

Addendum
to the
Silver Springs Subdivision
Environmental Impact Report
(SCH #970720221)

To Include the Green Valley Road/Deer Valley Road
Intersection Improvements

El Dorado County, California

December 1, 2010

1.1. Purpose of the Addendum

The Deer Valley Road/Green Valley Road Intersection Improvement Project was added by the Board of Supervisors to the Silver Springs Subdivision as an off-site condition of approval in response to a concern voiced by Green Springs Ranch homeowners at the same hearing the *Silver Springs Subdivision Environmental Impact Report EIR* (1998 EIR) was certified on December 15, 1998.

The 1998 EIR did not include the Green Valley Road/Deer Valley Road intersection in the Project Description. This Addendum is intended to provide additional information necessary to make the 1998 EIR adequately apply to the project as modified. Any relevant information and analyses in the 1998 EIR are briefly summarized or described, rather than repeated.

This document has been prepared 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.

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 1998 EIR.

(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 has occurred since certification of the 1998 EIR. This Addendum refers to a condition of approval which was added prior to certification. As demonstrated in the attached CEQA Checklist, no new information occurred or was discovered as a result of this analysis and no new mitigation measures are warranted.

1.2. Project Background and Description

This section describes the changes as added by the Board of Supervisors just prior to certification in December 1998. The original project need, objectives, location, and existing environmental setting have not changed. While the Deer Valley/Green Valley Road intersection is not located at the subject site, it is within the project area. This Addendum focuses on the modifications to the Project that could result in potentially significant environmental impacts that were not analyzed in 1998 EIR. The 1998 EIR did not include the Green Valley Road/Deer Valley Road intersection in the Project Description. The condition reads as follows:

56. The applicant shall construct right and left turn lanes on Green Valley Road at its intersection with Green Springs Road and Deer Valley Road.

The Project will improve the existing intersection to include widening to provide for dedicated left and right turn lanes, class II bike lanes, overlay of existing pavement section, associated

signage and striping, construction of asphaltic concrete curbs, associated existing drainage culvert extensions, and retaining wall construction. (Figure 1)

1.3. CEQA Checklist

The attached CEQA Checklist provides the supporting documentation demonstrating that no additional impacts or mitigation measures are required for the Deer Valley Road/Green Valley Road Intersection improvements. (Attachment A)

1.4 Mitigation Measures from 1998 EIR

The attached Mitigation Program provides discussion of applicable mitigation measures from 1998 EIR. (Attachment B) No additional mitigation measures are required.

1.5 Biological Surveys:

The subdivision applicant's biologist surveyed the site of the intersection improvements for any wetlands, waters of the U.S, or any other biological impacts in October, 2005. The site has not changed since that time. No wetlands or Waters of the U.S. exist on the site and therefore a 404 permit is not necessary from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, nor is a 401 Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board required.

Two clusters of elderberry shrubs were identified along the south side of Green Valley Road, east of Deer Valley Road. On October 5, 2005, Mr. Ken Fuller of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service conducted a site visit in order to inspect the elderberry shrubs for presence of the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB). Mr. Fuller confirmed the absence of exit holes, and noted that the shrubs are not associated with any riparian habitat. Upon discussion with his supervisor, he concluded that the shrubs do not serve as habitat for the VELB, and that the shrubs could be removed without the need for formal consultation with the U.S. F&WS.

In order to make certain that the VELB is still not present after 5 years; another survey was conducted by Padre Associates on February 26, 2010. Padre verified that the same elderberry shrubs remain on the site, and again, no exit holes were found. Therefore no formal consultation with the U.S. F&WS is required.

Additionally, since the project will not affect any streams, lakes or riparian habitat, a Streambed Alteration Agreement with the California Department of Fish and Game is not required.

