

2010 Bicycle Transportation Plan Update

Addendum

**to the 2005 El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration**

El Dorado County, California

August, 2010

1.1. Purpose of the Addendum

The Board of Supervisors certified the El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP) on January 25, 2005 and adopted the accompanying Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). The BTP, in addition to providing a blueprint for a countywide bicycle transportation system, enables the county to be eligible for State Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) funds (pursuant to the Caltrans Streets and Highways Code § 890-894.2, *appendix b*). Projects identified in the BTP are eligible for BTA funding for five complete funding cycles following adoption after which time the BTP must be updated.

This Addendum is intended to address the environmental impacts associated with the five-year BTP update 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 project for purposes of environmental review under CEQA. Any relevant information and analyses in the 2005 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 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 this addendum.

(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 2005 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 2005 MND. This Addendum addresses the minor differences between the 2005 BTP and the currently proposed 2010 BTP. 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.

Several projects identified in the 2005 document are now completed and several new projects are proposed in the 2010 document. However, the proposed 2010 BTP (and the current 2005 BTP) do not grant approval to construct the proposed projects listed within them. The BTP is a planning document used to develop a countywide bicycle transportation system. All projects identified in the BTP will have site-specific and project-specific CEQA review conducted as part of the future project-specific approval process.

Project Background and Description

The 2005 BTP was meant to provide a blueprint for a bicycle transportation system in El Dorado County. In order to continue to be eligible for BTA funds, the BTP must be updated every five years. The proposed 2010 BTP includes recommended changes to the existing 2005 BTP in various areas as indicated below. This Addendum focuses on the modifications to the BTP Maps that could result in potentially significant environmental impacts that were not analyzed in the 2005 MND. The original project need, objectives, locations, and existing environmental setting have not changed.

2010 Bicycle Transportation Plan – New Projects

Map 1 – El Dorado Hills Area

- Class I bike path parallel to the east side of Latrobe Road from 1,000 feet south of Suncast Lane to approximately 4,000 feet south of Investment Boulevard. El Dorado County Department of Transportation (DOT) has conditioned the developer to construct this Class I bike path.
- Class I bike path in the SMUD powerline corridor from Silva Valley Parkway to Alexandra Drive/Promontory Community Park. The first phase of the project from Silva Valley Parkway to El Dorado Hills Boulevard is fully funded with State Transportation Improvement Program – Transportation Enhancement (STIP-TE) monies and local construction funds programmed for 2011/2012. Future phases are currently unfunded.

Map 3 – Latrobe Area

- No new projects.

Map 4 – Diamond Springs / Placerville Area

- Class II bike lanes – Pleasant Valley Road from Big Cut Road to Newtown Road (the 2005 plan included a short 1 mile section of Class II near the elementary school on Pleasant Valley Road).
- Class II bike lanes – Newtown Road from Parkway Drive to Fort Jim Road.

Map 5 – Pleasant Valley / Camino / Pollock Pines Areas

- Class II bike lanes – Newtown Road from the east end of Fort Jim Road to Pleasant Valley Road.
- Class III bike route – Fairplay Road from Mt. Aukum Road to Omo Ranch Road.
- Class III bike route – Sly Park Road from Pony Express Trail to Pleasant Valley Road.

Map 6 – Coloma-Lotus / Georgetown / Cool Areas

- Class III bike route – Entire length of Prospectors Road.
- Class II bike lanes – Marshall Road from Prospectors Road to Garden Valley Road.
- Class III bike route – Marshall Road from Black Oak Mine Road to SR 193.
- Class II bike lanes – SR 193 from Marshall Road to SR 49.

1.2. CEQA Checklist

The attached CEQA Checklist (Attachment A) provides supporting documentation demonstrating no additional impacts or mitigation measures are required for the 2010 BTP update.

1.4 Mitigation Measures from 2005 BTP MND

The following is a discussion of the applicable mitigation measures placed on the 2005 BTP MND. No additional mitigation measures are required.

1.5 Cultural Resources:

The previous MND concluded there were no potentially significant environmental impacts as a result of the BTP. However, the MND did identify a “less than significant with mitigation incorporated” potential environmental impact in the Cultural Resources category. CEQA §15145 states that where a Lead Agency finds particular impacts to be too speculative for evaluation, the agency is to note its conclusion and terminate the discussion. This is the case with respect to Cultural Resources. Therefore, the previous MND applied the following two precautionary mitigation measures are carried forward in this Addendum and applicable to the 2010 BTP update:

Mitigation Measure V - 1: Cease earth-moving activities if a cultural or paleontological resource is encountered.

