriate fees.

**Mitigation Measure 2.** The removal of trees shall be conducted during the non-breeding season for native birds (September 1<sup>st</sup> through March 1<sup>st</sup>). This will avoid violations of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Department of Fish and

Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513. If construction activities cannot avoid the bird-breeding season, the County shall retain the service of a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey of all trees suitable for use by nesting raptors within the project area or within 350 feet of the project boundary as allowable. The pre-construction survey shall be performed between February 15<sup>th</sup> and August 15<sup>th</sup>, but no more than 14 days prior to the implementation of construction activities. If active special-status raptor nests are found during the pre-construction survey, the County shall contact CDFG to establish a buffer around the nest tree. No construction activity shall be conducted within this zone during the raptor nesting season (typically March to August) or until such time that the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active. The buffer zone shall be marked with flagging, construction lathe, or other means to mark the boundary of the buffer zone. All construction personnel shall be notified as to the existence of the buffer zone and to avoid entering the buffer zone during the nesting season. Implementation of this mitigation measure shall be confirmed by the County prior to the initiation of construction activity.

- b) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Implementation.** Sensitive habitats include those that are of special concern to resource agencies and those that are protected under CEQA, the California Fish and Game Code, or the Clean Water Act. Development of the proposed project has the potential to permanently impact approximately 0.06 acre of potentially jurisdictional waters/wetlands. Of the jurisdictional waters/wetlands onsite, all are wetlands that would be impacted. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure 3** would result in a less than significant impact to wetlands and waters of the U.S.

**Mitigation Measure 3.** Prior to disturbing any of the wetland features within the project area, the Delineation of Waters of the United States prepared for the proposed project shall be submitted to the Corps and the appropriate Clean Water Act Section 404 permit shall be acquired. Additionally, the County shall obtain a Clean Water Act Section 401 permit from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) prior to disturbance. Any waters of the U.S. that would be lost or disturbed shall be replaced or rehabilitated on a “no-net-loss” basis in accordance with the Corps’ mitigation guidelines. Based on a projected combined loss of approximately 0.06 acre of waters and wetlands and an assumed replacement-to-loss compensation ratio of 3:1, the County shall acquire 0.18 acre of mitigation credits. Habitat restoration, rehabilitation, and/or replacement shall be at a location and by methods agreeable to the Corps. The County shall obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) from CDFG, pursuant to Section 1600 of the CDFG Code. The

County shall obtain these Clean Water Act and Streambed Alternation Agreement approvals, if required by the Corps, the RWQCB and/or CDFG prior to the initiation of project ground disturbing activities and abide by the conditions of any executed permits.

- c) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?*

***Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.*** Development of the proposed project has the potential to permanently impact approximately 0.06 acre of potentially jurisdictional waters/wetlands. Of the jurisdictional waters/wetlands onsite, all are wetlands that would be impacted. These areas are potentially regulated by the Corps and/or CDFG. Additionally, these areas are protected under the El Dorado County General Plan. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure 3** would reduce the impact to waters of the U.S. and wetlands within the project area to less than significant.

- d) *Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

***Less Than Significant.*** Wildlife migration corridors are generally defined as connections between habitat patches that allow for physical and genetic exchange between otherwise isolated animal populations. The developed nature of the project area and the presence of vehicular traffic on project area roadways discourage migration of wildlife. This impact is considered less than significant.

- e) *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

***Less Than Significant.*** The El Dorado County General Plan Policy 7.4.1.1 provides for the protection of the Pine Hill Endemic plant species. As discussed in response (a) above, the proposed project has the potential to impact the Pine Hill Endemics. Although the County has already mitigated for the potential disturbance to Pine Hill Endemic plant species from development projects within El Dorado County, the County is required to identify the location of any rare plant species within the project area prior to their disturbance and/or removal. **Mitigation Measure 1**, above, will be implemented to identify Pine Hill Endemics within the project area consistent with this requirement.

Additionally, development of the proposed project has the potential to permanently impact approximately 0.06 acre of potentially jurisdictional waters/wetlands, which are protected by County General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4. The proposed project would

comply with the General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4, which provides for wetlands buffer and setback requirements. The project proposes grading and construction activities in accordance with the Section 404 permit that would be obtained. Because the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan Policy protecting wetlands, this impact is considered less than significant.

- f) *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?*

***Less Than Significant.*** There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, or Natural Community Conservation Plans which are applicable to the project area. The project would not affect implementation of the USFWS' adopted recovery plans for California Red-legged Frog or gabbro soils plants, both of which apply to portions of El Dorado County. Though the proposed project is located within the Sierra Nevada Foothills and Central Valley Recovery Unit identified in the USFWS Recovery Plan for the California Red-legged Frog, the project area lacks water features that could potentially provide suitable habitat. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of the California Red-legged Frog Recovery Plan. The project area is within the south portion of the Pine Hill formation; however, the proposed project does not conflict with any of the tasks identified in the implementation schedule of the recovery plan for gabbro soils plants, and the County has mitigated for potential disturbance to Pine Hill Endemic plant species throughout the County by creating the Pine Hill Preserve. The Pine Hill Preserve protects gabbro soils plants and would result in a less than significant impact to protected plant species with mitigation identified previously in this document.

This page is left intentionally blank.



## 4.5 Cultural Resources

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project:  |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?    |                                | ✓   |                              |           |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? |                                | ✓   |                              |           |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?       |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?                          |                                | ✓   |                              |           |

### 4.5.1 Environmental Setting

Analytical Environmental Services (AES) conducted a records search was conducted on June 18, 2008 at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System, located at Sacramento State University. The NCIC, an affiliate of the State of California Office of Historic Preservation, is the official state repository of archaeological and historic records and reports for a six-county area that includes El Dorado County. Additional research was conducted using the records and literature on file at AES.

On June 18, 2008, AES contacted the State of California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request their review of the Sacred Lands file for information on Native American cultural resources on the project site. A response was received on June 25, 2008 stating there are no reported sacred sites within the APE. The NAHC also provided a list of eight individuals and organizations with which to consult. Letters were sent to parties identified on June 27, 2008. AES placed follow-up phone calls on July 7, 2008. AES staff spoke via telephone to: the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians and the United Auburn Indian Community. Mr. Tayaba and Ms. LaPena both stated that the area is sensitive for the presence of Native American cultural resources and requested that construction be monitored.

AES archaeologist Mike Taggart, RPA and staff historian Shawn Riem, M.A., examined the entire project area on July 8, 2008. The study included a pedestrian survey using 5- to

10-meter-wide linear transects within the entire 31.3-acre study area. The majority of the project site is occupied by existing residential development to the north and south and commercial development south of Green Valley Road. To the west of the intersection of Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road, cleared grasslands are present with additional housing to the north. There is a newly constructed strip-mall on the west of the intersection with Cameron Park Drive and Cambridge Drive. Surface visibility was considered moderate due to vegetative ground cover. The ground surface was examined for archaeological remains, while rodent burrow backdirt piles and road cuts were examined for indicators of buried archaeological deposits.

#### **4.5.2 Potential Environmental Effects**

- a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?*

***Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.*** While no potentially significant cultural resources have been identified within the project area, two Native American parties consulted recommended that an archaeological monitor be present during construction given the region's sensitivity for prehistoric cultural resources. The County has determined that the implementation of **Mitigation Measure 4** would protect sensitive cultural resources within the project area. Based on the findings of the cultural resources report prepared for the proposed project, no further cultural resources study is warranted unless project designs change, and AES has recommended a Finding of No Historic Resources Affected. The County has determined that **Mitigation Measure 4**, below, would serve to protect any sensitive prehistoric cultural resources discovered within the project area.

