

EL DORADO COUNTY

PARKS AND TRAILS MASTER PLAN

INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

El Dorado County, California

January 2012

This page is intentionally left blank.

PROJECT INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE: El Dorado County Parks and Trails Master Plan

PROJECT LOCATION: El Dorado County

LEAD AGENCY: El Dorado County

CONTACT PERSON: Janet Postlewait, Principal Planner

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Parks and Trails Master Plan (Master Plan) provides direction and implementation strategies to guide the acquisition, development, and operation of County-owned parks and trails in the Plan Area. Goals and policies are set forth as guidance toward how the overall system of parks and trails will be developed and managed to best reflect the priorities and needs of the current and future population of El Dorado County. This Master Plan does not provide detailed planning or design for individual park or trail resources. That will occur on a site specific basis as projects come forward in the future.

DECLARATION

El Dorado County has determined that implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan project will not result in significant effects on the environment and therefore does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This determination is based on the attached Initial Study in support of the following findings:

- The project will not degrade environmental quality, substantially reduce habitat, cause a wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, reduce the number or restrict the range of special-status species, or eliminate important examples of California history or prehistory.
- The project does not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals.
- The project will not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- The project will not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
- No substantial evidence exists that the project will have a negative or adverse effect on the environment.
- The project incorporates all applicable mitigation measures identified in the attached Initial Study (IS).
- This Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.

This page is intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION	III
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Introduction and Regulatory Guidance	1
1.2. Lead Agency.....	1
1.3. Purpose and Document Organization	2
1.4. Thresholds of Significance	2
1.5. Terminology Used in this Document	2
1.6. Required Permit Approvals.....	3
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION	4
2.1. Location	4
2.2. Background and Project Purpose	4
2.3. Environmental Setting	4
3. INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST.....	12
3.1. Initial Study Checklist.....	12
3.2. Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.....	13
4. DETERMINATION.....	68
5. REPORT PREPARATION AND REFERENCES	69
5.1. Report Preparation	69
5.2. References	69

Appendix A — Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

This page is intentionally left blank.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction and Regulatory Guidance

This document is an Initial Study supporting a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) determination for the El Dorado County Parks and Trails Master Plan project (Master Plan). This MND evaluates the potential impacts resulting from implementation of the Master Plan at the Plan level. As future facilities are proposed for improvement, subsequent environmental analysis will be conducted and documentation will be prepared pursuant to CEQA as relevant for individually proposed projects based on site-specific characteristics and the nature of the project as proposed and defined by the project description. This MND has been prepared in accordance with CEQA, Public Resources Code § 21000 et seq., and State CEQA Guidelines, 14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) § 15000 et seq.

An Initial Study (IS) is prepared by a Lead Agency to determine if a project has the potential to result in significant impacts on the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15063). An EIR must be prepared if an IS indicates that the proposed project under review may result in significant impacts to the environment. A Negative Declaration may be prepared instead, if the Lead Agency prepares a written statement describing the reasons why a proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment, and therefore does not require the preparation of an EIR. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15070, a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when either:

- a) The Initial Study documents that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed project may result in any significant effect on the environment, or
- b) The Initial Study identifies potentially significant effects, but:
 - (1) Revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant before the proposed negative declaration is released for public review would avoid potentially significant impacts or mitigate potential impacts to less than significant levels, and
 - (2) There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency that the proposed project as revised, may result in significant impacts to the environment.

1.2. Lead Agency

The Lead Agency is the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a proposed project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15051 states that if a project will be carried out by a public agency that agency shall be the Lead Agency, even if the project would be located within the jurisdiction of another public agency. Since El Dorado County will oversee and implement the project, El Dorado County is the Lead Agency for the Proposed Master Plan Project for the purposes of CEQA.

1.3. Purpose and Document Organization

The purpose of this Initial Study is to document if implementation of the proposed Parks and Trails Master Plan project may result in potentially significant impacts on the environment.

This document is divided into the following sections:

1. **Mitigated Negative Declaration Information Sheet**
2. **Introduction and Regulatory Guidance** – provides an introduction and describes the purpose and organization of this document.
3. **Project Description** – provides a detailed description of the proposed project including the location of the project.
4. **Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures** – describes the environmental setting for each of the environmental subject areas, the regulatory setting, where relevant, and evaluates a range of impacts in response to the environmental checklist. Impacts are classified as “no impact”, “less than significant,” “potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated,” or “potentially significant.” Where appropriate, mitigation measures are provided that mitigate potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Determination – provides the environmental determination for the project.

Report Preparation and References – identifies a list of staff and consultants responsible for preparation of this document, persons and agencies consulted and references used.

Appendix A – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program – identifies mitigation measures included and the responsible entity for implementation of the mitigation measures, as required by Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines.

1.4. Thresholds of Significance

A significant effect on the environment is generally defined as a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in the physical environment {Guidelines sec. 15358}. Environment as used in this definition includes the land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects which are historical or aesthetic in nature. The guidelines in the following initial study focus on these elements and are used as tools to determine the potential of whether or not an activity is considered significant {Guidelines section 15065}. Effects are also recognized as to whether they would occur either directly or indirectly as a result of the project.

1.5. Terminology Used in this Document

The Environmental Checklist in this document utilizes the following terminology to describe the various levels of significance associated with project related impacts:

Potentially Significant Impact: An impact that may have a "substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15382); the existence of a potentially significant impact requires the preparation of an EIR with respect to such an impact.

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: An impact that could be mitigated to a level of less than significant with the addition of mitigation measures.

Less Than Significant Impact: An impact which is less than significant and does not require the implementation of mitigation measures.

No Impact: Utilized for checklist items where the project will not have any impact and does not require the implementation of mitigation measures.

