

| Summary Comparison of 1998 MND and Subsequent MND for Brittany Way and El Dorado Hills Boulevard Realignment Project | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|---|------------------------|
| Subsequent MND Mitigation | | | 1998 MND Mitigation | |
| Impact | Level of Significance | Mitigation | Notes | Level after Mitigation |
| 3.1 Aesthetics | | | | |
| 3.1a Scenic Vistas | LTS | No Impacts No mitigation is required | | LTS |
| 3.1b Scenic Resources within a Scenic Highway | LTS | No Impacts. No mitigation is required | The project is not within the vicinity of a designated scenic highway. | LTS |
| 3.1c Existing Visual Quality | LTS | No mitigation is required | The realignment would not significantly change the existing visual quality of the area. | LTS |
| 3.1d Light and Glare | LTS | No mitigation is required. | Reviewed under 1998 MND. Due to minor changes in alignment and increased distances between light sources (headlights) and receptors on Hoffman Court, 1998 mitigation measure requiring vegetative screening is no longer required. The project also includes the installation of safety lighting to illuminate the pedestrian crosswalk at the intersection. Lights would be installed between 30 and 40 feet above street grade for pedestrian safety within the crosswalk. The lighting would be located over 130 feet from the nearest residence and directed downward to illuminate the intersection. | LTS |
| 3.2 Air Quality | | | | |
| 3.2 a & b Temporary Construction Emissions | Potentially significant | <p>MM 3.2.1: Prior to commencement of construction or site grading activities, DOT shall determine the maximum daily fuel usage of construction equipment to be used during project construction. If fuel usage levels are below thresholds identified in Table 3.2-3, then no further mitigation is required. If the max daily fuel usage exceeds these thresholds (Table 3.2-3), then MM 3.2.2 must be applied.</p> <p>MM 3.2.2: If max daily construction equipment usage exceeds thresholds (Table 3.2-3) DOT shall require the prime contractor to comply with at least one(1) of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The prime contractor shall provide an approved plan demonstrating that the heavy-duty greater than 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in construction project, and operated by either the prime contractor or any subcontractor, will achieve a minimum fleet average 20% NOx reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. Successful implementation requires the prime contractor to submit a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater | Potential temporary impacts to air quality as a result of project construction were addressed in the 1998 MND, which included mitigation measures to reduce dust and construction air quality impacts. The mitigation measures included site watering, covering soil stockpiles, restricted traffic speed, and the suspension of grading activity when winds exceed 25 miles per hour. Since adoption of the 1998 MND, the County has adopted more stringent BMP's regulating fugitive dust and vehicle emissions during construction activities, which are required as part of the construction contract, and would be implemented by the County-hired contractor throughout construction of the proposed project. | LTS |

| Subsequent MND Mitigation | | | 1998 MND Mitigation | |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|------------------|
| Impact | Level of Significance | Mitigation | Notes | After Mitigation |
| | | <p>than 50 horsepower, to us as aggregate of 40 or more hours during the construction project. The inventory shall include horsepower rating, engine production year and hours of use or fuel throughput for each piece of equipment. The list shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prime contractor shall ensure emissions from all off-road powered equipment do not exceed 40% opacity for more than three minutes in any one-hour period. As enforcement, the prime contractor is required to agree to a visual survey of in-operation equipment conducted periodically. Also, submit summary of results throughout duration of construction that includes quantity and type of vehicles surveyed and the dates of each survey. • Contractor shall use aqueous emulsified fuel verified by the CARB to have the greatest NOx and PM10 reduction benefit available. | | |