ATTACHMENT A

CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form

1. **Project title:** ADDENDUM TO THE 1998 SILVER SPRINGS SUBDIVISION EIR TO INCLUDE THE GREEN VALLEY ROAD/DEER VALLEY ROAD INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT
2. **Lead agency name and address:**
El Dorado County Department of Transportation
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
3. **Contact person:** Janet Postlewait (530) 621-5993: janet.postlewait@edcgov.us
4. **Project location:** Green Valley Road at Deer Valley Road, 1.5 miles west of Bass Lake Road
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**
El Dorado County Department of Transportation
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
6. **General plan designation:** Rural Residential
7. **Zoning:** Residential Estate Ten Acres (RE-10)
8. **Description of project:** The Project will widen the existing intersection to provide for dedicated left and right turn lanes, class II bike lanes, overlay of existing pavement section, associated signage and striping, construction of asphaltic concrete curbs, associated existing drainage culvert extensions, and retaining wall construction. (Figure 1)
9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The Northwest corner of the intersection is vacant; the northeast and southwest corners have mobile homes on the properties; the southeast corner is the location of a proposed equestrian center.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):** El Dorado Irrigation District; Rescue Fire Department

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 1998 Silver Springs Subdivision EIR.


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 the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone).
- 2) All 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, then 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. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impacts" when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation " applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 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 were within the scope and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and if effects were addressed by mitigation measures from the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (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

**ADDENDUM TO THE 1998 SILVER SPRINGS SUBDIVISION EIR TO INCLUDE
THE GREEN VALLEY ROAD/DEER VALLEY ROAD INTERSECTION
IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT**

	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"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. This project widens an existing intersection where there is currently no scenic vista. b. No trees are required to be removed to complete these intersection improvements, and no rock outcroppings exist on site. c. The widening of an existing intersection will not change the character of quality of the site visually. d. A County required traffic signal will be installed that will include top shields and utilize low-sodium bulbs. 				
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<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: No agricultural farmland exists in the project area.

Addendum to the 1998 *Silver Springs Subdivision EIR*
to include The Deer Valley Road/Green Valley Road Intersection Improvement Project

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:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 project would result in short-term air pollutant emissions from ground disturbance and construction vehicle operation. All activities and equipment will comply with applicable rules and regulations for minimizing construction emissions that are currently in place for the Silver Springs Subdivision EIR as mitigation measures. No additional impacts will occur and no additional mitigation measures are required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <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, 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 as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <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 any 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"/> |

Addendum to the 1998 *Silver Springs Subdivision EIR*
to include The Deer Valley Road/Green Valley Road Intersection Improvement Project

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

a) Two clusters of elderberry shrubs were identified along the south side of Green Valley Road, east of Deer Valley Road. On October 5, 2005, Mr. Ken Fuller of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service conducted a site visit in order to inspect the elderberry shrubs for presence of the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB), who confirmed the absence of exit holes, and noted that the shrubs are not associated with any riparian habitat. Upon discussion with his supervisor, he concluded that the shrubs do not serve as habitat for the VELB, and that the shrubs could be removed without the need for formal consultation with the USF&WS. In order to make certain that the VELB is still not present after 5 years; another survey was conducted by Padre Associates on February 26, 2010. Padre verified that the same elderberry shrubs remain on the site, and again, no exit holes were found.

b-f) The project site was surveyed for any wetlands, waters of the U.S, or any other biological impacts in October, 2005. The site has not changed since that time. No wetlands or Waters of the U.S. or migratory fish or wildlife exist on the site. The project is consistent with all local policies and there is no HBC adopted that could be affect.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

a-d) No historical, archaeological or paleontological resources are located in the project area. Additionally, as set forth in the Silver springs Subdivision EIR mitigation measures, if unidentified resources are discovered during earthwork, work will stop in the immediate vicinity and appropriate federal and state laws will be complied with, including the Native American Heritage commission and/or county coroner.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

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

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

iv) Landslides?

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Addendum to the 1998 *Silver Springs Subdivision EIR*
to include The Deer Valley Road/Green Valley Road Intersection Improvement Project

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <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 Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a-c) This project will not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects relative to ground shaking, seismic related ground failure, or landslides. No substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil will result.

d-3) The project involves a minor widening of an existing intersection with no disturbance to the existing asphalt. Any ground disturbance is subject to implementation of the SWPP and approved erosion control plans that are part of contract documents within the plans and specifications. The February 1, 2006 Geotechnical Report entitled *Silver Springs Residential Development and Offsite Improvements*, by Engeo Inc, does not identify unstable or expansive soils. A sandy clay layer observed to be between 1 and 2 feet thick was observed at some bore locations. However, as recommended, these sites are able to be avoided in order to complete the project. No septic systems will be affected by this project.