1.6. Required Permit Approvals

Future projects that come forward consistent with direction and implementation strategies set forth in this Master Plan will be subject to appropriate CEQA and or NEPA documentation, and may require permits as set forth in Table 1.

Table 1 – POTENTIAL RESOURCE AGENCY PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS	
Approving Agency	Potential Required Permit/Approval
<i>Federal Agencies</i>	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Compliance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (16 USC 1536)
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Compliance with Nationwide Permit 14 (§ 404 of the Clean Water Act, 33 USC 1341)
<i>State Agencies</i>	
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	Project Approval/NEPA Compliance
State Water Resources Control Board, Regional Water Quality Control Board	Coverage under the General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit (Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, 40 CFR Part 122)
State Water Resources Control Board	Water Quality Certification (Section 401 of the Clean Water Act)
Department of Fish and Game	Streambed Alteration Agreement (§1602 of the Fish and Game Code)
<i>Local Agencies</i>	
El Dorado County	Project Approval/CEQA Compliance
El Dorado County Air Quality Management District	Fugitive Dust Plan

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1. Location

El Dorado County is located in east-central California and encompasses 1,805 square miles of rolling hills and mountainous terrain. The County's western boundary contains part of Folsom Lake, and the eastern boundary is also the California-Nevada State line. The County is topographically divided into two zones. The northeast corner of the County is in the Lake Tahoe basin, while the remainder of the County is in the "western slope," west of Echo Summit. US Highway 50 is the primary east/west connection through the County between Sacramento to the west and Lake Tahoe and the Sierra Nevada mountains to the east.

The scope of this Master Plan focuses on the "western slope" areas of the County that are outside the jurisdiction of other entities providing similar parks and trails resources. This Plan does not specifically address the eastern El Dorado County areas in the greater Tahoe Basin because a separate planning process has been established for that region. Planning for parks and trails in these areas is a multi-agency effort in which the County works with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC), the U.S. Forest Service, the City of South Lake Tahoe, and several special districts.

2.2. Background and Project Purpose

The 2004 El Dorado County General Plan called for development of a Parks Master Plan and an update of the Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan which was adopted in 1989 and amended in 1990. In 2008, the decision was made by the Board of Supervisors to combine these efforts as they related to County park and trail resources outside of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency area into a single, comprehensive planning document. The El Dorado County Parks and Trails Master Plan is the resultant document and provides direction for both parks and trails, while replacing the earlier Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan.

The purpose of the Parks and Trails Master Plan is to provide direction and implementation strategies to guide the acquisition, development, and operation of County-owned parks and trails in the Plan Area. This Master Plan does not provide detailed planning or design for individual park or trail resources. That will occur on a site specific basis as projects come forward in the future. Rather, the Plan provides recommendations as to how the overall system of parks and trails will be developed and managed to best reflect the priorities and needs of the current and future population of El Dorado County.

2.3. Environmental Setting

The focus of the County Parks and Trails Master Plan is on County owned facilities. However, County residents also benefit from a wide variety of park and trail facilities that are owned and operated by local, private, state and or federal providers. These other providers have undertaken their own comprehensive planning processes to evaluate current and projected park and trail needs for their respective users. For this reason, proposed County Parks and Trails Master Plan does not

replicate these efforts and pursues opportunities to collaborate with these entities on projects of mutual interest.

Examples of local providers are: the City of Placerville, the El Dorado Hills Community Services District, the Cameron Park Community Services District, the Georgetown Divide Recreation District, the Rolling Hills Community Services District and the Cosumnes River Community Services District. These facilities are intended primarily to serve the residents of these communities, but are generally open to all members of the public.

The following table lists a summary of parks and trails owned and managed by local recreation providers. Many include internal trails/paths not called out separately.

Park or Facility Name	Approximate Acres
City of Placerville	
Lions Park	24
Aquatics Center	1
Orchard Hill Park	4
Rotary Park	4
Lumsden Park	4
Benham Park	2
Gold Bug Park	62
El Dorado Trail (portion)	2 miles
El Dorado Hills CSD	
New York Creek Nature Trail	1 ½ miles
Brooks Gym	NA
Waterford Park	1
Ridgeview Park	4
Village Green Park	10
Community Park	40
Bertelsen Park	11
Overlook Park	2
McCabe Field	3
Wild Oaks Park	8
Kalitheia Park	4
Alan Lindsay Park	5
Bass Lake (Sellwood) Field	3
Promontory Park	19
Oak Knoll Park	3
Windsor Point	1
Creekside Greens	2
Fairchild Park	1
Weisberg Park	4
St. Andrews Park	5
Stephen Harris Park	6
Parkview Heights Park	1
Highland View	4
Reid White Memorial Park	2
Ridgeview Unit 7 Park	1
Cameron Park CSD	
Royal Oaks Park	10
Bass Lake (Sellwood) Field	3
Hacienda Park	5
David West Park	2
Northview Park	6

Park or Facility Name	Approximate Acres
Gateway Park	8
Christa McAuliffe Park	6
Eastwood Park	3
Rasmussen Park	10
Cameron Park Lake	51
Georgetown Divide Recreation District	
Trails (Georgetown Airport Area)	8 miles
Buffalo Hill Pedestrian Path	1
Bayley House Historic Park	11
Garden Valley Park	5
Beam Field	3
Georgetown Park	1
Greenwood Park/Schoolhouse	2
Regional Park (undeveloped)	141
Cosumnes River CSD	
Community Park	1
Rolling Hills CSD	
Stonebriar Park	10
Berkshire Park (undeveloped)	3
Holiday Lake CSD	
Holiday Lake/Trail	30
Cameron Estates CSD	
Various unpaved trails	

A broad variety of privately owned and operated recreational facilities and programs are available to citizens and visitors. Outdoor recreation such as camping, hiking, rafting, and horseback riding is a major component of western El Dorado County recreation. El Dorado County also has five 18-hole private golf courses and one 9-hole golf course. The 18-hole Apple Mountain Golf Resort is the only course that is open to the public.