There is the possibility, however remote, that subsurface archaeological deposits may exist in the Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road Intersection Improvement Project site, as archaeological sites may be buried with no surface manifestation. In the event that concentrations of prehistoric or historic-period materials are encountered during ground-disturbing work, **Mitigation Measure 4** would be implemented.

***Mitigation Measure 4.*** Should any buried archaeological materials be uncovered during project activities, such activities shall cease within 100 feet of the find. Prehistoric archaeological indicators may include: obsidian and chert flakes and flaked stone tools; bedrock outcrops and boulders with mortar cups; groundstone implements (grinding slabs, mortars and pestles) and locally darkened midden soils containing some of the previously listed items plus fragments of bone and fire affected stones. Historic period site indicators generally include: fragments of glass, ceramic and metal objects; milled and split lumber; and structure and feature remains such as building foundations, privy pits, wells and dumps; and old trails. Following an inadvertent discovery, the County shall be notified and a professional archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the find and recommend appropriate treatment measures. Project-related activities shall not resume within 100 feet of the

find until all approved mitigation measures have been completed.

- b) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?*

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.** As discussed in Response (a), no potentially significant cultural resources have been identified within the project area. In order to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, **Mitigation Measure 4** would be implemented.

- c) *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?*

**No Impact.** According to the El Dorado County General Plan Environmental Impact Report (Pages 2-69 and 2-70 of Volume 4a), paleontological resources in El Dorado County are associated with limestone cave deposits, occurrences of the Mehrten formation, and Pleistocene channel deposits. Since the project does not occur in areas supporting any of these formations, construction is not expected to affect any paleontological resources. The site also does not contain any other unique geologic features.

- d) *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.** It is not anticipated that any human remains would be encountered during construction of the proposed project due to the previously disturbed nature of the lands within the project area; however, the proposed project would be subject to the provisions of the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 et seq., regarding the discovery and disturbance of human remains should any human remains be discovered during project construction. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure 5** would reduce potential disturbance of human remains to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure 5.** Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that it is a misdemeanor to knowingly disturb a human grave. If human graves are encountered, work shall halt in the vicinity and the El Dorado County Coroner shall be notified immediately. At the same time, an archaeologist shall be contacted to evaluate the find. If human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification.

This page is left intentionally blank.

## 4.6 Geology and Soils

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project:   |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |                                |   |                              |           |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?   |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?   |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| iv) Landslides?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  |                                |   |                              |           |
|  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?   |                                |   |                              |           |
|  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?   |                                |   |                              |           |
|  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?   |                                |   |                              |           |
|  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |

#### **4.6.1 Environmental Setting**

##### Regional Geology

El Dorado County is located in the Sierra Nevada geomorphic province of California, which is east of the Great Valley province and west of the Range and Basin provinces. The Sierra Nevada province is characterized by steep-sided hills and narrow, rocky stream channels. This province consists of Pliocene and older deposits that have been uplifted as a result of plate tectonics, granitic intrusion, and volcanic activity. Subsequent glaciation and additional volcanic activity are factors that led to the east-west orientation of stream channels (El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR, 2003).

The southwestern foothills of El Dorado County are composed of rocks of the Mariposa Formation that include amphibolite, serpentine, and pyroxenite. The northwestern areas of the county consist of the Calaveras Formation, which includes metamorphic rock such as chert, slate, quartzite, and mica schist. In addition, limited serpentine formations are located in this area. The higher peaks in the County consist primarily of igneous and metamorphic rocks with granite intrusions, a main soil parent material at the higher elevations (El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR, 2003).

##### Seismicity

Seismicity is defined as the geographic and historical distribution of earthquake activity. Seismic activity may result in geologic and seismic hazards including seismically induced fault displacement and rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, lateral spreading, landslides and avalanches, and structural hazards. Based on historical seismic activity and fault and seismic hazards mapping, El Dorado County is considered to have relatively low potential for seismic activity, and is located beyond the highly active fault zones of the coastal areas of California. The County's fault systems and associated seismic hazards are described below (El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR, 2003).

##### Fault Systems

Earthquake activity is intrinsically related to the distribution of fault systems (i.e., faults or fault zones) in a particular area. The distribution of known faults in El Dorado County is concentrated in the western portion of the county, with several isolated faults in the central county area and the Lake Tahoe Basin. Fault systems mapped in western El Dorado County include the West Bear Mountains Fault; the East Bear Mountains Fault; the Maidu Fault Zone; the El Dorado Fault; the Melones Fault Zone of the Clark, Gillis Hill Fault; and the Calaveras–Shoo Fly Thrust. No active faults have been identified in El Dorado County. One fault, part of the Rescue Lineament–Bear Mountains fault zone, is classified as a well located late-Quaternary fault; therefore, it represents the only potentially active fault in the County. It is part of the Foothill Fault Suture Zone system, which was considered inactive until a Richter scale magnitude 5.7 earthquake occurred near Oroville on August 1, 1975. All other faults located in El Dorado County are classified as pre-Quaternary (inactive) (El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR, 2003).

## Soils

Soils on the west slope of El Dorado County consist of well-drained silt and gravelly loams divided into two physiographic regions, the Lower and Middle Foothills and the Mountainous Uplands. There are a total of eight soil associations in western El Dorado County. Three soil mapping units occur within the project area:

- Rescue sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes (ReB);
- Rescue very stony sandy loam, 3 to 15 percent slopes (RfC);
- Rescue extremely stony sandy loam, 3 to 50 percent slopes (RqE2).

### **4.6.2 Potential Environmental Effects**

a) *Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death, involving:*

i) *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?*

**No Impact.** El Dorado County does not contain any earthquake faults as identified on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map(s); therefore, there would be no potential impact of the project to expose people and/or structures to fault rupture hazards.

ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

**Less than Significant.** The project is not located in an area subject to seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure and is not subject to landslides, seismic-related or otherwise. The project area does not include any structures or dwellings that would be a high risk of collapse during a seismic event. The risk of adverse effects from ground shaking is considered to be less than significant.

iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

**No Impact.** Liquefaction is most likely to occur in deposits of water-saturated alluvium or similar deposits of artificial fill. No areas of this type have been identified in El Dorado County; therefore, no impacts due to liquefaction are anticipated.

iv) *Landslides?*

**No Impact.** The project would not alter slopes or other areas where landslides are likely to occur; therefore, the likelihood of landslides is minimal and no impacts are anticipated.

b) *Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

**Less Than Significant.** The project would require grading of approximately three acres which, if completed without the application of standard Best Management Practices, could result in a condition that might be susceptible to stormwater-related erosion. However, all construction would be consistent with the requirements of the County's Grading Ordinance and Storm Water Management Plan for Western El Dorado County. DOT or its contractor will prepare a construction-related Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), consistent with Section 402 of the Clean Water Act and construction activities will include implementation of stormwater runoff BMPs identified with the SWPPP. Application of these requirements and measures would prevent substantial erosion or topsoil loss. Following construction, all disturbed areas not paved would be revegetated consistent with measures to be identified within the SWPPP to ensure the long-term minimization of erosion and topsoil loss potential.

c) *Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?*

**Less Than Significant.** Soils in the project area include Rescue very stony sandy loam—3 to 50 percent slopes, eroded (RqE2), Rescue very stony sandy loam—3 to 15 percent slopes (RfC), and Rescue sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes (ReB). The project site is nearly level due to prior roadbed grading. The Rescue series soils have a low to moderate shrink-swell potential. None of the abovementioned soil types are susceptible to landsliding, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. The project is also not located on a geologic unit known to be unstable and susceptible to landsliding, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

d) *Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?*

**No Impact.** Expansive soils are soils that increase in volume when they absorb water and shrink when they dry out. When buildings are placed on expansive soils, foundations may rise during each wet season and fall during each dry season. This movement may result in cracking foundations, distortion of structures, and warping of doors and windows, which may result in structural hazards. Roadway and infrastructure improvements at the project site would include the modification of the soil immediately below any roadway improvements. As discussed above, Rescue



series soils have a low to moderate shrink-swell potential. Further, construction of the improvements would include the addition of an aggregate base below the road surface that would reduce potential impacts from soil expansion and contraction. Therefore, no impact associated with expansive soils is anticipated.

