

**Revised Latrobe Road Realignment Project:
Additional Hot Mix Asphalt Overlay Portion**

Addendum

**to the Latrobe Road Realignment Project
(CIP # 73359)
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration**

El Dorado County, California

December 2010

1.1 Purpose of the Addendum

The El Dorado County Board of Supervisors certified the Latrobe Road Realignment Project ("Realignment Project") (Capital Improvement Project (CIP) #73359) on June 16, 2009 and adopted the accompanying Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) in May 2009. The Realignment Project included realignment and overlay of 1,600 feet of Latrobe Road, north of Ryan Ranch Road, approximately 4 miles south of U.S. Highway 50 in El Dorado County. Based on the results of the Initial Study, the County determined the project could have a significant effect on the environment, but mitigation measures were identified that would reduce impacts to less than significant.

The Department of Transportation (DOT) intends to add an additional 1,800 feet of Hot-Mix Asphalt (HMA) Overlay (no realignment) connected to the southern end of the previously-approved Realignment Project creating the "Revised Latrobe Road Realignment Project" or "Revised Project". This Addendum is intended to address the environmental impacts associated with "HMA Overlay Portion" of the Revised Project to comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), (PRC §21000, et seq.). El Dorado County is the lead agency for the Revised Project (including the HMA Overlay Portion) for purposes of environmental review under CEQA. Any relevant information and analyses in the 2009 MND are briefly summarized or described, rather than repeated.

The applicable CEQA section authorizing the use of this Addendum is reproduced below:

15164. Addendum to an EIR or Negative Declaration

- (a) The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in §15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.*
- (b) An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in §15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.*
- (c) An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.*
- (d) The decision making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.*
- (e) A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency's findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.*

Pursuant to §15164 (e) set forth above, the following is a brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent ND or EIR pursuant to §15162.

(a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

Discussion: As demonstrated in the attached CEQA Checklist, no new significant environmental effects or increase in the severity of previously identified effects will occur as a result of the HMA Overlay Portion.

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

Discussion: As demonstrated in the attached CEQA Checklist, no substantial changes have occurred that require major revisions to the 2009 MND.

(3) New information of substantial importance not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Discussion: No new information of substantial importance has occurred since adoption of the 2009 MND. This Addendum addresses the additional 1,800 feet of asphalt overlay ("HMA Overlay Portion") connecting to the southern end of the Realignment Project. As demonstrated in the attached CEQA Checklist, no substantial new information occurred or was discovered as a result of this analysis and no new mitigation measures are warranted.

Project Background

The Realignment Project, approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2009, is currently in the Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) phase of development. Funding consists of

High Risk Rural Road (HRRR) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Exchange funds.

DOT recently completed an American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funded overlay (“ARRA Overlay”) project (CIP #72182), approximately 1,800 feet south of the approved Realignment Project, extending from Cothrin Ranch Road south to South Shingle Road (approximately 3.7 miles). A CEQA exemption was completed for the ARRA Overlay project and construction was completed in summer 2010.

The HMA Overlay Portion would overlay the 1,800 foot “gap” between the previously-approved Realignment Project and the completed ARRA Overlay project. - DOT intends to use state Proposition 1B funds for the HMA Overlay Portion of the Revised Project. The HMA Overlay Portion will be included in the Realignment Project when it proceeds to construction bid in early 2011 as one project. Therefore, DOT determined an Addendum to the Latrobe Road Realignment MND is the appropriate document to satisfy the requirements of CEQA.

Project Location

The HMA Overlay Portion of the Revised Project is located approximately 4.4 miles south of U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50) in the rural southwestern portion of El Dorado County. The southern boundary is located at Mile Post (MP) 6.7 just north of Deer Creek Bridge and connected to the recently completed Latrobe Road ARRA Overlay project (CIP# 72182). The northern end connects to the previously approved but not built “Latrobe Road Realignment Project” (CIP# 73359) which is approximately 800 feet north of Ryan Ranch Road intersection near MP 7.0. The existing roadway width within the HMA Overlay Project area is 40 feet. The full length of the HMA Overlay Portion area is approximately 0.3 mile.

Latrobe Road primarily runs north and south. It is surrounded by rural grasslands and designated land uses adjacent to the project area are identified as rural residential (RR) in the 2004 *El Dorado County General Plan*. Existing grasslands are transected by a tributary to Deer Creek east of the project area. One of the two Latrobe Fire Protection District stations is located approximately 0.45 mile east of the project area.

Project Purpose and Objectives

This section of roadway has poor pavement condition with significant “alligator” cracking, many areas of localized base failure and storm water ponding. The objective of the proposed HMA Overlay Portion is: To improve pavement condition and lengthen service life of the pavement along Latrobe Road between MP 6.7 and MP 7.0.

Project Description - Proposed Improvements

Roadway Modifications

The HMA Overlay Portion includes repairing and replacing unsound/unstable asphalt pavement, reconstructing existing dikes, placing HMA overlay across the roadway and shoulders and throughout the project limit, and placing additional shoulder backing from PM 6.7 to PM 7.0 on Latrobe Road. The paved traffic lanes would be restriped to 12 feet wide in both the northbound and southbound directions.