Examples of state recreational lands in El Dorado County include a portion of Folsom Lake State Recreation Area, Auburn State Recreation Area, which covers 40 river miles in both Placer and El Dorado Counties, and Marshall Gold Discovery State Historic Park in Coloma.

Many federal recreational facilities located in The Eldorado National Forest are managed by the U. S. Forest Service and offer opportunities such as campgrounds, fishing, swimming, hiking trails, including the Pacific Crest Trail, biking, equestrian trails, and day use areas. Popular summertime destinations within the National Forest include Union Valley and Ice House Reservoirs, Loon Lake, Silver Lake, Caples Lake, Wrights Lake, Horsetail Falls, and the Desolation Wilderness.

Also located in the Eldorado National Forest is Crystal Basin Recreation Area, operated by the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD) that encompasses 85,000 acres of pine and fir forests along the western slope. Containing three reservoirs and numerous lakes and streams, the Crystal Basin's four seasons and varied terrain offer a range of outdoor recreational opportunities, including camping, fishing, boating, horseback riding, hiking, snow skiing, and biking.

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) also provides numerous recreation facilities in El Dorado County including Cronan Ranch Regional Trails Park, a 1,400-acre open space along the South Fork of the American River. Trails are open to mountain bicycles, hikers, and equestrians. The Dave Moore Nature Area is a BLM facility located two miles west of Coloma. It includes an accessible mile-

long loop trail from the parking area to the river, passing through several habitats. Popular uses include hiking, biking, nature study, and bird watching. Equestrian use on the trail is not allowed.

The Pine Hill Preserve encompasses 4,042 acres in 5 non-contiguous units ranging in size from 222 acres to 2,999 acres. The preserve was established to protect habitat for eight rare plant species. BLM staff provides guided spring wild flower tours. Hiking, mountain biking, and equestrian uses are allowed on existing trails. New trails may be developed in the future as long as alignments and usage do not adversely impact the preserve.

BLM also holds custodial ownership of the 695-acre Kanaka Valley, a wildlife corridor that links federal and state public lands along the South Fork American River and the Pine Hill Preserve. BLM is currently preparing a management plan to identify specific recreation goals and uses. Public non-vehicular access is allowed to but trail design and development is not expected to begin until 2013.

Trails on other BLM holdings on the South Fork of the American River include Red Shack Trail, connecting State Route 49 to the river below Chili Bar, and a trail within the 233-acre Wildman Hill that descends steeply to the river from the trailhead on Highway 193.

The National Park Service has designated two National Historic Trail (NHT) alignments that pass through El Dorado County, the California National Historic Trail and the Pony Express National Historic Trail. The California Historic Trail is a route of approximately 5,700 miles including multiple routes and cutoffs, extending from Independence and Saint Joseph, Missouri, and Council Bluffs, Iowa, to various points in California and Oregon. The Pony Express NHT commemorates the route used to relay mail via horseback from Missouri to California before the advent of the telegraph.

In western El Dorado County both trails generally follow routes adjacent to the U.S. 50 corridor to Mother Lode Drive and Pleasant Valley Road to Diamond Springs. The Pony Express NHT then veers north to Placerville and follows U.S. 50 to the Echo Lake area, where it splits into several spurs heading north towards Stateline and south to Highway 88. At Diamond Springs, the California NHT continues east generally following Pleasant Valley Road, Starkes Grade Road, and Sly Park Road to the Gold Ridge area, then veers southeast along Forest Service roads to Girard Mill Road, and follows Mormon Emigrant Trail to Highway 88. At Highway 88 it heads east for about 2 miles, then south to the Carson Emigrant National Recreation Trail south of Silver Lake to the county border.

These trails are not expressly maintained by the National Park Service for recreational use. Where they pass through federal lands, as in the El Dorado National Forest, the federal land manager oversees recreational uses. These portions of both the Pony Express NHT and the California NHT are open for various types of public trail use. Remaining segments that traverse private property or occupy the same alignment as improved vehicular roads are typically not available for public use, unless public road improvements have included trail improvements in the corridor.

Many schools in the Plan Area make recreation facilities available for the use of County residents either on an informal basis or through formal joint use agreements with the local park districts or the City of Placerville. El Dorado County has periodically provided funding for recreation facility improvements at schools, but does not maintain on-going joint use agreements that provide for public access at school sites that are outside of the areas served by the local park providers

Existing County Parks

Currently, there are 73 acres of developed community parks in the Plan Area, and an additional 26 acres of undeveloped community park land located in Pollock Pines. The 2004 El Dorado County General Plan provides guidelines that equate to the need of 107 acres of developed community park land to serve the current population. Therefore, 26 undeveloped acres will need to be improved

and an additional 8 acres acquired and improved. Depending on how some of the 26 acres in Pollock Pines are improved, a portion of the land could function as and be credited as a neighborhood park. There are 57 acres of developed regional parks in the Plan Area, and an additional 115 acres of undeveloped regional park land. While this equates to a net surplus of 65 acres of regional park land, 50 of the undeveloped acres will need to be improved in order to meet the General Plan guideline of 107 acres of developed regional park land to serve the current population.

As described in the Draft Master Plan document, El Dorado County is currently responsible for managing and maintaining 6 existing public recreation facilities and owns land targeted for three additional parks. A list of these County facilities and the improvements at each park is provided below. Several of the existing parks have internal pathways or trail networks, and similar features are planned at the proposed parks. There is one County owned and managed trail that is independent of a park site. The 6 existing public recreation facilities are:

Henningsen Lotus Park, is a 51 acre community park facility located on the site of an old gravel mining operation in the Coloma-Lotus area. Amenities include a pavilion, Little League ball fields, softball fields, a regulation soccer field, a junior soccer field, picnic areas, and restrooms. The park is adjacent to the South Fork of the American River, and supports rafting and kayaking, a boat launch and beach on the downstream end of the park. Paved paths are provided throughout the park. Soccer, and ball fields are lighted, and the park is heavily used during the summer season.