- e) *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

**No Impact.** Neither septic tanks nor alternative wastewater disposal systems are part of the proposed project. Therefore, there is no impact associated with the proposed project.

This page is left intentionally blank.

**4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project:   |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?                                   |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?   |                                |   |                              | ✓         |

#### **4.7.1 Environmental Setting**

A material is considered hazardous if it appears on a list of hazardous materials prepared by a Federal, State, or local agency, or if it has characteristics defined as hazardous by such an agency. A hazardous material is defined in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) as follows:

*A substance or combination of substances which, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical or infectious characteristics, may either (1) cause, or significantly contribute to, an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible, or incapacitating reversible, illness; or (2) pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or environment when improperly treated, stored, transported or disposed of or otherwise managed. (California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66261.10)*

Chemical and physical properties cause a substance to be considered hazardous. Such properties include toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity, and reactivity. CCR, Title 22, Sections 66261.20-66261.24 define the aforementioned properties. The release of hazardous materials into the environment could potentially contaminate soils, surface water, and groundwater supplies.

Under Government Code Section 65962.5, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) maintains a list of hazardous substance sites. This list, referred to as the "Cortese List", includes CALSITE hazardous material sites, sites with leaking underground storage tanks, and landfills with evidence of groundwater contamination. In addition, the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department maintains records of toxic or hazardous material incidents, and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) keeps files on hazardous material sites.

Most hazardous materials regulation and enforcement in El Dorado County is overseen by the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department which refers large cases of hazardous materials contamination or violations to the Central Valley RWQCB and the State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). Other agencies, such as the El Dorado County AQMD and the Federal and State Occupational Safety and Health Administrations (OSHA), may also be involved when issues related to hazardous materials arise.

Based on an online review of DTSC's ENVIROSTOR database (<http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>), no Cleanup Sites (Federal Superfund Sites [NPL], State Response Sites, Voluntary Cleanup Sites, and/or School Cleanup Sites) and/or Hazardous Waste Facilities (Permitted or Corrective Action) are located within one mile of the Proposed Project area.

#### **4.7.2 Potential Environmental Effects**

- a) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?*

**Less Than Significant.** Small amounts of hazardous materials would be used during construction activities (i.e., equipment maintenance, fuel, solvents, trail paving and striping materials). Hazardous materials would only be used during construction of the project, and any hazardous material uses would be required to comply with all applicable local, state and federal standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

- b) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

**Less Than Significant.** The proposed project would result in a less than significant impact associated with the use and potential accidental release of hazardous materials during construction (see discussion at item “a”, above).

- c) *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

**Less Than Significant.** The nearest school is Green Valley Elementary School which is located approximately 0.25 mile southwest of the western project terminus. As noted above, the project would involve the short-term handling of hazardous materials during construction; however, handling and storage of hazardous materials would comply with all applicable local, state, and federal standards. This is considered a less than significant impact.

- d) *Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

**No Impact.** The project area does not include any sites which were included on a list of hazardous materials sites as maintained by the DTSC.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

**Less Than Significant.** The project is located within the Safety Area 3 (Overflight Zone) of the Cameron Airpark Airport as identified in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The northern end of the approach zone to runway 13 (the northernmost runway) at the Cameron Airpark Airport is located approximately 3,300 feet (0.63 mile) south-southeast of the southern boundary of the project area and approximately 4,000 feet (0.76 mile) south-southeast of the project area intersection. The proposed project does not involve the installation of light standards, traffic signals, or other structures that would have the potential to obstruct airspace. This impact is considered less than significant.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

**No Impact.** The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

- g) *Would the project impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

**Less Than Significant.** The County will coordinate project construction activities with local law enforcement and emergency services providers. As a result of this coordination, law enforcement and emergency service providers would be aware of project construction and the potential for any emergency vehicle movement delays within the project area and measures to avoid such delays would be determined. The proposed project construction would not affect the provision of emergency services in and adjacent to the project area or evacuation in the event of a major emergency. This impact is considered less than significant.

- h) *Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?*

**No Impact.** According to the California Fire Alliance's Fire Planning and Mapping Tools database, the southern portion of the project area is located within and adjacent to an area classified as "no fire threat, while, the remainder of the project is in an area dominated by fuels classified as "moderate", "high" to "very high" in terms of wildland fire risk (<http://wildfire.cr.usgs.gov/fireplanning>), accessed (September 26, 2008). However, project construction and operation is not anticipated to result in a new or increased exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

## 4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project:  |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?   |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?   |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?   |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?   |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?   |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?   |                                |   |                              | ✓         |

#### **4.8.1 Environmental Setting**

The proposed project area is located in the unincorporated community of Cameron Park in El Dorado County. The project is located within the 1,265-square mile Cosumnes River watershed, which encompasses the southern region of El Dorado County, extending from its headwaters at the Iron Mountain Ridge in the Sierra Nevada, west to its confluences with the Sacramento River in Sacramento County (El Dorado County, 1998).

Four channels are located within the project vicinity. Channel 1 is located north of and adjacent to Green Valley Road in the western portion of the project alignment. The channel supports a dominance of upland vegetation consisting of ripgut brome, wild oat, Italian ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum*), bindweed (*Convolvulus arvensis*), and cutleaf geranium (*Geranium dissectum*).

Channel 2 flows through the project site and is a tributary to Deer Creek. Channel 2 flows east to west and crosses under Cameron Park Drive through a six-foot culvert. Channel 2 supports emergent wetland vegetation within the channel. On the east side of Cameron Park Drive Channel 3 flows adjacent to the roadway and flows into Channel 2. Channel 3 is unvegetated throughout its length. On the west side of Cameron Park Drive Channel 4 flows adjacent to the roadway and flows into Channel 2. Channel 4 supports emergent wetland vegetation within the channel.

Channels 2, 3, and 4 are tributaries to Deer Creek. Channel 2 and its tributaries (Channels 3 and 4) flow to a reservoir on Deer Creek just west of the Cameron Park Airport approximately 1.8 miles south of the project site. A review of the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) map indicates that Channel 2 is a palustrine emergent, seasonally flooded, excavated (PEMCx) channel in the project area and a palustrine, shrub scrub, seasonally flooded (PSSC) channel just prior to the reservoir. Channel 1 is not included on the NWI map. All channels within the project site may be considered jurisdictional Waters of the United States (WoUS) regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

#### **4.8.2 Potential Environmental Effects**

- a) *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

**Less Than Significant.** The project would be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, which requires the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs), as outlined in the *Storm Water Management Plan for Western El Dorado County (SWMP)*, to minimize water quality impacts from construction projects. The County would obtain coverage for the project under the Statewide General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity, Order No. 99-08 DWQ. In accordance with the provisions of the General Permit and the SWMP, the County would require the contractor to



prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to reduce or minimize discharge of pollutants from construction activities.

Due to the implementation of BMPs as required by El Dorado County and the NPDES permit, construction activities associated with the project would result in less than significant impacts to water quality.

- b) *Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?*

**No Impact.** The project would not affect the current function of the fractured rock aquifer groundwater systems in the area, including movement within the aquifers and recharge.