Lighting, Utilities and Drainage Facilities

There are no existing lighting fixtures adjacent to the project roadway alignment. There are no utility or drainage facilities involved with the Project.

Vegetation Removal and Replacement

Construction activities associated with the roadway overlay would require no vegetation removal.

Signage

The HMA Overlay Portion would not include the installation of signage within the project area other than temporary construction signs.

Right-of-Way Requirements

The HMA Overlay Portion would require no right-of-way acquisition or easements including temporary construction easements.

Construction Schedule

DOT anticipates construction of the HMA Overlay Portion (together with the previously approved Realignment Project) to commence in Summer 2011 and require approximately three months to complete.

1.1. CEQA Checklist

The attached CEQA Checklist provides supporting documentation demonstrating no additional impacts or mitigation measures required for the HMA Overlay Portion. (Attachment A)

1.3 Mitigation Measures from 2009 MND

The following is a discussion of the applicable mitigation measures placed on the 2009 MND, included as Attachment B. No additional mitigation measures are required.

1.4 Biological Resources:

The Biological Resource analysis conducted for the 2009 MND concluded there were no biologically important areas within the project study area of the Latrobe Road Realignment Project based on a search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). However, the MND did identify potential impacts that were "less than significant with mitigation incorporated" due to the disturbance of potential habitat for California Red-Legged Frogs (CRLF), Foothill Yellow-Legged Frogs (FYLF), Swainson's hawk, and other migratory birds. While no special-status species of flora or fauna were identified during field investigations or historical records research, Mitigation Measures #1-3 were included in the MND to ensure

potentially significant impacts to these species would be less than significant. Finally, the previous project had the potential to affect 0.0002 acres of potentially jurisdictional wetlands within the purview of the Army Corp of Engineers (ACOE). Therefore, Mitigation Measure #4 was included to ensure impacts to potential wetlands were minimized.

The proposed Project does not involve development or disturbance outside of areas previously disturbed. More specifically, this project does not involve the realignment of Latrobe Road as the previous project does but rather a simple asphalt overlay of the existing roadway. The width of the roadway would remain approximately the same as would the width of the shoulders. Therefore, as indicated in the checklist below, no potentially significant impacts would result to Biological Resources. No mitigation measures are required.

1.5 Cultural Resources:

The previous MND concluded there were no potentially significant environmental impacts to cultural resources as a result of the Latrobe Road Realignment Project based on a field survey conducted by Peak & Associates, a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System, and consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission. However, the MND noted there is always the potential for disturbance of unknown historic resources during construction activities. Therefore, the previous MND applied Mitigation Measure #5 to the project to reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.

As indicated, the proposed Project does not involve development or disturbance outside of areas previously disturbed; which includes the roadway and shoulder. Therefore, this mitigation measure is not applicable as no impact would occur.

ATTACHMENT A

CEQA Guidelines Appendix G

Environmental Checklist Form

1. **Project title:** REVISED LATROBE ROAD REALIGNMENT PROJECT:
ADDITIONAL 1,800-FOOT LONG HOT MIX ASPHALT (HMA) OVERLAY

2. **Lead agency name and address:**
El Dorado County Department of Transportation
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

3. **Contact person, phone & email:** Janet Postlewait, Principal Planner,
(530) 621-5993 janet.postlewait@edc.gov.us

4. **Description of project:**

The proposed Revised Latrobe Road Realignment Project: Additional HMA Overlay (“HMA Overlay Portion”) includes repairing and replacing unsound/unstable asphalt pavement, reconstructing existing dikes, placing a Hot-Mix Asphalt overlay across the roadway and shoulders throughout the Project limit, and placing additional shoulder backing from PM 6.7 to PM 7.0 on Latrobe Road in southwestern El Dorado County. The paved traffic lanes would be restriped to 12 feet wide in both the northbound and southbound directions. No vegetation removal would occur and no disturbance would occur outside of the existing roadway and shoulders.

5. **Location of Project:** The HMA Overlay Portion is located on Latrobe Road between Mile Post 6.7 and 7.0, approximately 4.4 miles south of the US Highway 50 / El Dorado Hills Blvd / Latrobe Road Interchange in El Dorado County. Figure 1 identifies the location of the project area.

6. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement:** The El Dorado County Board of Supervisors has authority to approve the Project. No additional approvals are anticipated.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and
Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/
Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation: (choose appropriate one)

- 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 other than this addendum to the previously approved MND for the Latrobe Road Realignment project (CIP# 73359)


Signature

12-7-10
Date

Janet Postlewait
Printed Name

El Dorado County Department of Transportation
For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by information sources cited in parentheses following each question. "No Impact" is adequately supported if referenced information shows that the impact does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., project falls outside a fault rupture zone).
- 2) Answers must take account of the whole action involved, including both on and off site, cumulative and project-level; indirect and direct; construction and operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. An EIR is required if there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impacts" determinations.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation" applies where mitigation reduces an effect from "Potentially Significant" to "Less Than Significant". The lead agency must describe the mitigation and briefly explain how the effect is reduced to less than significant ("Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. §15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the checklist were within the scope, adequately analyzed and addressed by mitigation measures in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation," describe the mitigation measures which was incorporated or refined from the earlier document and extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate information sources into the checklist references (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant

CEQA Environmental Checklist

REVISED LATROBE ROAD REALIGNMENT PROJECT:
ADDITIONAL 1,800-FOOT LONG HOT MIX ASPHALT (HMA) OVERLAY
ADDENDUM TO THE 2009 LATROBE ROAD REALIGNMENT MND

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

Environmental Setting

The project area is primarily rural grasslands and is located approximately 4.4 miles south of U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50) on Latrobe Road. The project is bounded on both sides by private ranchland and the site consists of an approximately 40 foot wide paved roadway surface with approximately 5 to 6 foot wide shoulders. A residence is located over 675 feet west of the northern extent of the project, and another is located approximately 450 feet east of the southern extent of the project area. No unique scenic resources or notable vistas are present within the project area.

Discussion: The proposed project only involves an asphalt overlay of the existing pavement. No change to the visual setting of the area will occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: To determine if 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:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Revised Latrobe Road Realignment Project:
Additional HMA Overlay Portion
Addendum to the Latrobe Road Realignment IS/MND

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed asphalt overlay will not impact Agricultural resources.

- | III. AIR QUALITY: 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: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Create greenhouse gas emissions and contribute to global climate change | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The proposed project will generate minimal air quality impacts associated with the required asphalt construction equipment. These impacts are temporary and only related to construction activities. Therefore, impacts to air quality would be less than significant.

- | IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 CA Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands per Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal) through removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Revised Latrobe Road Realignment Project:
Additional HMA Overlay Portion
Addendum to the Latrobe Road Realignment IS/MND

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project would not disturb areas that were not previously disturbed by the construction of the existing 40 foot roadway and 5-6 foot shoulders. The overlay project will stay within this area and not impact Biological resources.

- | V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The proposed project will be contained within the existing roadway. No disturbance outside of the roadway or previously-disturbed areas would occur. The proposed project would not result in impacts to Cultural resources.

- | VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on unstable soil, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, that could result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the UBC creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Revised Latrobe Road Realignment Project:
Additional HMA Overlay Portion
Addendum to the Latrobe Road Realignment IS/MND

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project will be contained within the existing roadway. No disturbance outside of the roadway or previously-disturbed areas would occur. The proposed project would not result in impacts to Geologic resources.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create significant hazard to the public or environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed project will be contained within the existing roadway. No disturbance outside of the roadway or previously-disturbed areas would occur. The project involves the use of oil-based materials including asphalt. The overlay will be installed using El Dorado County DOT standard procedures, and would not result in impacts due to Hazardous materials.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Revised Latrobe Road Realignment Project:
Additional HMA Overlay Portion
Addendum to the Latrobe Road Realignment IS/MND

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or lower 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The proposed project will be contained within the existing roadway. No disturbance outside of the roadway or previously-disturbed areas would occur. The overlay will be applied over existing impervious pavement; therefore, the amount of impervious surface will remain the same. No increase in surface runoff will occur. The proposed project would not result in impacts to Hydrology or Water Quality.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (ie: general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The proposed project would not change the land use in the project area and would not impact adjacent land uses.

Revised Latrobe Road Realignment Project:
Additional HMA Overlay Portion
Addendum to the Latrobe Road Realignment IS/MND

X. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site from a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed project would not result in impacts to Mineral resources.

XI. NOISE: Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed project would result in minimal and temporary noise impacts due to the use of construction equipment. These impacts are temporary, related only to construction. Therefore, impacts due to noise would be less than significant.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed project would not result in an impact on Population or Housing.

Revised Latrobe Road Realignment Project:
Additional HMA Overlay Portion
Addendum to the Latrobe Road Realignment IS/MND

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed project would not result in an increased need for Public Services.

XIV. RECREATION:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed project would not result in increased use of Recreational resources.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: 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 substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, volume to capacity ratio, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including increase in traffic levels or change in location resulting in safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Revised Latrobe Road Realignment Project:
Additional HMA Overlay Portion
Addendum to the Latrobe Road Realignment IS/MND

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The proposed project would not increase the existing vehicular capacity of Latrobe Road. The project will not reduce the existing level of service of Latrobe Road. No impacts would result to Transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

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

Discussion: The proposed project would not increase the existing demand for Utilities and Service Systems. The project would not require the establishment of new utility service. No impacts to Utility and Service Systems would occur.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Revised Latrobe Road Realignment Project:
Additional HMA Overlay Portion
Addendum to the Latrobe Road Realignment IS/MND

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

Discussion: The proposed project will not result in significant environmental impacts. All potential less than significant impacts identified in the checklist above are associated with construction activities and are therefore temporary in nature.

**Latrobe Road 1,800-foot long HMA Overlay
Mitigation Monitoring Program**

No mitigation monitoring program is required as the project would have a less than significant impact on the environment.