| Naturally Occurring Asbestos | LTS | No mitigation necessary with enforcement of state and County standards in place. | <p>The 1998 MND assumed that NOA would be present on the project site once site grading begins at levels that can be reduced to less than significant by compliance with regulations and Contract Standard Special Provisions, as approved by AQMD. Specifically, measures found in the County AQMD Rule 223-2-Fugitive Dust – Asbestos Hazard Mitigation (7/19/05) would include standard monitoring and mitigation approved by the AQMD, and implement Best Available Control Measures listed in Tables 1-6 of Rule 223-2, including water or stabilizing agents to disturbed soils on a regular basis to prevent visible dust, pre-water soils prior to excavation, minimize drop heights and empty speeds from loader buckets to avoid dust plumes, hydro seed, and limit stockpile sizes. In accordance with the CARB Final Regulation Order for Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations, Section 93105 (3/04), DOT would notify the AQMD Officer in writing at least 14 days prior to construction and must implement dust control measures from Section 93105 in addition to the County regulations. Adherence to County and State policies identified above and MM 3.2-1 ensures that the project would not conflict with or obstruct local, State or Federal air quality plans.</p> | LTS |
| Operational Emissions | LTS | LTS. No mitigation is required | <p>The proposed project would result in roadway improvements to accommodate existing as well as future traffic volumes. Other than the short-term construction emissions, no new vehicle trips would occur and therefore would not generate any new air emissions.</p> | |
| Cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment. | LTS | LTS. No mitigation is required | <p>Regional air pollutants of importance in El Dorado County are ozone precursors (ROG and NOx) and PM10. The project would affect emissions of these pollutants by changing vehicle operating conditions if using EDH Blvd.</p> | LTS |
| Sensitive Receptors | LTS | LTS. No mitigation is required | <p>The project would not generate any emissions that would exceed the County AQMD's thresholds. Any construction emissions created would</p> | LTS |

| Subsequent MND Mitigation | | | 1998 MND Mitigation | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|------------------|
| Impact | Level of Significance | Mitigation | Notes | After Mitigation |
| | | | be short-term. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. | |
| Objectionable Odors | No Impact | No Impact | Odors are usually linked to uses such as treatment plants, restaurants, gas stations, or industrial facilities. This is a road project and objectionable odors are not expected to occur. | |
| 3.3 Biological Resources | | | | |
| 3.3a Special Status Species | Potentially Significant | MM 3.3.1: A preconstruction survey to determine the presence of special-status plant species within the project area shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the plants' flowering periods (May to June) and prior to any construction activity. If special-status plant species are found, those individuals or populations shall be avoided to the maximum extent feasible. The County's Pine Hill Preserve system has been developed to mitigate impacts from development projects' (including roadway projects) impacts on special-status plant species found in the County. Although removal of such species may occur from areas not within the preserve system, documentation of these species' presence must be performed prior to the removal of individual plants. If rare, threatened or endangered plants (or rare plant communities) is identified during pre-construction surveys, documentation consisting of location, plant type, etc. shall be completed and kept on file at the County. Plant removal may proceed following the full documentation of the species' presence. | Reviewed under 1998 MND. Mitigation measure updated to reflect current methodology and supersede those identified in 1998 | LTS |
| California Red-Legged Frog | LTS | LTS. No mitigation is required. | Reviewed under 1998 MND and considered LTS. This analysis is based upon "Revised Guidance on Site Assessments and Field Surveys for the California Red-Legged Frog" USFWS 2005). Based on the conclusions of multiple site assessments (see document for details) the potential for CRF is considered less than significant. | LTS |
| Raptors and other Migratory Birds | Potentially Significant | MM 3.3.3: (MM 3.3.2 skipped inadvertently) Tree removal shall be conducted during non-breeding season for native birds (September 1st-March 1st). to avoid violations of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and CDGD Code Sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3513. If construction activities cannot avoid breeding season, DOT shall retain the service of a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey of all trees suitable for use by nesting raptors and native birds within 500 feet of the boundary as allowable, and performed no more than 30 days prior to construction activities. If active special-status bird or raptor nests are found, appropriate buffer zones shall be | Mitigation measure updated to reflect current methodology and supersede those identified in 1998 | LTS |