No additional impacts relative to geology and soils have been identified and no additional mitigation measures are required.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <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 adopted 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 a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Addendum to the 1998 *Silver Springs Subdivision EIR*
to include The Deer Valley Road/Green Valley Road Intersection Improvement Project

a-d) The project would not involve routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. Safety measures will be implemented to prevent accidental release of hazardous material if it were to occur, pursuant to mitigation measures set forth in the Silver Springs Subdivision EIR. No additional measures are required. The site is not located on any list indicated hazardous materials.

e-f) the project is not located near an airport

g) The project will not impair implementation of or interfere with any adopted emergency response plan, nor will it create any additional risk of wildland fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 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 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, tsunamis, or mudflow | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a-c) No water quality standards or waste discharge requirements will be violated. An erosion control plan will be implemented as well as the SWPPP as approved the State of California. Pursuant to the 2006 Geotechnical Report, no groundwater was observed.

d-i) The site is being graded in accordance with the approved Master Drainage Report by MacKay and Somps, which was designed to follow the natural drainage patterns. Therefore, there will not be substantial erosion or siltation. Increased surface runoff is directed to the detention pond constructed per the Master Drainage Report which will prevent potential increase in flooding or water quality impacts on downstream facilities. The site is not located within a 100 year flood hazard area pursuant to the FEMA Flood Hazard Boundary. There are no levees or dams in the area.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |

A-c The project is on an existing intersection, and will not divide an established community. The project is consistent with the County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, and there is no HCP or NCCP plan that encompasses the area.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |

No known mineral resources are available on the site.

XI. NOISE: Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 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 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"/> |

- a) Construction level of noise will be limited to acceptable standards as required in the Contract specifications. Work at night will not occur.
- b) Excessive background vibration is not anticipated.
- c) No permanent increase in ambient noise levels will occur. This is an existing intersection that will be improved.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Addendum to the 1998 *Silver Springs Subdivision EIR*
to include The Deer Valley Road/Green Valley Road Intersection Improvement Project

b) Displace substantial existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

This is an intersection improvement project to an existing intersection, and will not induce population growth, nor will it displace any existing population.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES:

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?

Police protection?

Schools?

Parks?

Other public facilities?

All standards regarding public services will be adhered to. This is an intersection improvement project and will not affect any services. In the event that lane closures occur, they will be done according to an approved traffic management plan set forth in the contract specifications and according to mitigation measures that are already in place with the EIR.

XIV. RECREATION:

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?

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?

Discussion: This project will not affect recreation – it's an intersection improvement project.

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)?

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

Addendum to the 1998 *Silver Springs Subdivision EIR*
to include The Deer Valley Road/Green Valley Road Intersection Improvement Project

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 (e.g., farm equipment)? | <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 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"/> |

a-g) The road widening will increase the existing capacity by providing dedicated right and left turn lanes. As such, it will improve the level of service and improve traffic patterns by improving traffic flow. Likewise, emergency access will be improved. Parking will not be affecting and alternative transportation will not be affected.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <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 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"/> |

All standards and policies relative to utilities and service systems will be adhered to pursuant to the mitigation measures set forth in the EIR. Wastewater treatment will not be affected, as this is an intersection improvement project.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Addendum to the 1998 *Silver Springs Subdivision EIR*
to include The Deer Valley Road/Green Valley Road Intersection Improvement Project

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)?

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

The project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species. No streams exist in the vicinity and the VELB have not been found on the elderberry shrubs – see Biological Resources.