In the event cultural or paleontological resources are encountered during project construction, all earth-moving activity shall cease until the County retains services of a qualified archeologist or paleontologist. The archeologist shall examine the findings, assess their significance, and offer recommendations for procedures deemed appropriate to either further investigate or mitigate adverse impacts on those cultural or paleontological archeological resources that were encountered (e.g., excavate the significant resource).

Mitigation Measure V – 2: Cease earth-moving activity if human bone or bone of unknown origin is found.

If human bone or bone of unknown origin is found during project construction, all work shall stop in the vicinity of the find and the County Coroner shall be contacted immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission. The Native American Heritage Commission shall notify the person it believes to be the most likely descendant. The most likely descendant shall work with the County to develop a program for re-internment of the human remains and any associated artifacts. No additional work shall take place within the immediate vicinity of the find until the identified appropriate actions have been completed.

ATTACHMENT A

CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form

1. **Project title:** 2010 El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan Update
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@edcgov.us

4. **Description of project:**

The project is a five-year update to the 2005 El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan. The 2010 El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan (2010 BTP) provides a blueprint for the development of a bicycle transportation system on the western slope of El Dorado County (excluding the area within the City of Placerville). The plan is in compliance with Caltrans Streets and Highways Code (sections 890-894.2, *Table 1*), making the County eligible for State Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) funds. Caltrans requires bicycle plans be updated every two to five years for jurisdictions to be eligible to apply for BTA funds.

The 2010 BTP represents the efforts of the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) staff, the Bicycle Transportation Plan Advisory Committee, El Dorado County, El Dorado Hills Community Services District and numerous dedicated citizens in the area. The plan was developed with the overall goal of ***providing a safe, efficient and convenient network of bicycle facilities that establish alternative transportation as a viable option in El Dorado County and neighboring regions.*** The plan addresses the following specific issues pertaining to non-motorized transportation:

- Bicycle Commuting - 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.
- Safety and Education - Maximize bicycle safety.
- Implementation and Maintenance – Identify detailed and prioritized improvements in the El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan.
- Land Use Development - Integrate bicycle and pedestrian planning with other regional and community planning, including land use and transportation.
- Multi-Modal Integration - Maximize multi-modal connections to the bicycle transportation system.
- Funding - Obtain all possible funding for plan implementation.

- Connectivity - Develop a well-connected bikeway system.
- El Dorado Trail – In usable segments, develop Class I Bike Paths on El Dorado Trail.

The proposed bikeway system is slightly over 200 miles in length, and will provide better access to the County’s transit network and activity centers as well as encourage increased use of the bicycle as a transportation mode. An increase in bicycle transportation benefits the entire region in terms of improving air quality, reducing congestion and improving the health and overall quality of life for the residents of El Dorado County.

In accordance with the Streets and Highways Code, the Bicycle Transportation Plan contains the following elements:

TABLE 1

Caltrans requirement	Section/Description	Location
A. Estimated number of existing bicycle commuters in the plan area and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle commuters resulting from implementation of the plan	Bicycle Commuter Projections	Chapter 2
B. A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which shall include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers	Land Use Discussion	Chapter 2
	Map Set	Chapter 5
C. A map and description of existing and proposed bikeways.	Map Set	Chapter 5
	Description (existing)	Chapter 4
	Description (proposed)	Chapter 5
D. A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking at schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers	Map Set	Chapter 5
	Description	Chapter 2
E. A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.	Multi-Modal Connections	Chapter 5
	Map Set	Chapter 5
F. A map and description of existing and proposed facilities for changing and storing clothes and equipment. These shall include, but not be limited to, locker restroom, and shower facilities near bicycle parking facilities.	Existing	Chapter 4
	Proposed Improvements	Chapter 5
G. A description of bicycle safety and education programs conducted in the area included within the plan, efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the Vehicle Code pertaining to bicycle operation, and the resulting effect on accidents involving bicycles.	Bicycle Safety	Chapter 2
	Education	Chapter 2
H. A description of the extent of citizen and community involvement in the development of the plan, including, but not limited to, letters of support.	Citizen/community involvement	Chapter 1