- c) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*

**Less Than Significant.** On-site drainage modification for the proposed project would include under-grounding of Channel 2 with the installation of new culvert that would connect the existing culvert (which runs under Cameron Park Drive) with the Cameron Glen Storm Drain System. Such modification would be constructed consistent with County standards and would be protected at the outfall in a manner that would minimize on- and off-site erosion and siltation potential. As such, the project would result in less than significant impacts associated with erosion and siltation.

- d) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?*

**Less Than Significant.** The project involves installation of approximately 200 feet of new culvert within the project area and the replacement of approximately 700 feet of existing culvert (replacement required due to age of existing facilities). The project would result in the addition of 1.2 acres (52,380 square feet) of impervious surface in the form of new paved trail surface. In order to accommodate this increase in impervious surfaces within the project area, the project would install approximately 200 feet of new culvert. Installation of the underground drainpipes would accommodate expected runoff, and the proposed project would not result in substantial increases in runoff to the extent that the existing drainage systems within the project area would be adversely affected and/or would operate inefficiently as to

cause flooding on- or off-site. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

- e) *Would the project create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*

**Less Than Significant.** The proposed project would result in a net increase of approximately 1.2 acre (52,380 square feet) of impervious surface. Proposed improvements to the drainage infrastructure associated with the project would accommodate expected runoff, and the additional impervious surface is not expected to contribute to a substantial increase in water runoff from the site (see additional discussion at item “d”, above). Therefore, the project would have a less than significant contribution to the amount and quality of stormwater flows in the area.

- f) *Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

**No Impact.** No additional impacts other than those discussed under c) and e) above are anticipated.

- g) *Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project is a trail development project and no housing development is associated with the project.

- h) *Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?*

**No Impact.** According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map 06017C0750E, the project is located within Zone X, which is defined as an area outside of the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain. The project is not located within or adjacent to any dams, levees, or mapped 100-year floodplains. The project would provide sufficient stormwater runoff facilities so as not to impede or redirect stormwater flows.

- i) *Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?*

**No Impact.** The project is not located within or adjacent to any dams, levees, or mapped 100-year floodplains.

j) *Would the project be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?*

***No Impact.*** The proposed project would not create an additional risk from seiche or tsunami in the project area and the relatively flat topography eliminates the potential for mudslides to inundate the project site.

This page is left intentionally blank.

## 4.9 Land Use and Planning

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project:  |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Physically divide an established community?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?   |                                |   |                              |           |

### 4.9.1 Environmental Setting

The primary applicable land use plan within the project area is the El Dorado County General Plan. The El Dorado County Transportation Commission's El Dorado County 2025 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan provide planning direction and/or jurisdiction within the project area that require consideration. The County's Bicycle Transportation Plan identifies Class II bicycle lanes along Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road within the project area as a component of the Bicycle Transportation Plan.

### 4.9.2 Potential Environmental Effects

a) *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

**No Impact.** The project involves modifications to an existing roadway that provides access to and within the Cameron Park community. The project would not divide this existing community.

b) *Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

**Less Than Significant.** The project does not conflict with any 2004 General Plan goals, policies or objectives intended to mitigate potential environmental effects (refer to the responses to 4.4(e) above and 4.15(b) below).

The 2005 El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan identifies Class II bicycle lanes along Cameron Park Drive through the project area as a Tier 1 (highest priority) project, while the Plan also identifies Class II bicycle lanes along Green Valley Road through the project area as a Tier 2 project. Currently, there are no designated bicycle lanes or routes through the project area. The proposed project includes Class II bicycle lanes within the project area adjacent to Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road. Class II bicycle lanes with widths varying from 5- to 8-feet would be striped in the north- and southbound directions along Cameron Park Drive and the east- and westbound directions along Green Valley Road.

- c) *Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

**Less Than Significant.** As noted above under the response to 4.4(f), there are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans that apply to El Dorado County. The project would not affect implementation of the USFWS' adopted recovery plans for California Red-legged Frog or gabbro soils plants, both of which apply to portions of El Dorado County. Though the proposed project is located within the Sierra Nevada Foothills and Central Valley Recovery Unit identified in the USFWS Recovery Plan for the California Red-legged Frog, the project area lacks water features that could potentially provide suitable habitat. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of the California Red-legged Frog Recovery Plan. The project area is within the south portion of the Pine Hill formation; however, the proposed project does not conflict with any of the tasks identified in the implementation schedule of the recovery plan for gabbro soils plants, and the County has mitigated for potential disturbance to Pine Hill Endemic plant species throughout the County by creating the Pine Hill Preserve. To ensure potential impacts to Pine Hill Endemic plants have been documented, implementation of **Mitigation Measure 1**, would result in a less than significant impact. The Pine Hill Preserve protects gabbro soils plants and would result in a less than significant impact to protected plant species.

## 4.10 Mineral Resources

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project:  |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?                                |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? |                                |   |                              | ✓         |

### 4.10.1 Environmental Setting

El Dorado County is considered a mining region capable of producing a wide variety of mineral resources. Metallic mineral deposits, gold in particular, are considered the most significant extractive mineral resources. No mineral extraction activities occur within or in the vicinity of the project site.

### 4.10.2 Potential Environmental Effects

- a) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state*

**No Impact.** The project is not within or adjacent to any important mineral resource areas as identified by the State of California; therefore, the Proposed Project would not impact the availability of mineral resources that would be of value to the state.

- b) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?*

**No Impact.** The project is not within or adjacent to any important mineral resource areas as identified by El Dorado County (2004 El Dorado County General Plan Figure CO-1); therefore, the Proposed Project would not impact the availability of mineral resources that would be of value to the region.

This page is left intentionally blank.



## 4.11 Noise

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project result in:  |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?   |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |

### 4.11.1 Environmental Setting

Of the existing noise sources in the area, the most prominent is vehicular traffic along Cameron Park Drive. The El Dorado County Draft EIR (2003) identifies that future conditions along Cameron Park Drive may expose noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to the roadway to noise levels that exceed the applicable standards.

Land uses in the vicinity of the Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road intersection include developed residential parcels surrounding the project area roadways and intersections, as well as commercial uses and undeveloped land.

County General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11 would apply to construction-related noise associated with the project. Policy 6.5.1.11 outlines standards for daytime construction.

The significance of potential noise impacts associated with operation of transportation facilities is normally measured using General Plan Policy 6.5.1.12, which takes into account the existing (ambient) noise environment. However, because the project would not result in an increase of the number of vehicles passing through the roadway corridor, the ambient condition is not expected to change as a result of the project.

#### **4.11.2 Potential Environmental Effects**

- a) *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?*

##### Construction-related Noise

***Less Than Significant.*** Construction activities could increase noise levels temporarily in the vicinity of the project. Actual noise levels would depend on the type of construction equipment involved, distance to the source of the noise, time of day, and similar factors. However, these increases would be temporary. Construction activity would comply with noise standards for construction activities outlined in General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11. Given that the project contractor would adhere to applicable County construction-related noise standards, this impact is considered less than significant.

##### Traffic-related Noise

***Less than Significant.*** In July 2008, j.c. brennan & associates, Inc. prepared an environmental noise assessment for the proposed project. Between July 14<sup>th</sup> and July 24<sup>th</sup>, j.c. brennan staff conducted continuous noise level measurements at six locations which represent noise-sensitive receivers, adjacent to the project site.

Increases in traffic noise levels associated with the proposed project could occur, due to shifts in roadway alignment closer to noise-sensitive receivers. Based upon the proposed improvements, the centerline of Green Valley Road would shift to the north by approximately 6 feet between Hastings Drive and Starbuck Drive. The centerline of Starbuck Drive and Cameron Park Drive would shift to the west near the intersection of Green Valley Road by approximately 6 to 10 feet.