The project has no cumulative impacts

The project will not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

ATTACHMENT B

1998 SILVER SPRINGS SUBDIVISION EIR MITIGATION MEASURES RELATIVE TO GREEN VALLEY ROAD/DEER VALLEY ROAD INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS

GEO-1a: Prior to final project approval, the project applicant shall submit an erosion control plan to the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District that shall conform to the specifications of the El Dorado County RCD Erosion Control Requirements and Specifications.

GEO-1b: Prior to conducting grading operations, backfilling shall occur in depressions from tree and structure removal, and organic materials shall be stripped from surface layers.

GEO-1c: During grading, any clay encountered should be avoided due to potential for soil expansion. Additional mitigation addressing expansive soils include: Wherever soil with high clay concentrations are exposed at finished pad grade or within 2 feet of finished subgrade in roadway areas, it should be removed to a depth at least two feet below finished pad grade or finished subgrade and replaced with granular soil or weathered rock. If clay is encountered at the base of the footing excavations, the footings shall be deepened through the clay layer.

GEO-1d: Prior to and after grading/filling operations, site preparation shall include scarifying fill areas, moisture conditioning and compacting direct fill, benching fill into existing slopes and prescriptions for import materials and rock excavation.

GEO-1f: Prior to grading for utility lines, the recommendations outlined in the Geotechnical Report shall be implemented. These include prescriptions for pre-ripping, dewatering, excavation, trench backfill, and avoiding building pad disturbance.

GEO-1g: Prior to final project approval, the applicant shall prepare and submit an erosion control plan to the County, consistent with the El Dorado County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance and the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District's Erosion and Sediment Control Plan. This plan shall address stabilization measures for graded areas after vegetation removal and during the rainy season.

GEO-1h: As a condition of subdivision map approval, the project shall comply with the El Dorado County Grading Ordinance Section 15-14.

GEO-1i: Prior to issuance of grading permits, the following shall apply to the proposed project where soils are designated serpentine rock;

- Pre-wet area and immediately follow with fine spray application on the immediate area being worked to eliminate visible dust to the greatest extent possible.
- Limit vehicle access and speed on exposed serpentine areas to reduce fiber releases.
- Cover areas exposed to vehicle travel with non-asbestos cover material.
- Maintain high moisture condition of the disturbed surface or apply "binder- material to seal loose fibers together and to the parent rock particle. Dust palliatives such as lignin sulfonate, magnesium chloride, and pitch, rosin, and polymer emulsions can be effectively utilized in a variety of applications.

- Material transfers or stockpiles of loose material should be kept adequately wet, sealed by a palliative or covered when conditions warrant.
- Provide employee notification of potential health risk of airborne asbestos and the requirements of the asbestos dust mitigation plan.
- Worker safety precautions and exposure monitoring should be considered but it is not specifically required in all cases. Other relevant regulations from the county and state agencies may also be used when applicable according to their provisions.

WR-1: Prior to Final Map approval, storm drain plans shall be prepared to finalize the detailed storm drain improvements. These plans shall confirm that the increase in site runoff attributable to the proposed project will not adversely affect downstream conditions in or adjacent to Green Springs Creek. Ultimately, if required, facilities shall be provided on-site as needed to reduce runoff quantities to discharge levels that will not result in downstream flooding, scour or erosion. These plans shall be approved by the County Transportation Director.

WR-2a: Prior to final map approval, detailed interim and final erosion control and hazardous materials control plans shall be developed for project site, consistent with El Dorado County's Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance and El Dorado County Resource Conservation District's Erosion and Sediment Control Plan. These programs should include Best Management Practices (BMP's) to protect water quality during and after construction. The following erosion control measures are required to control water and wind erosion:

- Sandbags will be placed across streets where necessary, depending upon size of catchment and sediment yield.
- Erosion control at the sediment sources will be emphasized during construction.
- A stand-by crew will be made available for emergency work during the rainy season. Necessary materials will be available onsite, and stockpiled at convenient locations to facilitate rapid construction of temporary erosion control devices when significant rain events are forecast.
- Removable protective erosion control devices will be put in place at the end of each working day when the five day rain probability forecast exceeds 50 percent.
- All erosion control measures will be Implemented In conformance with the requirements of the grading code for B Dorado County. All construction will be conducted with provisions for the control of sand, dust, and debris originating at the construction site. Appropriate areas will be contained with berms, desilting basins or similar structures to prevent runoff during construction operations.
- Prior to the issuance of building permits, landscape and erosion plans will be reviewed and approved by the County Transportation Director. Temporary mulching, seeding, landscaping, permanent erosion control or other suitable stabilization measures will be included as part of the individual projects in order to protect exposed areas during and after construction and will be noted on project plans.
- To minimize the potential for erosion, grading should be confined to the dry season. However, if project grading continues outside this period, wet weather erosion control measures should be on site and in place around areas to be disturbed at all times.

WR-2b: Prior to conducting grading activities for infrastructure and roadways, the applicant shall obtain an NPDES permit from the prepared Regional Water Quality Control Board. As a component of the permit, the applicant shall prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan

(SWPPP) which identified the specific procedures for minimizing erosion, etc. on the site during construction. The SWPPP shall identify specific areas on the project site requiring pretreatment of runoff discharge to minimize the effects of construction on drainages.

BR-1: As a condition of tentative subdivision map approval, the project applicant shall develop an oak tree mitigation plan containing provisions including, but not limited to, the following:

- a. Guidelines to minimize direct and indirect impacts to oak woodlands on the project site during construction and operation phases of the proposed project. This includes use of buffers and barriers to prevent or reduce disturbance to oak trees and understory. Canopy cover retention within oak woodlands shall meet requirements of General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4, wherever possible. These guidelines shall appear as standards in the tentative maps, improvement plans, and subdivision CC&Rs, and shall be implemented prior to initiation of ground clearing, grading or other construction activities that may impact oak trees. Unless stated otherwise, all measures shall be the sole responsibility of the project applicant.
- b. Direction to retain a qualified project biologist or equivalent professional to oversee all aspects of the construction monitoring that pertain to oak tree protection. The project applicant shall be responsible for reimbursing the County for all costs related to the compliance monitoring of the project.
- c. Guidelines for oak woodland revegetation shall consist of an Implementation and monitoring component. Because the exact extent of tree loss can only be determined after final grading plans and building envelopes are defined, a detailed analysis of 1) the precise number and species to be removed, and 2) the specific mitigation areas to be planted shall be developed and identified as part of the tentative and final map processes in compliance with General Plan Policy 7.4.5.1. Lost tree canopy cover must be replaced as the percentage required under policy 7.4.4.4 of the County General Plan.
- d. Guidelines identifying monitoring and management techniques for a minimum period of ten years following implementation. These guidelines shall establish performance standards and describe appropriate remedial measures to be implemented if the performance standards are not achieved.

The mitigation plan shall be approved by the County Planning Director prior to approval/recordation of the final subdivision map or prior to approval of the grading permit, whichever comes first. The project applicant shall identify and secure sources of funding and personnel to implement the measures outlined above prior to any tree removal and prior to the issuance of a grading permit by the County.

BR-2: Subsequent to approval of the tentative subdivision map and prior to grading of any regulated wetland, waters of the U.S., or streambed, the applicant shall obtain necessary Corps permits and/or a Section 1603 agreement with the CDFG. The applicant shall comply with all provisions included in the permits and agreements as set forth by resource agencies.

BR-3: Removal of trees containing active Cooper's hawk nests or birds No displaying nesting activities, if *any*, should be avoided if possible. Removal of such trees, if required, should be completed between August and March to avoid disturbance during nesting activities.

BR-4: Prior to approval/recordation of the final subdivision map, the applicant shall pay the appropriate fees which offset the loss of special status plant species. Pursuant to General Plan Policy 7.4.1.1, five preserve sites have been established to protect, in perpetuity, those special status plant species that are endemic to gabbro and serpentine soils. The project applicant will be required to comply with the specific provisions and implementation requirements contained in the County's *Ecological Preserve Fee Ordinance Program* or as amended.

If this process is not available to the applicant, then on-site mitigation measures will be implemented to protect the population of Layne's butterweed present on the site. These measures may include, but are not limited to, buffer zones of 25-50 feet set-asides with deed restrictions, fencing and careful management of fire breaks.