I. A description of how the bicycle transportation plan has been coordinated and is consistent with other local or regional transportation, air quality, or energy conservation plans, including but not limited to, programs that provide incentives for bicycle commuting.	Description	Chapter 1
J. A description of projects proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation	Proposed Improvements	Chapter 5
	Priority Projects	Chapter 6
K. A description of past expenditures for bicycle facilities and future financial needs for projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters in the plan area.	Past Expenditures	Chapter 4
	Future Financial Needs	Chapter 6

5. **Location of Project:** The study area of the El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan is the west slope of El Dorado County excluding that area within the Placerville City limits. 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 El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan.

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 checked="" 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 2005 Bicycle Transportation Plan.


Signature


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

2010 BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (BTP) UPDATE

ADDENDUM TO THE 2005 BTP 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: Projects proposed in both the 2005 and the proposed 2010 Update to the BTP include Class I, II and III bike paths. Class I bike paths are proposed in various natural areas, which could introduce new visible features along the bike path routes (i.e., the paved surface of the path, facilities such as signage and access barriers, and minimal landscaping). Class II and Class III facilities are, by definition, located within the paved shoulder of a road, with minimal visual impacts.

Adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan. The BTP is a planning document used to develop a countywide bicycle transportation system. Any project within the Plan proposed to proceed would be subject to a project specific CEQA analysis that would analyze potential impacts to aesthetics prior to that particular project approval.

	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"/>
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: Projects proposed in both the 2005 and the proposed 2010 Update to the BTP include Class I, II and III bike paths. Class I bike paths are proposed in various natural areas, which could introduce new visible features (i.e., the paved surface of the path, facilities such as signage and access barriers, and minimal landscaping). Class II and Class III facilities are, by definition, located within the paved shoulder of a road. Any project within the Plan proposed to proceed would be subject to a project specific CEQA analysis that would analyze potential impacts to Agricultural Resources as part of the project approval process.

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: Adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan.

Projects proposed in the El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan include Class I, II and III Bike Paths. Class I bike paths are proposed in various natural areas. Class II and Class III facilities are, by definition, located within the paved shoulder of a road. Any project within the Plan proposed to proceed would be subject to a project specific CEQA analysis that would analyze potential violation to air quality standards as defined by the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District, California Air Resources Board, and Environmental Protection Agency, as well as affect area residents in and adjacent to the proposed projects. However, the provision of additional bicycle commuter facilities could reduce air quality impacts by reducing total motorized transportation impacts.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
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: Adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan. The BTP is a planning document used to develop a countywide bicycle transportation system.

Results related to the area of Biological Resources are highly dependent on site-specific project information and characteristics. For the issues related to biological resources, future environmental analysis required of each individual project will address these concerns at a project-specific level.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: Adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan. Results related to the area of cultural resources are highly dependant on site-specific project information and characteristics. Future environmental analysis required of each individual project will address these concerns at a project-specific level.

The following mitigation measures were added with the original MND in 2005. However, these measures would need to be added to each project on a project specific basis. Further, each of these mitigation measures is standard for all grading project in the El Dorado County. Therefore, the significance conclusion has been changed to a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measure V - 1: Cease earth-moving activities if a cultural or paleontological resource is encountered.

In the event that cultural or paleontological resources are encountered during project construction, all earth-moving activity shall cease until the County retains services of a qualified archeologist or paleontologist. The archeologist shall examine the findings, assess their significance, and offer recommendations for procedures deemed appropriate to either further investigate or mitigate adverse impacts on those cultural or paleontological archeological resources that have been encountered (e.g., excavate the significant resource).

Mitigation Measure V – 2: Cease earth-moving activity if human bone or bone of unknown origin is found.

If human bone or bone of unknown origin is found during project construction, all work shall stop in the vicinity of the find and the County Coroner shall be contacted immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission. The Native American Heritage Commission shall notify the person it believes to be the most likely descendant. The most likely descendant shall work with the County to develop a program for re-internment of the human remains and any associated artifacts. No additional work shall take place within the immediate vicinity of the find until the identified appropriate actions have been completed.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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?

Discussion: Adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan. The BTP is a planning document used to develop a countywide bicycle transportation system.