Pioneer Park is a 21-acre community park located in southern El Dorado County. The park has a full size Equestrian Arena that is host to a number of livestock events, horseshows, and other equestrian activities. The facility also offers a community center, a disc golf course, a soccer field, regulation size baseball field, play structures, picnic tables, and two parking lots.

Bradford Park is a 5-acre neighborhood park that was originally built by the Lions Club and handed over to the County to own and operate. The park contains a large children's play area, a small sports field, a large covered picnic area, and an off-street parking lot.

Joe's Skate Park, located at El Dorado County Fairgrounds, is a 1-acre, fenced, and unsupervised skate-park that is open during the day and shares parking with the adjacent Fairgrounds.

Chili Bar is a 16 acre site, owned by El Dorado County, used for rafting/kayaking put-in spot downstream of the Highway 193 Bridge over the South Fork of the American River. The lower area is operated for rafting activities by the American River Conservancy, under terms of a conservation easement. The upper level includes parking, various structures, and a defunct mobile home park. A convenience store is open at irregular intervals. Off-street parking and minimal day use facilities are also available. The park currently operates only during the rafting season.

The **El Dorado County Fairgrounds** is a 48 acre facility located in the western part of the City of Placerville, operated by the County Fair Association under contract with El Dorado County. Attracting 65,000 visitors over its four day run each June, the fair also hosts a variety of events including horse and dog shows, bingo, holiday events, and a monthly flea market, and may be rented for private events. The Fairgrounds is also the home to a local community theater

Planned County Parks

Bass Lake Park comprises 40 acres of undeveloped county park land located between Cameron Park and El Dorado Hills. A master plan was developed in 2001 to 2003 that includes potential amenities such as a community center, group picnic areas, and basketball courts, a baseball field, toddler play area, playground, soccer field, dog park, disc golf, outdoor classroom, nature interpretive area, and parking. However, the environmental review process was not completed and the project has been

on hold since 2003. The master plan will need to be revisited before improvements for this site are implemented to reflect changes in community needs and recreation trends.

Pollock Pines Community Park: El Dorado County has completed a master plan for the Pollock Pines Community Park, with proposed amenities to include a baseball field, soccer field, basketball court, volleyball court, horseshoe pits, playground, restrooms, nature pavilion, trails, off-street parking, and an outdoor classroom amphitheater. The park site covers 26 acres of steep, forested land at the end of Red Hook Trail, north of U.S. 50 in the Pollock Pines community. However, construction has been delayed due to budget constraints. Project implementation may require revisiting the master plan to reduce costs and phase construction.

Cronan Ranch Regional Trails Park: The County owns a 62-acre portion of the existing Cronan Ranch Regional Trails Park located in Pilot Hill. Cronan Ranch Regional Trails Park is a 1,600-acre natural area that was acquired through the cooperative efforts of the American River Conservancy, the Bureau of Land Management, and others. It is held in public trust to be used exclusively for recreation and wildlife conservation. The county has not yet developed conceptual plans for the county owned portion, but uses will be similarly constrained by the terms of the easement.

A **Railroad Park** is proposed on a 6.3 acre site located within the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor (SPTC) right-of-way in the township of El Dorado. Proposed improvements include facilities to house El Dorado County Museum’s railroad artifacts, a section of operational track, and multiple use pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian trails. The County is actively seeking grant funding to complete this proposed project, along with 2.2 miles of multi-use trail extending to Missouri Flat Road.

Existing County Trails

Residents and visitors to western El Dorado County have access to a number of public walking, biking, and equestrian trails close to populated areas. Marshall Gold Discovery State Historic Park, Cronan Ranch, Auburn State Recreation Area, Sly Park, and the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area provide many miles of multiple use trails. Some of the most popular trails are listed in the following table, and additional trail information is available on the various park web sites.

Partial List of Western El Dorado County Public Trails

Trail	Location	Approx. Length in Miles	Type			
			Pedestrian, Equestrian, Bicycle			
			Surface	P	E	B
Auburn to Cool Trail (portion)	Auburn SRA	3.2	Unpaved	■	■	■
Olmsted Loop	Auburn SRA	9	Unpaved	■	■	■
Pointed Rocks Trail	Auburn SRA	1.5	Unpaved	■	■	■
Western States Trail (portion)	Auburn SRA	19.1	Unpaved	■	■	■
Monroe Ridge Trail	Marshall Gold Discovery SHP	2.3	Unpaved	■		■
Monument Trail	Marshall Gold Discovery SHP	0.8	Unpaved	■		■
Discovery Trail	Marshall Gold Discovery SHP	0.7	Unpaved	■		■
Brown's Ravine to Old Salmon Falls	Folsom Lake SRA	8.7	Unpaved	■	■	■
County Boundary to Brown's	Folsom Lake SRA	2.3	Unpaved	■	■	■

Trail	Location	Approx. Length in Miles	Type			
			Surface	P	E	B
Ravine						
Darrington Trail	Folsom Lake SRA	8.5	Unpaved	■	■	■
Sweetwater Creek to Salmon Falls	Folsom Lake SRA	2.2	Unpaved	■	■	■
Cronan Ranch (various)	Pilot Hill	12	Unpaved	■	■	■
S. Fork American River Trail	Magnolia Ranch to Salmon Falls Bridge	25	Unpaved	■	■	■
El Dorado Trail	Camino Heights to Los Trampas Dr.	1.7	Unpaved	■	■	■
El Dorado Trail	Los Trampas Dr. to Placerville	5.1	Paved	■		■
El Dorado Trail	Forni Rd./Ray Lawyer Dr. to Missouri Flat Rd.	2.7	Paved, unpaved shoulder	■	■	■
El Dorado Trail	Missouri Flat Rd. to Oriental Sr.	1.7	Unpaved	■	■	■
Sly Park Recreation Area	Pollock Pines/Jenkinson Lake	9	Unpaved & Paved	■	■	■

¹ P: Pedestrian, E: Equestrian, B: Bicycle

The El Dorado Trail is envisioned as ultimately traversing the length of El Dorado County from its western border to the Tahoe Basin. Several sections have been developed to date through multiple projects undertaken by the County and the City of Placerville as described in detail in the Draft Master Plan. As funding becomes available, the remaining sections will be designed and completed.