| Subsequent MND Mitigation | | | 1998 MND Mitigation | |
|--|-------------------------|---|--|------------------|
| Impact | Level of Significance | Mitigation | Notes | After Mitigation |
| | | established in consultation with the CDFG for all nests located within the project as allowable, and no construction shall be conducted within this established buffer zone during the nesting season (typically March to August) or until such time that the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active. The buffer zone shall be marked with flagging, construction lathe, or other means to mark the boundary of the buffer zone and to avoid entering the buffer zone during the nesting season. | | |
| Special Status Bats | Potentially significant | MM 3.3.4: Preconstruction survey by a qualified biologist shall be conducted prior to construction to determine presence or absence of roosting bats. If the survey does not identify these species onsite, no further mitigation is required. If roosts are identified, the bats shall be safely flushed from where roosting habitat is planned to be removed prior to the maternity roosting periods. | Not addressed in 1998 MND, therefore added in current subsequent document. | LTS |
| 3.3b Riparian or Other Sensitive Natural Communities | Potentially Significant | MM 3.3.5: If impacts to riparian and other sensitive natural communities are unavoidable, and on-site preservation is not possible, then habitat compensation shall be required at a 1:1 impact preservation ratio. DOT shall prepare and implement a riparian vegetation mitigation and monitoring plan for disturbed riparian habitat. The plan shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Onsite and/or offsite location(s) for replacement shrubs and trees. • Protection measures for replacement shrubs and trees that shall ensure that 80 percent of replacement plantings are alive three years following site revegetation. • Monitoring measures, including construction monitoring by a biologist, arborist, or ecologist. | 1998 MND required wetland delineation. Delineation was conducted for this document in April 2005 (Appendix B). | LTS |
| 3.3c Wetlands and Potential Waters of the US | Potentially Significant | MM 3.3.6: (no number assigned in 2007 document) As applicable, the County must apply for a Sections 404 and 401 permits, and 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement. Adherence to the federal and state permitting requirements, as well as MM 3.3.5 ensures that impacts to wetlands and waters of the United States would be less than significant. | Reviewed under 1998 MND. Army Corp of Engineers must still verify the wetland delineation. (See 2007 document for full discussion. | LTS |
| 3.3.d Migratory Wildlife | LTS | No Impact. No mitigation is required. | | LTS |
| 3.3.e Conflicts with Loss of Oak Trees | Potentially Significant | MM 3.3.7: (Numbered as MM 3.4.2 in 2007 document) DOT shall mitigate the removal of native oaks consistent with the requirements specified in Policy 7.4.5.2 (A) and Policy 7.4.4.4 of the General Plan. The replacement requirement shall be calculated based upon an | Reviewed under 1998 MND. Mitigation measures updated to reflect current methodology and supersede those identified in 1998 | LTS |

| Subsequent MND Mitigation | | | 1998 MND Mitigation | |
|--|-------------------------|---|--|------------------|
| Impact | Level of Significance | Mitigation | Notes | After Mitigation |
| | | inch for inch replacement of removed oaks. The total of replacement trees shall have a combined diameter of tree(s) removed, and may be planted on or off-site. MM3.3.8: To protect trees in the area not proposed for removal, the County shall place temporary protective fencing around the work area perimeter. No work or staging shall occur beyond the fenced area, and no materials shall be stored or dumped beyond the fenced area. | | |
| 3.3.f: Conflicts with HCP's | LTS | No Impact. No mitigation is required. | Not addressed in 1998 MND. | LTS |
| 3.4 Cultural Resources | | | | |
| Known Cultural Resources | LTS | No impacts identified. | Reviewed under 1998 MND. No mitigation was identified | LTS |