The movement of the roadway alignments can result in traffic noise level increases of approximately 0.5 dB to 1 dB L<sub>dn</sub>. Based upon the project description, none of the roadway improvements would result in moving the overall roadway centerlines closer to residential uses. Based upon Policy 6.5.1.12 of the El Dorado General Plan there would not be a significant increase in traffic noise levels associated with the project. This impact is considered less than significant.

- b) *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

**Less Than Significant.** Project construction includes activities, such as operation of large pieces of equipment (e.g., heavy trucks), which may result in the periodic, temporary generation of groundborne vibration. Equipment generally associated with excessive groundborne vibration, such as pile drivers, would not be used during construction. Because the project would not expand the roadway or change the way in which it is used, an increase in groundborne vibration associated with use of the road would not change from the current condition. Given the nature of any potential groundborne vibration and given that any impacts would be temporary and periodic, potential impacts are less than significant.

- c) *Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

**Less Than Significant.** As discussed above in Response 4.11 (a), increases in traffic noise levels due to the proposed project would not result in a significant impact. Because the project is not traffic-inducing or growth-inducing and would not change the way in which the roadway is used, the proposed project would not contribute to a substantial permanent increase in the ambient noise level in the project vicinity.

- d) *Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

**Less Than Significant.** Construction activities would increase noise levels temporarily in the vicinity of the project. Actual noise levels would depend on the type of construction equipment involved, distance to the source of the noise, weather, time of day, and other factors. However, these increases would be temporary. Construction activity would comply with noise standards for construction activities outlined in General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11. Because the project contractor would be required to comply with applicable County construction-related noise standards, this impact is considered less than significant.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

**Less Than Significant.** With the exception of temporary construction noise, discussed above, the proposed project would not result in a change in noise exposure for people residing or working within the project area.

- f) *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

**No Impact.** The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

## 4.12 Population and Housing

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project:  |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   |                                |   |                              | ✓         |

### 4.12.1 Environmental Setting

The project area consists of improvements to existing roadway segments, which are adjacent to existing residential uses. There are developed residential parcels surrounding the project area roadways and intersection.

### 4.12.2 Potential Environmental Effects

- a) *Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not propose construction or replacement of new homes or businesses, would not affect the current distribution of homes and businesses, and does not propose extension of infrastructure that could support substantial population growth.

- b) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

**No Impact.** The project does not involve the displacement of any housing.

- c) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

**No Impact.** The project does not involve the displacement of people.

**4.13 Public Services**

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: |                                |   |                              |           |
| Fire protection?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| Police protection?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| Schools?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| Parks?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| Other public facilities?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |

**4.13.1 Environmental Setting**

Public safety and law enforcement services for the project area are provided by the El Dorado County Sheriff. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and the Cameron Park Fire Department cooperatively provide fire protection services and emergency services to the project area. The nearest fire station is Fire Station #88, which is located approximately 0.60 mile south of the project area at 2961 Alhambra Drive. Additionally, the County provides maintenance of public facilities, including the project area roadways.

**4.13.2 Potential Environmental Effects**

*Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant*

*environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:*

a) *Fire protection?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not include elements that would increase human presence in the area; therefore, there would be no need for additional governmental facilities to provide fire protection.

b) *Police protection?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not include elements that would increase human presence in the area; therefore, there would be no need for additional governmental facilities to provide police protection.

c) *Schools?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not include elements that would increase population in the area and would not result in an increased demand for schools.

d) *Parks?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not include elements that would increase human presence in the area; therefore, the project would not result in an increased demand for parks or governmental facilities to maintain parks.

e) *Other public facilities?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not include residential or commercial components that would result in increased human presence in the area; therefore, the project would have no impact on other public facilities.



**4.14 Recreation**

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?                        |                                |   | ✓                            |           |

**4.14.1 Environmental Setting**

There are no recreation facilities within or immediately adjacent to the proposed project area. The nearest park is Rasmussen Park, located approximately 1.0 mile southeast of the project area. The Cameron Park Lake facility, which provides tennis facilities, a volleyball court, playground, walking/jogging trail, fishing, boat rentals, a swim area, and picnic areas, is located approximately 0.65 mile south of the project area. There are no known plans to develop new recreational facilities in the project vicinity.

**4.14.2 Potential Environmental Effects**

- a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

**Less Than Significant.** The project would not increase the use of existing recreational facilities in the area; however, the proposed project involves the development of Class II Bicycle Lanes adjacent to Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road. The County would be responsible for routine maintenance of the bicycle lanes, and it is not anticipated that regular use by bicyclists would result in substantial physical deterioration.

- b) *Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of existing facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

***Less Than Significant.*** The proposed project includes development of Class II Bicycle Lanes adjacent to Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road. Although the project has the potential to result in adverse physical effects on the environment, all significant impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels through implementation of the proposed mitigation measures.

## 4.15 Transportation/Traffic

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project:   |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?   |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?   |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?   |                                |   | ✓                            |           |

### 4.15.1 Environmental Setting

The circulation systems for El Dorado County consist of a roadway network that until recently was primarily rural in character, but is rapidly urbanizing in the western portion of the County. U.S. 50 is the primary transportation corridor connecting the County's major population centers. Other State highways, County arterials, and a network of local public and private roads constitute the remainder of the roadway system. Considered key county roads in the County General Plan Draft EIR (2003), Cameron Park Drive and

Green Valley Road are integral components of the County roadway system, serving as transportation arterials carrying traffic.

An El Dorado Transit bus route is located within the project area and travels west on Green Valley Road (east of the project area intersection), south on Cameron Park Drive, then loops around southeast of the project area before returning westbound on Green Valley Road. Timepoint 14 is located at the Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road intersection, just south of the project area intersection. There are no delineated bicycle facilities within the project area segment of Cameron Park Drive or Green Valley Road.

#### **4.15.2 Potential Environmental Effects**

- a) *Would the project cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?*

**No Impact.** Because the project involves modification to but not a traffic-inducing or growth-inducing expansion of an existing roadway, it is not expected to result in an increase in traffic. Because no trip-generating land uses are associated with the project, the project would not result in substantial increases in traffic in or near the project area.

- b) *Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

**No Impact.** Because the project involves modification to but not a traffic-inducing or growth-inducing expansion of an existing roadway, it is not expected to exceed a level of service standard established by the County. Because no trip-generating land uses are associated with the project, the project would not result in substantial increases in traffic in or near the project area.

- c) *Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns or increase traffic levels that would result in a substantial safety risk. The project does not propose construction of any structures that would impede the height limitation of the Cameron Airpark Airport. Therefore, no impacts on air traffic patterns would occur as a result of this project.

- d) *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

**No Impact.** The project includes features intended to improve safety of the existing roadway. The project would not include design features such as sharp curves, dangerous intersections, or turning radii that would increase hazards. Because uses of the roadway and surrounding areas would not change, it would likewise not result in any use incompatibility.

- e) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

**Less Than Significant.** The project contractor would be required to prepare a Traffic Management Plan for construction activities to ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles during project construction. Following construction, the project would result in improved operation on Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road which would be anticipated to result in a long-term improvement to emergency vehicle movement within the project area.

- f) *Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?*

**No Impact.** The project does not propose development of parking nor would it result in the loss of existing parking capacity.

- g) *Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

**Less Than Significant.** The 2005 El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan identifies proposed Class II bicycle lanes along Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road. Currently, there are no designated bicycle lanes or routes through the project area. The proposed project includes Class II bicycle lanes consistent with the 2025 improvements identified in the County General Plan. Class II bicycle lanes with widths varying from 5- to 8-feet would be striped in the north- and southbound directions along Cameron Park Drive and in the east- and westbound directions along Green Valley Road.