Currently, the westernmost point of the Trail point begins as a gravel trail in Camino, south of U.S. 50, and heads west 1.7 miles to the intersection with Los Trampas Drive. It then becomes a paved Class I, multi use trail for 4.7 miles, crosses over U.S. 50 to the trailhead on Jaquier Road, jogs south along Jaquier for one block then turns west to the transit station on Mosquito Road, turns south again under U.S. 50, and terminates at Clay Street near Main Street. The *City of Placerville Non-motorized Transportation Plan* shows the El Dorado Trail being extended to Bedford Street as a Class I facility which will transition to an on-street Class III bike route and Class II bike lane through Placerville along Main Street. The Class I facility would resume at the Forni Road and Main Street intersection, and proceed west 1 mile to connect with the existing Class I segment that extends from Forni Road near Ray Lawyer Drive to Missouri Flat Road (2.7 miles). The Trail then becomes an unimproved trail along the railroad track at Missouri Flat Road, south of Wal-Mart and runs west approximately 1.75 miles to near Oriental Street in the town of El Dorado.

Future westerly expansion will take it to the Sacramento-El Dorado County border within the County-owned Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor (SPTC). It remains to be determined whether the trail will be located along the side of the existing tracks within the SPTC right-of-way, or if the tracks will be removed and the trail placed on the original rail bed. The trail is also planned to continue to the Tahoe Basin but the specific alignment has yet to be determined. A study identifying possible alignments for the segment from the existing terminus in Camino Heights to Pacific House was completed for the County in 2009. The remaining segment from Pacific House to Tahoe would follow the historic Pony Express Trail and the Sayles Canyon Trail to Echo Summit and a connection to South Lake Tahoe.

The Rubicon Trail is a world-famous off-highway vehicle (OHV) route connecting the town of Georgetown to Homewood on the west side of Lake Tahoe. In places the Rubicon Trail is a well-defined dirt road while other segments are characterized by challenging rock domes, ledges, and rock debris. The trail is used by thousands of OHV enthusiasts driving various 4-wheel drive and Jeep-type vehicles as well as hikers. The Rubicon Trail runs easterly to the Little Sluice Box-Spider Lake area and the Buck Island Reservoir area, and then turns northerly roughly following the Rubicon River to the El Dorado/Placer County line.

The Rubicon Trail is primarily located on Eldorado National Forest land within an old El Dorado County road easement. A survey was completed in 2009 and the trail location established in 2010. The County is developing an Operations and Maintenance Plan that includes monitoring and management practices to address sedimentation and other water quality issues.

Future County Trails

The 1990 Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan for El Dorado County identified many potential trail corridors to be considered for future implementation. These corridors were envisioned to provide a comprehensive network of trails traveling east-west and north-south through the County, with connections to existing or proposed federal and state trails. They are very conceptual and actual routes have not been determined or evaluated for feasibility. Many of the corridors follow existing paved road alignments where adjacent terrain and property ownership present significant challenges for creating trails. These potential future corridors are addressed in more detail in the Needs Analysis in Chapter 10 of the Master Plan.

3. INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

3.1. Initial Study Checklist

This section of the Initial Study incorporates the Environmental Checklist contained in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, except that forestry resources are not discussed because they are not present in the project area and greenhouse gases are discussed under air quality. Each resource section provides a brief description of the setting, a determination of impact potential, and a discussion of the impacts. Mitigation measures are identified where appropriate for adoption by the County and incorporation into the proposed project to reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. The following 16 environmental categories are addressed in this section:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

Each of the environmental categories was fully evaluated, and one of the following four determinations was made for each checklist question:

- **“No Impact”** means that no impact to the resource would occur as a result of implementing the project.
- **“Less Than Significant Impact”** means that implementation of the project would not result in a substantial and/or adverse change to the resource, and no mitigation measures are required.
- **“Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated”** means that the incorporation of one or more mitigation measures is necessary to reduce the impact from potentially significant to less than significant.
- **“Potentially Significant Impact”** means that there is either substantial evidence that a project-related effect may be significant, or, due to a lack of existing information, could have the potential to be significant.

3.2. Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact: The development of future recreational facilities would provide attractive open space to improve the scenic vistas. Therefore implementation of the Master Plan would not substantially affect any scenic vistas. No impact would result from implementation of the Master Plan.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Less Than Significant Impact: The only designated state scenic highway is U.S. 50, from just west of Placerville to Tahoe. Development of any parks and/or trails within the viewshed of that designated portion of U.S. 50 would be subject to CEQA review that shall take into account any potential adverse impacts. Implementation of the Master Plan would therefore result in a less than significant impact within a state scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Less Than Significant Impact: The Parks and Trails Master Plan sets forth goals, policies and standards to provide guidance to be implemented during the planning, design, and approval phases required for each project that may be proposed in the future. The Master Plan document itself does not approve projects on a site specific basis. Proposed park sites may be located within various types of undeveloped land or open space. Park or trail facilities would be designed to generally include areas of natural open space, greenways, and structures set within landscaped areas designed for aesthetic enjoyment as well as recreational utility that will be maintained year round. While the visual attributes of these facilities may differ from the visual attributes of whatever the existing landscape may be, the preservation of open vistas, natural areas, and improved ornamental landscaping will provide comparable visual quality and character. Additionally, the Parks and Trails Master Plan sets forth goals, policies and standards to provide guidance to be implemented during the planning, design, and approval phases required for each project proposed in the future.