| Undiscovered Cultural Resources. | Potentially Significant | In the event that buried cultural resources are discovered during the course of project grading or construction activities, operations shall immediately stop in the vicinity of the find, and a qualified archaeologist who fulfills the required standards shall be notified immediately to evaluate and determine proper procedure for dealing with the resource. Resources could consist of, but not be limited to, artifacts of stone, bone, wood, shell, or other materials, or features, including hearths, structural remains, or dumps. Excavation of existing fill placements shall be monitored by a qualified archaeological monitor, in the event that the fill may have been placed over sensitive cultural resources. If human burials are found anywhere of project area, all work in the area shall stop immediately and notify the county coroner's office within 48 hours. If remains are determined to be Native American in origin, both the Native American Heritage Commission and any identified descendents must be notified for treatment solicited (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5; Public Resources Code Section 5097.89). | MM is from 1998 MND. | LTS |
| 3.5 Geology and Soils | | | | |
| Seismicity Hazards | LTS | | Overall seismic hazards of the Folsom and El Dorado Hills areas are considered relatively low. Therefore, impacts involving seismicity are less than significant. | LTS |
| Soil Erosion and Geologic/Soil Stability | LTS | 1998 Mitigation Measures: Placement of new fill to relocate and construct the roadway shall, to the extent possible, minimize soil loss with ecological or economic value. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soils that are disturbed as a result of the project, but not paved shall be revegetated to protect further disturbance or erosion. • Soils associated with the abandoned El | Reviewed in 1998 MND. Any grading would be subject to the County AQMD's current Fugitive Dust Rule 223- General Requirements (amended July 19, 2005) and Rule 223.1-Construction Activities (adopted July 19, 2005), which would serve to minimize dust and the loss of topsoil from project construction. The project also include Best Management Practices designed to reduce soil erosion, and would require a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to identify measures that would be implemented during construction. The project | LTS |

| Subsequent MND Mitigation | | | 1998 MND Mitigation | |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|------------------|
| Impact | Level of Significance | Mitigation | Notes | After Mitigation |
| | | <p>Dorado Hills Blvd shall be revegetated to protect the soil from erosion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engineering plans for improvements shall specifically identify each location requiring slope stability or soil cover improvements, and identify monitoring plans that specifically identifies measures if stabilization of recontoured slopes is not achieved. • Re-grading for the purpose of road construction and improving slope stability shall be conducted according to standard geotechnical engineering practice, which include (1) the height & extent of cuts & fills shall be minimized as nearly as possible, (2) prominent topographic landmark features shall not be modified by excavation, and (3) there will be no major changes in drainage pattern affects the course of streams. • Re-grading and revegetation to improve soil cover shall be conducted to improve soil infiltration, decrease surface runoff and reduce soil erosion. • An erosion and revegetation plan shall be prepared by DOT. • All grading and erosion control shall be conducted per Chapter 15.14 Grading Erosion & Sediment Control Ordinance). | must also comply with the Storm Water Management Plan for El Dorado County. | |
| Septic Tanks | LTS | No Impact. No Mitigation Required. | Reviewed under 1998 MND. | LTS |
| 3.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials | | | | |
| 3.6a through h: Release of Hazardous Materials | LTS | No mitigation is required | <p>The project would not result in the significant use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials and is not expected to expose area residents, local schools or local air strips, to any existing health hazards. Any use, storage, and handling of hazardous materials during construction activities would occur in accordance with federal, state, and local laws including the California Occupational Health and the Safety Administration.</p> <p>The 1998 MND did not address potential hazards related to natural occurring asbestos, (NOA). As discussed in Section 3.2, grading activities in certain areas of the County have the potential to release NOA in the air. Through the potential release of NOA could happen though normal construction activities (i.e., not just as a result of upset or accident conditions), the project does not include improvements that could result in the release of hazardous materials in the event of upset or accident conditions. Any grading required for project construction is subject to County AQMD's current Fugitive Dust Rules 223, 223-1 and 223-2, as well as Title 17, Section 93105, that minimize asbestos release from project construction. Therefore, the impacts as a result of any hazards or hazardous materials is considered less than significant.</p> | LTS |