An El Dorado Transit bus route and Timepoint 14 is located within the project area. Construction activities have the potential to temporarily delay transit schedules; therefore, the County will coordinate project construction activities with El Dorado Transit. As a result of this coordination, El Dorado Transit would be aware of project construction and the potential for any transit delays within the project area and measures to avoid such delays would be determined. This impact is considered less than significant.

The proposed project includes the potential development of a bus turnout on westbound Green Valley Road immediately west of the project area intersection. The

County will coordinate design and development plans for the bus turnout with El Dorado Transit.

#### 4.16 Utilities and Service Systems

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project:  |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?   |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                            |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                                     |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? |                                |   |                              | ✓         |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?   |                                |   | ✓                            |           |

##### 4.16.1 Environmental Setting

Utilities located within and adjacent to the project area include water and sewer services provided by the EID, electricity provided by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E),

telecommunication services provided by Comcast, and telephone services provided by SBC Communications. Solid waste services in the project area are provided by El Dorado Disposal Service, Inc. Storm drainage facilities are maintained by El Dorado County.

#### **4.16.2 Potential Environmental Effects**

- a) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not produce additional wastewater; and therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts to wastewater treatment facilities.

- b) *Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

**No Impact.** Please refer to response a) above. Furthermore, the project would not require the use of water beyond that already available in the area for emergency purposes. The project would have no impact on water or wastewater treatment facilities.

- c) *Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

**Less Than Significant.** On-site drainage modification for the proposed project would include under-grounding of Channel 2 with the installation of new culvert that would connect the existing culvert (which runs under Cameron Park Drive) with the Cameron Glen Storm Drain System. The new culvert outfalls would be properly constructed and armored as to prevent any environmental impacts, such as scouring and erosion (see the response to Item 4.8(a), (c) and (f) above). These drainage improvements would not cause significant environmental effects. This impact is considered less than significant.

- d) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would require no water service; therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on water supplies.



- e) *Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not produce wastewater; therefore, the proposed project would not result in an impact to wastewater treatment capacity.

- f) *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?*

**Less than Significant.** Solid waste generated by the project would be minimal and would be limited to construction debris, including asphalt and concrete, generated by the installation of the signalized traffic light and roadway pavement. Solid waste disposal would occur in accordance with federal, state and local regulations. Disposal would occur at permitted landfills. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate the need for new solid waste facility and the project's impacts would be considered less than significant.

- g) *Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

**Less Than Significant.** The proposed project would conform to all applicable state and federal solid waste regulations; therefore, the impact would be considered less than significant.

This page is left intentionally blank.

### 4.17 Mandatory Findings of Significance

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?   |                                |   | ✓                            |           |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  |                                |   | ✓                            |           |

a) *Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

**Less Than Significant.** As discussed throughout this checklist, the project has the potential to result in adverse physical effects on the environment; however, due to implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the project is not expected to degrade the quality of the environment. Furthermore, the project is not expected to substantially reduce the habitat or affect populations of any fish or wildlife species (see Section 4.4) or eliminate important examples of the major period of California

history or prehistory (see Section 4.5). Full implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would result in a less than significant impact.

- b) *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects?*

***Less than Significant.*** The following sections discuss the potential for cumulative impacts associated with each resource checklist category in the preceding sections.

#### Aesthetics

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR (2003) discusses the cumulative effects on the visual resources along U.S 50; however, discussion of cumulative visual effects outside of the U.S. 50 corridor is not provided.

Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to contribute to cumulative visual resource impacts associated with the proposed roadway and intersection modifications. The proposed project would not significantly alter the existing visual character of the project area, would not result in the removal of an identified scenic resource, and is not visible from a designated State scenic highway. Thus, a less than significant impact to aesthetics is anticipated under cumulative conditions.

#### Agricultural Resources

No agricultural resources are present within the project area or in the areas immediately surrounding or adjacent to the roadway. No Farmland is present within the project area, and the project would not result in conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact agricultural resources under cumulative conditions.

#### Air Quality

The project would result in temporary (construction-related) increases in PM<sub>10</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and ROG. However, project construction emissions were determined to be less than significant. This determination is based upon significance thresholds prescribed by the EDCAQMD and developed in recognition of the County's air quality (including its ozone and PM<sub>10</sub> non-attainment status). These criteria are therefore considered applicable for consideration of project-related cumulative impacts. As a result, it has been determined that the project would not result in cumulatively considerable long-term effects upon the region's air quality.

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR (2003) discusses the cumulative effects on air quality due to planned development which would result in increases in motor vehicle travel, wood fire stoves/fireplaces, and other sources that could contribute

cumulatively to the significant impact on air quality in the region. Because the proposed project would not result in increases in motor vehicle travel or associated air pollutant emissions, the proposed project would not impact air quality under cumulative conditions.

As discussed in Section 4.3, the proposed project would result in short-term emissions associated with the use of construction equipment. The proposed project does not include the development of on-site stationary sources, and there would be no increase in the number of vehicular trips associated with the proposed project; therefore, there would be no continual increase in contribution to global warming. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to Global Climate Change in the form of GHG emissions is limited to construction equipment/vehicle emissions. The project will not result in a new, ongoing source of GHG emissions; therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative GHG emissions and Global Climate Change is less than significant.

### Biological Resources

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR (2003) discusses the cumulative effects on biological resources due to planned development which has the potential to reduce populations of special-status species, such as rare plant communities and the California red-legged frog, that occupy oak woodland, chaparral, and riparian habitats. The El Dorado County General Plan EIR identified all significant and unavoidable impacts that could occur from the implementation of the 2004 General Plan, including significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts resulting from oak tree removal and loss of oak woodlands. All feasible mitigation measures to avoid or substantially lessen the significant adverse project and cumulative impacts associated with project development were also identified in the General Plan EIR. The cumulative impact analysis from the General Plan EIR is incorporated by reference in the tiered Initial Study for this project pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15130(d). This IS/MND did not identify any new significant and unavoidable adverse impacts or related mitigation measures associated with the Project. The Project would not increase the severity of the impacts previously identified in the General Plan EIR. All significant and unavoidable impacts were fully addressed in the General Plan EIR and in the Findings and Overriding Considerations adopted by County Board of Supervisors in connection with its approval of the General Plan and certification of the General Plan EIR.

In addition, implementation of **Mitigation Measure 1** would reduce potential impacts to Pine Hill Endemic plant species to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure 2** would ensure a less than significant impact to potential disturbance to nesting birds and/or raptors. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure 3** would ensure a less than significant impact to waters of the U.S. through identification of potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and the applicable replacement or credit purchase measures. The proposed project may result in a

potential disturbance to Pine Hill Endemic plant species within the project area. The County has established the Pine Hill Preserve to mitigate for potential loss of Pine Hill Endemic plant species, therefore, mitigation measures identified in Section 4.4 of this Initial Study and development of the Preserve would reduce these potential impacts to less than significant and would fully mitigate the project's contribution to cumulative conditions. Since the project level impacts associated with biological resources would be reduced to less than significant, potential cumulative impacts to biological resources would be reduced to less than significant as well.

### Cultural Resources

No cultural resources have been identified within the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would not impact any known historical, archaeological, paleontological, or cultural resources in the project area. If previously undiscovered cultural resources are discovered during construction activities, the proposed project would comply with the provisions of the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 et seq., regarding the discovery and disturbance of human remains should any human remains be discovered during project construction. The project level impacts to cultural resources associated with the proposed project are considered less than significant. Therefore, the project would not contribute to potential cumulative impacts associated with the destruction of undiscovered cultural resources.