Therefore, any aesthetic impacts with regard to visual character would remain less than significant with the approval of the Parks and Trails Master Plan.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views?

Less Than Significant Impact: The Parks and Trails Master Plan sets forth goals, policies and standards to provide guidance to be implemented during the planning, design, and approval phases required for each project that may be proposed in the future. The Master Plan document itself does not approve projects on a site specific basis. Section 10.3, Design Guidelines, Facilities, specifically addresses avoidance of potential adverse lighting or glare: *1. Where night lighting is included in parks for safety and anticipated recreational uses, glare impacts on nearby residential areas shall be mitigated through appropriate equipment choices and placement.* Therefore, Aesthetic impacts with regard to light and glare would remain less than significant with the approval of the Parks and Trails Master Plan.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES — 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

a, b, c) **No Impact:** Approval of the Parks and Trails Master Plan is not anticipated to result in conversion of agricultural lands or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
III. AIR QUALITY/GREENHOUSE GAS — 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

III. AIR QUALITY/GREENHOUSE GAS — 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:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

El Dorado County is in the Mountain Counties Air Basin, and air quality is regulated by the El Dorado County AQMD. The AQMD regulates air quality through the federal and state Clean Air Acts, district rules, and its permit authority. National and state ambient air quality standards have been adopted by the Environmental Protection Agency and State of California, respectively, for each criteria pollutant: ozone, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and sulfur dioxide. El Dorado County AQMD's (2002) Guide to Air Quality Assessment identifies specific daily emissions thresholds based on the national and state standards that can be used to determine the significance of project emissions. Thresholds of significance for specific pollutants of concern are:

- Reactive Organic Gasses (ROG): 82 lbs/day
- Nitrogen Oxides (NOx): 82 lbs/day
- Carbon Monoxide (CO): 9 parts per million (ppm) – 8-hour average; 20 ppm – 1-hour average
- Respirable Particulate Matter (PM₁₀): 30 µg/m³ – annual geometric mean; 50 µg/m³ – 24-hour average

Based on the ambient air quality, the Environmental Protection Agency and State also designate regions as “attainment” (within standards) or “nonattainment” (exceeds standards). The County is in nonattainment status for both federal and state ozone standards and for the state PM₁₀ standard and is in attainment or unclassified status for other pollutants (California Air Resources Board 2009). The closest air quality monitoring station to the APE is in Folsom (Natoma Street), which is in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin. Data collected at this station for the period of 2007 to 2009 indicate multiple exceedances of the state and national air quality standards for ozone each year, which were reported primarily in the summer months (California Air Resources Board 2011). No exceedances of nitrogen dioxide were reported, and no data for CO or PM₁₀ were available.

Sources of pollutants in the County are vehicle emissions, residential wood-burning stoves, and construction activities that periodically take place in developed areas

Naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) is also a concern in El Dorado County because it is known to be present in certain soils and can pose a health risk if released into the air. The AQMD has adopted an El Dorado County Naturally Occurring Asbestos Review Area Map that identifies those areas more likely to contain NOA (El Dorado County 2005). Ground disturbance activities within areas with a high or known likelihood of containing NOA are subject to additional County regulatory requirements to minimize human exposure potential.

Discussion of Impacts

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the Master Plan would result in the eventual development of Park and Recreation facilities throughout the County West Slope, although no site specific projects are approved with adoption of the Master Plan. Future construction activities would result in short-term increases in emissions from the use of heavy equipment that generates dust, exhaust, and tire-wear emissions; soil disturbance; materials used in construction; and construction traffic. Project construction would create short-term increases in fugitive dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) and would generate both reactive organic compounds (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) emissions from vehicle and equipment operation. All future projects are required to be consistent with applicable air quality plans in the area and is not anticipated to affect air quality planning.

Additionally, all future projects are required to comply with applicable AQMD rules, including Rule 223 Fugitive Dust – General Requirements and Rule 223-1 Fugitive Dust – Construction Requirements. These rules regulate fugitive dust generated by construction activities. In compliance with Rule 223-1, a fugitive dust plan will be prepared and submitted to the County AQMD for approval prior to construction. In addition, any future projects with potential for NOA in the soils underlying the respective area of potential affect (APE) are required to comply with the California Air Resources Board Airborne Toxic Control Measure at Title 17 Section 93105 addressing Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining activities and with the Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Surfacing Applications (Code of Regulations, Title 17, Section 93106).

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)?

Less Than Significant Impact: As discussed under items a) and b) above, future project construction would likely cause short-term air quality impacts as a result of construction activities; however, it would not result in long-term or cumulatively considerable increases in air quality pollutant emissions for which El Dorado County is currently in nonattainment (ozone precursors and PM₁₀). The temporary increase in air pollutant emissions associated with construction activities would result in less-than-significant contributions to cumulative pollutant levels in the region.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact: “Sensitive receptors” for air pollutants are considered to be residences, schools, parks, hospitals, or other land uses where children or the elderly congregate, or other outdoor activities. Residents and recreationists near potential future project construction sites could be exposed to temporary air pollutants from construction activities, such as fugitive dust,

ROG, NOx, and carbon monoxide. Construction activities would be temporary, and compliance with AQMD Rules would also ensure fugitive dust from construction activities remains within the project area or within 50 feet of disturbed areas. This impact would be less than significant.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact: Construction of future projects that may come forward may involve the use of gasoline or diesel-powered equipment that emits exhaust fumes; construction would also involve asphalt paving, which has a distinctive odor during application. These activities would take place intermittently throughout the construction workday, and the associated odors are expected to dissipate within the immediate vicinity of the work area. Persons near the construction work area may find these odors objectionable. However, the limited number of receptors, infrequency of the emissions, rapid dissipation of the exhaust into the air, and short-term nature of the construction activities would result in less-than-significant odor impacts.

f) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact: Assembly Bill 32, adopted in 2006, established the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 which requires the State to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Senate Bill 97, adopted in 2007, required the Governor's Office of Planning and Research to develop CEQA guidelines "for the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions or the effects of greenhouse gas emissions," and the Resources Agency certified and adopted the amendments to the guidelines on December 30, 2009.