| Fire Hazards | LTS | No mitigation is required. | The project would involve some vegetation clearing during | LTS |

| Subsequent MND Mitigation | | | 1998 MND Mitigation | |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|------------------|
| Impact | Level of Significance | Mitigation | Notes | After Mitigation |
| | | | construction phase of the project; but is not anticipated to result in significant fire hazards. The proposed project would have no impact regarding fire hazards. | |
| Emergency Access interference | LTS | No additional mitigation required. | Reviewed under 1998 MND. The project is required to comply with the State Standard Specifications for Construction of Local Streets and Roads (July 2002), Compliance would allow emergency access 24 hours a day, and at no time would there be significant reduction in response time. Upon completion of the project, the area roadways would have better levels of service, which would facilitate improved emergency access. | LTS |
| 3.7 Hydrology and Water Quality | | | | |
| 3.7 a: Violation of Waste discharge or water quality standards 3.7 c and d: Drainage and flooding 3.7e: Surface Water Quality | LTS | Measures from 1998 MND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All storm drainage improvements to comply with the County Drainage Manual (latest edition). This project is subject to the Statewide General Permit for Construction Discharges (Water Quality Order 99-08-DWQ) issued by the State Water Resources Control Board pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) under the Clean Water Act. The Permit requires construction activities disturbing more than 1 acre of land obtain this permit, and implement BMP's to reduce or eliminate construction discharges. The County would comply with conditions therein. Also, DOT is subject to NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water from Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. Improvements receiving drainage from areas less than 100 acres shall be designed to safely convey the storm runoff from an event with an average recurrence interval of 10 years without the headwater depth exceeding the culvert barrel height. Implement erosion and sediment control measures to include the spreading of straw mulch over all disturbed areas during the rainy season, grass lined drainage courses that are altered or relocated shall be replaced with sodded grass lined swales, and ungrouted rip-rap placed at inlets and outlets of all new culverts to prevent erosion. | Reviewed under 1998 MND. | LTS |
| 3.7b: Groundwater | LTS | No Impacts. No mitigation required. | This issue was discussed in the previous MND. | LTS |
| 3.7f: Other Water Quality Impacts | LTS | No mitigation required. | Less than Significant (Reviewed Under 1998 Document). Project implementation would not involve use of hazardous materials that could impact groundwater quality. Any hazardous materials would be used per existing laws and manufacturer's directions. | LTS |

| Subsequent MND Mitigation | | | 1998 MND Mitigation | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---|------------------|
| Impact | Level of Significance | Mitigation | Notes | After Mitigation |
| 3.7g through i: | LTS | No mitigation required | The project would result in no impact from water related hazards, including flooding. | LTS |
| 3.7 j: Tsunami or mudflow hazards | LTS | No Impact and no mitigation required | The site is not located near any ocean, coast or seiche hazard areas. | LTS |
| 3.8 Land Use | | | | |
| 3.8a Division of established community | LTS | No Impact and no mitigation required. | | LTS |
| 3.8b Conflict with General Plan Policies | LTS | No Impact and no mitigation required. | Reviewed under 1998 MND. | LTS |
| 3.8c: Conflict with HCP | LTS | No Impact and no mitigation required. | | LTS |
| 3.9 Mineral Resources | | | | |
| 3.9 a and b: Energy and Mineral Resources | LTS | No Impact and no mitigation required. | | LTS |
| 3.10 Noise | | | | |
| 3.10a and c: Operational Noise | LTS | No mitigation required. | Based upon the predicted future plus project traffic noise levels shown in Table 3, overall traffic noise levels at residential outdoor activity areas are predicted to decrease from the future no project scenario, due to changes in the realignment since 1998, and the use of open graded asphalt pavement or rubberized asphalt pavement. | LTS |
| 3.10b: Groundborne Vibration Noise Impacts | LTS | No mitigation required. | Potential groundborne vibration noise is typically associated with blasting during construction, which is unlikely. | LTS |
| 3.10d: Temporary Noise Impacts | LTS | No mitigation measures required. | Noise generated from construction equipment would result in periodic and temporary increases in ambient noise levels, and subject to limited construction hours. | LTS |