### Geology and Soils

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR (2003) discusses the cumulative effects on geology and soils due to planned development as site-specific. No cumulative effects were identified in the General Plan EIR. Project-related impacts on geology and soils would be site-specific and implementation of the proposed project would not contribute to seismic hazards or water quality impacts associated with soil erosion. Cumulative water quality impacts associated with soil erosion by the Proposed Project would be less than significant through compliance with regulatory requirements including: the El Dorado County Grading Ordinance, Storm Water Management Plan, Statewide General Permit for Small Municipalities, and Statewide General Permit for Construction Discharges (all requiring revegetation of disturbed areas, and implementation of BMP's for erosion control in accordance with Resource Conservation District recommendations, including storm drain outlet protection, overside drains, rip rap, lined ditch and vegetation practices). Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on cumulative geophysical conditions in the region.

### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR (2003) discusses the cumulative effects on human health and safety (which includes hazardous materials transportation safety, electromagnetic fields, naturally occurring asbestos, and wildland fire exposure) due to planned development as site-specific. The proposed project is not expected to result in any site-specific public health or hazard impacts. The project is expected to have no impact on cumulative hazard conditions.

### Hydrology and Water Quality

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR (2003) discusses the cumulative effects on hydrology and water quality due to planned development. The proposed project would contribute to minimal increased storm drainage flows in the project area and would not negatively impact surface water quality. The project includes improvements to the drainage infrastructure, and adherence to the Statewide General Permit for Construction Discharges and the County's NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water from Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems, would result in a less than significant impact to hydrology and water quality. The proposed project would not violate any water quality standard and would not increase the risk of flooding in the project area. Therefore, the project would not contribute to cumulative surface or groundwater impacts.

### Land Use and Planning

As described in this Initial Study, the proposed project consists of the roadway modifications along Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road and improvements to the Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road intersection. No land use impacts were identified for this project; therefore the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts associated with land use that were identified in the 2003 El Dorado County General Plan EIR. The proposed project is anticipated to have no impact on cumulative land use conditions in the region.

### Mineral Resources

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR (2003) discusses the cumulative effects on mineral resources due to planned development as site-specific. The proposed project is not expected to result in any site-specific significant impacts to mineral resources. Additionally, the project is expected to have no impact on mineral resources under cumulative conditions.

### Noise

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR (2003) discusses the cumulative effects on noise levels outside of the regional freeway and U.S. 50 corridors due to planned development as site-specific. Construction contractors will be required to conduct

construction activities in compliance with the El Dorado County General Plan Noise Element. Due to compliance with these measures, the proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative impact to the project area.

### Population and Housing

As described in this Initial Study, the proposed project consists of the roadway modifications along Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road and improvements to the Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road intersection. No new construction of housing or removal of existing housing is proposed in association with the project. The proposed project is anticipated to have no impact on cumulative population and housing conditions in the region.

### Public Services

The project would not result in a significant effect on public services and is not expected to contribute to cumulative public service impacts.

### Recreation

The project would not directly or cumulatively affect the use of parks or other recreation facilities. Development of the proposed project would further Goal 1 of the El Dorado County Transportation Commission's 2005 Bicycle Transportation Plan, which states, "Develop a bicycle transportation system that enhances the safety and convenience of bicycling to neighboring jurisdictions, employment centers, residential neighborhoods, campgrounds, parks, education, commercial and other activity centers in El Dorado County." Because the proposed project would develop a segment of the comprehensive bicycle transportation system proposed for El Dorado County, development of the Class II Bicycle Lanes is considered a beneficial cumulative recreational impact.

### Transportation/Traffic

As described in Section 4.14 of the Initial Study, the proposed project would result in roadway modifications along Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road and improvements to the Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road intersection, which is intended to improve traffic operations within the project area. The project is therefore expected to have a beneficial impact on cumulative traffic operations in the project area.



### Utilities and Service Systems

Construction activities related to the proposed project may result in temporary impacts to utilities and service systems, including gas, electric, telephone, water and sewer facilities. The proposed project includes project commitments that require the County to coordinate with local utility providers early in the planning process to ensure that existing infrastructure in the project area is not damaged during construction activities, and that planned improvements to the underground utilities in the project area are coordinated with the roadway improvements. Additionally, adherence to the California Streets and Highways Code and the Public Utility Code would ensure that potential impacts are not cumulatively considerable.

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

***Less than Significant.*** The project is intended to provide operational improvements to the Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road intersection and the adjacent roadway segments and would result in beneficial effects. The project would not result in substantial direct or indirect adverse effects from noise, either during project operation or construction, nor would it result in impacts to air quality, water quality, or utilities and public services. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on human beings.

This page is left intentionally blank.

## **5 Supporting Information Sources**

Analytical Environmental Services. 2008. Cultural Resources Study, Cameron Park Drive Green Valley Road. July 2008.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.)

California Fire Alliance. 2004. Fire Planning and Mapping Tools. Available at: <http://wildfire.cr.usgs.gov/fireplanning/>. Accessed on: May 15, 2007.

County of El Dorado Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 3883, amended Ordinance Nos. 4061, 4167, 4170)

County of El Dorado. 2005. Agricultural Preserves.

El Dorado County Air Quality Management District CEQA Guide to Air Quality Assessment (2002)

El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (2003 and 2004)

Volume I - Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report

Volume II - Response to Comment on DEIR

Volume III - Comments on Supplement to DEIR

Volume IV - Responses to Comments on Supplement to DEIR

Volume V - Appendices

El Dorado County General Plan: A Plan for Managed Growth and Open Roads; a Plan for Quality Neighborhoods and Traffic Relief (2004)

j.c. brennan & associates, Inc. 2008. Environmental Noise Assessment, Cameron Park Drive and Green Valley Road Intersection and Roadway Improvements, El Dorado County, California. September 30, 2008.

Padre Associates, Inc. 2008. Biological Reconnaissance Report for the Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road Intersection Improvement Project, Cameron Park, California. July 10, 2008.

Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California (1974)

Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3, Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (Section 15000, et seq.)

# **Appendix A**

## **Mitigation Monitoring Plan**

**Mitigation Monitoring Plan**  
for the  
**Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road  
Intersection Improvements Project**

**CEQA Lead Agency:  
El Dorado County**

**Prepared: December 2008**

**Adopted by Board of Supervisors on: \_\_\_\_\_**



# **INTRODUCTION**

## **Purpose**

El Dorado County (County) has prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the proposed Cameron Park Drive/Green Valley Road Intersection Improvements Project. The MND identified five mitigation measures that are required to avoid potentially significant impacts of the proposed project or to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. This Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) identifies each of the mitigation measures that must be implemented in association with the project, if adopted by the Board of Supervisors, upon adoption of the MND. This document lists each individual impact for which mitigation measures were identified in the project MND, presents each corresponding mitigation measure, identifies the implementation process for each mitigation measure, identifies criteria to determine the effectiveness of mitigation implementation, defines the time frame for implementation, and provides signed verification of the party responsible for monitoring and reporting the implementation of each measure. This MMP will be used by the County to ensure implementation of the mitigation requirements of the project and to verify that all required mitigation measures are incorporated into the project.

El Dorado County, as the lead agency in CEQA compliance, will be responsible for overseeing implementation and administration of this MMP. The County will designate a staff member to manage the MMP. Duties of the staff member responsible for program coordination would include conducting routine inspections, reporting activities, coordinating with the project contractor, and ensuring enforcement measures are taken if necessary.

## **Regulation**

California Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires public agencies to adopt mitigation or reporting plans when they approve projects requiring preparation of a MND that identifies significant environmental impacts. The reporting and monitoring plans must be adopted when a public agency makes its findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) so that the mitigation requirements can be made conditions of project approval.