GHGs are recognized by wide consensus among the scientific community to contribute to global warming/climate change and associated environmental impacts. The major GHGs that are released from human activity include carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide (Governor's Office of Planning and Research 2008). The primary sources of GHGs are vehicles (including planes and trains), energy plants, and industrial and agricultural activities (such as dairies and hog farms).

GHG emissions from potential future project may be produced from the materials used in the construction of park facilities well as construction-related equipment emissions, but these emissions would be short-term and minor. While the project would have an incremental contribution within the context of the county and region, the individual impact is considered less than significant.

g) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

No Impact: Future potential projects would not generate significant emissions of greenhouse gases and, therefore, would not conflict with any applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The 2004 General Plan EIR Biological Element describes the west slope of El Dorado County as possessing a large diversity of native flora and fauna that can be attributed to a combination of unique physical characteristics that have resulted in a wide diversity of habitats. These unique physical features include varied elevations and terrain, diverse substrate material, large tracts of contiguous natural habitat, and a broad range of climatic conditions. Coniferous forest is dominant at higher elevations in the eastern half; oak and hardwood habitats are found mostly in the central region. Annual grassland, chaparral, agriculture, and urban development are found primarily in the western third of the county.

Coniferous forest habitats are the dominant vegetation type above 2,500 feet elevation and cover more than half of the 1,145,400 acres in the county. The eight major coniferous forest habitats in El Dorado County are Douglas-fir, Jeffrey pine, lodgepole pine, ponderosa pine, red fir, Sierran mixed conifer, subalpine conifer, and white fir.

Shrub-dominated habitats are found at scattered locations throughout the County and include sagebrush, alpine dwarf-shrub, montane chaparral, chamise chaparral, and mixed chaparral. Annual grassland is fairly common at low elevations (below 2,500 feet) and comprises mostly non-native annuals, primarily of Mediterranean origin, but can also include a variety of native herbaceous species.

Important wildlife habitat is found throughout the county. Coniferous forest and other high-elevation habitats provide important habitat for many wildlife species, both resident and migratory. Common resident birds found at higher elevations in the county include Clark's nutcracker, mountain chickadee, red-breasted nuthatch, brown creeper, and Williamson's sapsucker. Common migratory birds found in coniferous forest habitats at high elevations include white-crowned sparrow, Hammond's flycatcher, and Lincoln's sparrow.

Hardwood habitats at mid-elevations are important for a large percentage of the wildlife species found in El Dorado County. Reptiles and amphibians found in oak woodlands include California slender salamander, western fence lizard, and California kingsnake. Common birds in oak woodland include acorn woodpecker, western scrub-jay, and oak titmouse. Mammals that characterize oak woodland habitat include mule deer, western gray squirrel, gray fox, and bobcat.

Chaparral also provides habitat for many wildlife species, including some that are considered rare elsewhere. Reptiles found in chaparral include western rattlesnake, western fence lizard, and western whiptail. Common birds in chaparral at low elevations include wrentit, Bewick's wren, California towhee, and California quail. At higher elevations chaparral can provide habitat for mountain quail, fox sparrow, and green-tailed towhee. Mammals commonly associated with chaparral include and gray fox and mule deer.

The El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan adopted in May 2008, recognizes the close affiliation between oak woodland preservation with planning and design of parks and trails. Appendix A, Oak Woodland Management Plan Background and Support Information provides the following discussion:

A major incentive for people to move into the Sierra Nevada foothills is the open space. As the population has grown, so has the desire to maintain areas of open space for recreational purposes or aesthetic values. El Dorado County supports an expanding network of trails for hikers, bicyclists, and equestrians. These lands designated for recreation (e.g., Cronan Ranch Regional Trails Park) help to maintain large expanses of oak woodland. The benefits of supporting oak woodland habitat and providing wildlife habitat are enhanced when recreational areas connect with other open space, such as under agricultural and natural resources land use designations.

A partial list of areas in the OWMP study area that provide recreational and/or open space values are described below. This list is not exhaustive, but helps to identify potential opportunities to maintain large expanses of oak woodland and to provide connectivity among the woodlands.

The **Cronan Ranch Regional Trails Park**, east of Coloma, is managed by the Bureau of Land Management. Plans exist to connect this area with the South Fork American River corridor trail that will run from Greenwood Creek to Salmon Falls. This park contains oak woodlands.

The **Folsom Lake State Recreation Area** provides trails, camping, and open space around Folsom Lake.

The **Auburn State Recreation Area** provides trails through oak woodland habitats near the confluence of the north and middle forks of the American River and in Cool. Corridors are maintained along the north and middle forks of the American River.

Marshall Gold Discovery State Historic Park in Coloma has the Monroe Ridge and Monument trails and other open space in oak woodland habitats near the South Fork of the American River.

The Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor (SPTC), as discussed in Section 11, includes 28 miles of the corridor within El Dorado County, much of which passes through oak woodland.

The **El Dorado Trail** is jointly owned by the City of Placerville and El Dorado County. It winds through oak woodland habitats from Placerville to Camino. The El Dorado Trail eventually will connect the SPTC and the National Pony Express Trail Route. Potential may exist to expand the sections through oak woodlands to enhance oak woodland conservation and to meet the need for trails.