Issues related to geology and soils are highly dependant on site-specific project information and characteristics. Future environmental analysis required of each individual project will address these concerns at a project-specific level.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: Hazardous materials and waste regulations are implemented by a number of government agencies including, but not limited to, the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), the California EPA – Department of Toxic Substances Control, and the California Division of Industrial Safety. These agencies have established regulations regarding proper transportation, handling, management, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials for specific operations and activities. Further, adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan. Future environmental analysis required of each individual project will address these concerns at a project-specific level.

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"/>
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)?	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding 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: Future environmental analysis required of each individual project will address these concerns at a project-specific level. Adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan.

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 (i.e.: 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: Adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP is consistent with relevant policies of the El Dorado County 2004 General Plan calling for an Updated Bicycle Transportation Plan in support of enhanced non-motorized transportation options. All issues regarding potential land use conflicts will be addressed with future environmental analysis required of each individual project at a project-specific level. Adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan.

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 delineated on 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: Adoption of the 2010 BTP project does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan. All issues regarding potential conflicts with mineral resources will be addressed with future environmental analysis required of each individual project at a project-specific level.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: Adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan. Future environmental analysis required of each individual project will address any concerns regarding noise impacts at a project-specific level.

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: Adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan. Future environmental analysis required of each individual project will address any concerns regarding the unlikely event of impacts to population and housing at a project-specific level.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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: Adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan. Future environmental analysis required of each individual project will address any concerns regarding the unlikely event of impacts to public services at a project-specific level.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: Projects proposed in the Bicycle Transportation Plan would increase recreational opportunities within the County. Future environmental analysis required of each individual project will address any concerns regarding the unlikely event of impacts to recreation at a project-specific level.

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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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: Class I bike paths and Class II bike lanes proposed in the BTP will be designed to meet Caltrans safety standards for curvature, width, location, signage, barriers and guardrails. Development of some bike paths and lanes could create the need for re-located or additional parking. Future environmental analysis required of each individual project will address any concerns regarding the unlikely event of impacts to population and housing at a project-specific level

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 that it has 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: Adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan. Future environmental analysis required of each individual project will address any concerns regarding the unlikely event of impacts to utilities and services at a project-specific level.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (Cumulatively considerable means that incremental effects are considerable when viewed in connection with effects of past projects, effects of other current projects, and effects of probable future projects)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: *Adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan. Future environmental analysis required of each individual project will address all environmental impacts. Mitigation measures were added in the 2005 BTP MND regarding Cultural Resources. However, these measures cannot be met except on a project specific basis during the individual CEQA analysis that must take place for each proposed project within the BTP.

**El Dorado County Bicycle Transportation Plan
 Mitigation Monitoring Program***

MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING			
Impact	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Agency	Time Frame
*CULTURAL RESOURCES	In the event that cultural or paleontological resources are encountered during project construction, all earth-moving activity shall cease until the County retains services of a qualified archeologist or paleontologist. The archeologist shall examine the findings, assess their significance, and offer recommendations for procedures deemed appropriate to either further investigate or mitigate adverse impacts on those cultural or paleontological archeological resources that have been encountered (e.g., excavate the significant resource).	*El Dorado County Planning Department and Department of Transportation	*During grading activities of future trail projects, should resource discovery interrupt work, work shall not resume until authorized by the County. A qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to advise the County (see note below).
	If human bone or bone of unknown origin is found during project construction, all work shall stop in the vicinity of the find and the County Coroner shall be contacted immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission. The Native American Heritage Commission shall notify the person it believes to be the most likely descendant. The most likely descendant shall work with the County to develop a program for re-interment of the human remains and any associated artifacts. No additional work shall take place within the immediate vicinity of the find until the identified appropriate actions have been completed.	*El Dorado County Sheriff's Department, El Dorado County Planning Department and Department of Transportation	*During grading activities of future trail projects, should the discovery of human remains interrupt work, work shall not resume until authorized by the County (see note below).

*Adoption of the proposed 2010 BTP does not automatically grant approval to construct the projects proposed within the Plan. Future environmental analysis required of each individual project will address all environmental impacts. The above mitigation measures were added in the 2005 BTP MND. However, these measures will be implemented on a project specific basis during the individual CEQA analysis that must take place for each proposed project within the BTP.