| 3.10e ad f: Airport Noise Impacts | LTS | No Impact. No mitigation required. | The project site is not located near an airport. | LTS |
| 3.11 Population and Housing | | | | |
| 3.11 a, b and c. Growth, Displacement | LTS | No Impact. No mitigation required. | This is a road project designed to improve traffic operation. | LTS |
| 3.12 Public Services | | | | |
| 3.12a and b: Fire and Emergency Medical Services and Police Protection Impacts | LTS | No mitigation required. | Conformance with the Standard Specifications for Construction of Local Streets and Roads is required, and would allow emergency access 24 hours a day. The 1998 MND reached a similar conclusion. | LTS |
| 3.12 c: Schools Impacts | LTS | No mitigation required. | The project does not include construction of residential units and would not create an additional need for schools. | LTS |
| 3.12d: Parks Impacts | LTS | No mitigation required. | Reviewed Under 1998 MND. The existing roadway to be abandoned is part of a land swap with the EDH CSD, resulting in a net increase in park acreage. More detail is found in Section 3.13 of this initial study. | LTS |
| 3.12e: Other Services | LTS | No Mitigation is required. | The proposed project would not result in new maintenance service. | LTS |
| 3.13 Recreation | | | | |
| 3.13a and b: Recreation Existing Facilities | LTS | No Mitigation is required. | This impact was addressed in the 1998 MND and the mitigation has since become part of the project description. The land swap is depicted in Figure 2-4. The project would increase the total park acreage. The realignment would run through the northern half of Wild Oak Park and result in a loss of inactive parkland to be replaced | LTS |

| Subsequent MND Mitigation | | | 1998 MND Mitigation | |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|------------------|
| Impact | Level of Significance | Mitigation | Notes | After Mitigation |
| | | | through a land swap with the EDH CSD that will be available for use as an active park. No park facilities or structures would be removed. | |
| 3.14 Transportation and Traffic | | | | |
| 3.14a: Traffic Congestion – construction related | LTS | No mitigation is required. | Construction is temporary and will not substantially impact levels of service. | LTS |
| Operation Impacts | LTS | No Mitigation required. | Reviewed Under 1998 MND. The project is designed to improve current traffic patterns and reduce congestion. | LTS |
| 3.14 b: Cumulative traffic impacts | LTS | No Mitigation required. | Reviewed under 1998 MND. The project is designed to improve circulation and reduce congestions. | LTS |
| 3.14 c: Air Traffic | LTS | No Mitigation required | Reviewed under 1998 MND. Not applicable. | LTS |
| 3.14 d & e: Safety | LTS | No Mitigation required | Reviewed under 1998 MND. The purpose of the project is to reduce congestion and improve safety. | LTS |
| 3.14 f: Parking | LTS | No Mitigation required | Reviewed under 1998 MND. No parking impacts would occur. | LTS |
| 3.14 g: Alternative Transportation | LTS | No Mitigation required | Reviewed under 1998 MND. The project includes the retention and expansion of bicycle lanes and provides a buss turnout. | LTS |
| 3.15 Utilities and Service Systems | | | | |
| 3.15 a through e: Existing Infrastructure conflicts | LTS | <p>From 1998 MND.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOT shall coordinate with emergency response program officials to develop alternate traffic routing during construction to reduce potential interference with emergency response or evacuation plans. • DOT will consult with PG&E, early in planning stages to avoid conflicts with existing facilities and allow combined construction efforts in areas where PG&E will be conducting system upgrades. Cost of repair or relocation to gas lines from construction will be assumed by County if utility has prior title to the property. • DOT will consult with Pacific Bell and AT&T early in the planning stages of the Project in order to avoid any conflicts with existing facilities. The cost of repair or relocation of telephone lines from construction activities will be assumed by County if the utility has prior title to the property. • DOT will consult with EID early in planning stages to avoid conflicts with existing facilities and to allow EID and DOT to combine construction efforts in areas where EID will be conducting system upgrades. The cost of repair or relocation of water lines from construction activities will be assumed by the County if the utility has prior title. | Reviewed under 1998 MND. | LTS |
| 3.15 f and g: Solid Waste Capacity and Compliance | LTS | No mitigation is required. | No impacts. Reviewed under 1998 MND. | LTS |