## **Format**

The MMP outlines the impacts and mitigation measures described in the project MND. Each of the impacts discussed within this MMP are numbered based upon the sequence in which they are discussed in the MND.

A summary of each impact with the corresponding specific mitigation measure identified within the MND is provided. Each mitigation measure is followed by an implementation description, the criteria used to be used to determine the effectiveness of the mitigation,



implementation timing and the party responsible for monitoring the implementation of the measure. Although the implementation of certain measures may be the responsibility of County contractors, the ultimate monitoring and confirmation responsibility lies with County staff. Finally, each measure also contains a “Verified By” signature line which will be signed by the County project manager when the measure has been fully implemented and no further actions or monitoring is necessary for the implementation or effectiveness of the measure.

**Impact 4.4(a)-1:** The Proposed Project has the potential to impact Pine Hill Endemic plant species.

**Mitigation Measure 1:** A pre-construction survey to determine the presence of Pine Hill Endemic plant species within the project area shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the plants' flowering period (April/May to June) and prior to any construction activity. If special-status plant species are found, those individuals or populations shall be avoided to the maximum degree possible. The County's Pine Hill Preserve system has been developed to mitigate impacts from development projects' (including roadway projects) impacts on Pine Hill Endemic plant species. Although removal of such species may occur from areas not within the preserve system, documentation of these species presence within a project area must be performed prior to the removal of individual plants. Additionally, pursuant to Resolution 205-98 of the Pine Hill Preserve Program, this project is located in Rare Plant Mitigation Area 1. If a rare, threatened, or endangered plant (or rare plant community) is identified during preconstruction surveys, the appropriate documentation consisting of location, plant type, etc. shall be completed and kept on file at the County along with payment of the appropriate in-lieu fee in place at the time, in coordination with the County Planning Services. Plant removal may proceed following the full documentation of the species presence and payment of appropriate fees.

**Implementation:** This measure shall be implemented in the manner described above. The County will retain the services of a qualified biologist to conduct a preconstruction survey of potential Pine Hill Endemic plant habitat.

**Effectiveness Criteria:** The County will prepare and keep on file documentation identifying findings of the preconstruction survey.

**Timing:** Pre-Construction Phase

**Verified By:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
County Project Manager

**Impact 4.4(a)-2:** The proposed project may require the removal of trees within the project area which provide potential nesting habitat for birds and raptors, some of which may be afforded protection under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

**Mitigation Measure 2:** The removal of trees shall be conducted during the non-breeding season for native birds (September 1<sup>st</sup> through March 1<sup>st</sup>). This will avoid violations of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Department of Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513. If construction activities cannot avoid the bird-breeding season, the County shall retain the service of a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey of all trees suitable for use by nesting raptors within the project area or within 350 feet of the project boundary as allowable. The pre-construction survey shall be performed between February 15<sup>th</sup> and August 15<sup>th</sup>, but no more than 14 days prior to the implementation of construction activities. If active special-status raptor nests are found during the pre-construction survey, the County shall contact CDFG to establish a buffer around the nest tree. No construction activity shall be conducted within this zone during the raptor nesting season (typically March to August) or until such time that the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active. The buffer zone shall be marked with flagging, construction lathe, or other means to mark the boundary of the buffer zone. All construction personnel shall be notified as to the existence of the buffer zone and to avoid entering the buffer zone during the nesting season. Implementation of this mitigation measure shall be confirmed by the County prior to the initiation of construction activity.

**Implementation:** This measure shall be implemented in the manner described above. The County, using the services of a qualified biologist, will identify whether trees to be removed offer potential native bird habitat. The pre-construction survey will also identify any trees that will require construction contractor(s) to avoid all areas of potential avian habitat when feasible.

**Effectiveness Criteria:** The County shall prepare and keep on file documentation verifying tree survey results and vegetation avoidance efforts.

**Timing:** Pre-Construction Phase/Throughout Construction Phase

**Verified By:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
County Project Manager

**Impact 4.4(b and c):** The Proposed Project has the potential to impact wetlands or water of the U.S. protected for Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

**Mitigation Measure 3:** Prior to disturbing any of the wetland features within the project area, the Delineation of Waters of the United States prepared for the proposed project shall be submitted to the Corps and the appropriate Clean Water Act Section 404 permit shall be acquired. Additionally, the County shall obtain a Clean Water Act Section 401 permit from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) prior to disturbance. Any waters of the U.S. that would be lost or disturbed shall be replaced or rehabilitated on a “no-net-loss” basis in accordance with the Corps’ mitigation guidelines. Based on a projected combined loss of approximately 0.06 acre of waters and wetlands and an assumed replacement-to-loss compensation ratio of 3:1, the County shall acquire 0.18 acre of mitigation credits. Habitat restoration, rehabilitation, and/or replacement shall be at a location and by methods agreeable to the Corps. The County shall obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) from CDFG, pursuant to Section 1600 of the CDFG Code. The County shall obtain these Clean Water Act and Streambed Alteration Agreement approvals, if required by the Corps, the RWQCB and/or CDFG prior to the initiation of project ground disturbing activities and abide by the conditions of any executed permits.

**Implementation:** The County will prepare and submit permit applications to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and the California Department of Fish and Game. The County will abide by all conditions of any executed permits.

**Effectiveness Criteria:** The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying execution of permits for the regulatory agencies.

**Timing:** Pre-Construction Phase

**Verified By:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
County Project Manager

**Impact 4.5(a, b):** The project has the potential to cause adverse change to a historical resource.

**Mitigation Measure 4:** Should any buried archaeological materials be uncovered during project activities, such activities shall cease within 100 feet of the find. Prehistoric archaeological indicators may include: obsidian and chert flakes and flaked stone tools; bedrock outcrops and boulders with mortar cups; groundstone implements (grinding slabs, mortars and pestles) and locally darkened midden soils containing some of the previously listed items plus fragments of bone and fire affected stones. Historic period site indicators generally include: fragments of glass, ceramic and metal objects; milled and split lumber; and structure and feature remains such as building foundations, privy pits, wells and dumps; and old trails. Following an inadvertent discovery, the County shall be notified and a professional archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the find and recommend appropriate treatment measures. Project-related activities shall not resume within 100 feet of the find until all approved mitigation measures have been completed.

**Implementation:** In the event that construction activities unearth potential archaeological resources as identified in the mitigation language above, the County will retain the services of a qualified archaeologist to examine the findings, assess their significance, and offer recommendations for appropriate handling procedures.

**Effectiveness Criteria:** The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying the methods used by, conditions observed by, and conclusions/recommendations of the qualified archaeologist retained by the County in the event construction activities unearth cultural resources.

**Timing:** Throughout Construction Phase

**Verified By:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
County Project Manager

**Impact 4.5(d):** Construction activities could potentially disturb human remains.

**Mitigation Measure 5:** Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that it is a misdemeanor to knowingly disturb a human grave. If human graves are encountered, work shall halt in the vicinity and the El Dorado County Coroner shall be notified immediately. At the same time, an archaeologist shall be contacted to evaluate the find. If human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification.

**Implementation:** In the event that human bone or bones of unknown origin are discovered during project construction, the El Dorado County Coroner will be immediately notified. If it is discovered that the remains are Native American, the County will develop a program for re-internment in coordination with the most likely descendant.

**Effectiveness Criteria:** The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying the methods used by, conditions observed by, and conclusions/recommendations of the qualified archaeologist retained by the County in the event construction activities unearth human remains.

**Timing:** Throughout Construction Phase

**Verified By:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
County Project Manager