BR-5: Prior to approval/recordation of the final subdivision map, the applicant shall pay the appropriate fees which offset the loss of special status plant species. Pursuant to General Plan Policy 7.4.1.1, five preserve sites have been established to protect, in perpetuity, those special status plant species that are endemic to gabbro and serpentine soils. The project applicant will be required to comply with the specific provisions and implementation requirements contained in the County's *Ecological Preserve Fee Ordinance Program* or as amended.

If this process is not available to the applicant, then on-site mitigation measures will be implemented to protect and avoid any impact to this species. Since Lot M has not yet been designed, the parcels shall be laid out to avoid impact to the populations of Red Hills soap root.

BR-6a: Subsequent to tentative map approval and prior to grading activities the applicant shall consult with the USFWS regarding the "take" of the VELB. The applicant may be permitted "take" of the VELB through application and approval of an individual Section 10 (a) permit under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA). If the applicant is also applying for a Section 404 permit from the Corps, "take" of the VELB may be permitted under Section 7 of the FESA. Under Section 7, the Corps would consult with USFWS as part of Section 404 process; if it is determined that "take" of the VELB is associated with activities requiring the Section 404 permit.

BR-6b: Mitigation for "take" of the VELB shall be implemented in accordance with *Mitigation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle*: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, September 1996. Mitigation shall include, but not limited to, the following: Avoid and protect existing elderberry trees wherever possible; transplant elderberry trees that cannot be avoided. Plant additional elderberry trees and associated native vegetation in transplant areas. Establish a mitigation area that will provide habitat for the VELB in perpetuity, including long term monitoring of the area.

AQ-1a: The following are provided to reduce air pollutants generated by vehicle and equipment exhaust during the project construction phase:

a. The Construction Contractor shall select the construction equipment used on site based on low emission factors and high energy efficiency. The Construction Contractor shall ensure

that construction grading plans include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.

b. The Construction Contractor shall utilize electric or diesel powered equipment in lieu of gasoline powered engines where feasible.

c. The Contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that work crews shall shut off equipment when not in use. During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period should be extended, thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day to minimize vehicles and equipment operating at the same time.

d. The Construction Contractor shall time the construction activities so as to not interfere with peak hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary, a flag person shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.

e. The Construction Contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew.

AQ-1b: The following would reduce or minimize fugitive dust emissions associated with grading or other soil disturbances: a) The EDCAPCD Rule 223 shall be adhered to during construction; b) A fugitive dust control plan shall be submitted and approved by the EDCAPCD prior to project construction in compliance with County Grading Ordinance Section 15.14.

AQ-1c: The following would reduce or minimize air pollutant emissions associated with road development/asphalt paving: The construction Contractor shall adhere to the requirements of the EDCAPCD Rule 224, Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials. .

N-1a: All construction vehicle and equipment shall be fitted with working mufflers.

N-1b: Construction activity shall be limited to the hours of 7 AM to 7 PM, Monday through Saturday. No construction is allowed on Sundays and federal holidays.

VIS-2: As a condition of tentative subdivision map approval, subsequent to ordinance adoption, all principals and design criteria included (or as amended) in the Draft Scenic Highway Ordinance shall retroactively be incorporated into project design for those portions of the site that would be visible from Green Valley Road, provided that applicable project development has not been initiated. Applicable areas include Lot L (School Site), lot J (Church Site), Phase IV, and the northern portions of Phase II and lot M (10 future custom EDU's).

CR-1: As a condition of grading permits, prior to grading and ground disturbances, applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist to observe removal of earth and watch for indications of cultural resources. If a cultural resource is uncovered, construction will be redirected until the monitor has evaluated the resource for significance and identified appropriate mitigation. If human remains are encountered, work in the immediate vicinity will be halted until the County coroner, who must be notified within 24 hours, has evaluated the remains. If the coroner determines that the burial is Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted to determine the most likely descendent (MLD) for this area. The MLD may become involved in the disposition of the remains following scientific analysis.