Lands along Weber Creek that are part of the El Dorado Irrigation District's (District) Texas Hill properties contain large expanses of oaks. Potential partnering between the District and the County could meet water storage needs and oak conservation goals.

The **Dave Moore Nature Area** provides a small recreation area with oak woodland habitat along the South Fork of the American River.

The **Red Shack Trail** passes through a 131-acre property supporting oak woodland habitat to reach the South Fork of the American River.

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) manages over 3,100 acres in **the Pine Hill Preserve** network that serves to protect rare plants that occur on gabbroic soils. The Pine Hill Preserve consists of five separate units in northern gabbroic mixed chaparral and oak woodland.

The **Upper Cosumnes River Project Area encompasses** 1,200 acres in conservation easements and 280 acres in fee to protect riparian habitat throughout the Upper Cosumnes River Basin (American River Conservancy, 2006). This project protects oak woodlands in open space and provides connectivity with adjacent public lands.

Discussion of Impacts

- 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?***

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: A total of 29 special-status plant species have been documented in the county. Of these, six are state or federally listed as Threatened, Endangered, or Rare: Stebbins' morning-glory, Pine Hill ceanothus, Pine Hill flannelbush, El Dorado bedstraw, Layne's butterweed, and Tahoe yellow cress. The remaining 24 special-status plants are on California Native Plant Society Lists. Several special-status plants are restricted to the Pine Hill soil formation in western El Dorado County. These plants are of particular concern to state and federal agencies responsible for protection of natural resources because of the rarity of the plants and their limited range, and because of the high development pressure in the region.

Pine Hill Rare Plants

The Pine Hill formation, (elevation 453 to 2,060 feet), is located between Cameron Park and Salmon Falls that supports seven special-status plant species: Stebbins' morning-glory, Pine Hill ceanothus, Pine Hill flannelbush, El Dorado bedstraw, Layne's butterweed, El Dorado mule-ears, and Red Hills soaproot. With the exception of Red Hills soaproot, these plants are restricted chiefly to gabbro-derived soils and are collectively called gabbro soil plants.

Special-Status Wildlife

Fifty-one special-status wildlife species are known to occur in El Dorado County. Ten of these are state or federally listed as Threatened or Endangered: vernal pool fairy shrimp, valley elderberry longhorn beetle, Lahontan cutthroat trout, California red legged frog, willow flycatcher, American peregrine falcon, bald eagle, bank swallow, California wolverine, and Sierra Nevada red fox. The remaining 41 species are considered as California Species of Special Concern by CDFG and/or federal Species of Concern by USFWS.

Sensitive Habitats

Sensitive habitats located in El Dorado County include montane and valley-foothill riparian habitat, aspen, valley oak woodland, wet meadow, and vernal pools.

Regulatory Setting

The following subsections briefly describe the regulatory background governing special-status species identified as potentially occurring in El Dorado County. Special-status species are defined as species that are afforded a protective status under federal, state, and/or local environmental laws and policies that are relevant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental review process.

Federal Endangered Species Act

The Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) was passed in 1973 to protect species endangered or threatened with extinction. FESA is intended to operate in conjunction with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to help protect the ecosystems upon which endangered and threatened species depend. FESA prohibits the "take" of endangered or threatened wildlife species. "Take" is defined to include harassing, harming, pursuing, hunting, shooting, wounding, killing, trapping, capturing, or collecting wildlife species or any attempt to engage in such conduct (FESA Section 3 [(3)(19)]). Harm is further defined to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in death or injury to listed species by significantly impairing behavioral patterns (50 CFR §17.3). Harassment is defined as actions that create the likelihood of injury to listed species to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns (50 CFR §17.3).

FESA and Clean Water Act (CWA) §404 guidelines prohibit the issuance of wetland permits for projects that jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat of such species. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) must consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) when threatened or endangered species may be affected by a proposed project. In the context of the proposed project, FESA would be initiated if development resulted in take of a threatened or endangered species or if issuance of a §404 permit or other federal agency action could result in take of an endangered species or adversely modify critical habitat of such a species.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

Raptors (birds of prey), migratory birds, and other avian species are protected by a number of state and federal laws. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) prohibits the killing, possessing, or trading

of migratory birds except in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Interior. Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code states that it is “unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds in the order Falconiformes or Strigiformes or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto.”

California Endangered Species Act

The California Endangered Species Act (CESA), enacted in 1984. CESA is similar to FESA but pertains to state-listed endangered and threatened species. CESA requires state agencies to consult with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) when preparing CEQA documents to ensure that lead agency actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or result in the destruction, or adverse modification of critical habitat essential to the continued existence of those species, if there are reasonable and prudent alternatives available (CDFG Code §2080). CESA directs agencies to consult with CDFG on projects or actions that could affect listed species, directs CDFG to determine whether jeopardy would occur and allows CDFG to identify “reasonable and prudent alternatives” consistent with conserving the species. CESA allows CDFG to authorize exceptions to the state’s prohibition against take of a listed species if the “take” of a listed species is incidental to carrying out an otherwise lawful project that has been approved under CEQA (DFG Code § 2081).

CDFG Species of Concern

In addition to formal listing under FESA and CESA, species receive additional consideration by CDFG and local lead agencies during the CEQA process. Species that may be considered for review are included on a list of “Species of Concern,” developed by CDFG. The list tracks species in California whose numbers, reproductive success, or habitat may be threatened or declining.

California Native Plant Society

The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) maintains a list of plant species native to California that has low population numbers, limited distribution, or are otherwise threatened with extinction. This information is published in the Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (CNPS 2001). Potential impacts to populations of CNPS-listed plants receive consideration under CEQA review.

Impact Analysis

The Parks and Trails Master Plan sets forth goals, policies and standards to provide guidance to be implemented during the planning, design, and approval phases required for each project that may be proposed in the future. The Master Plan document itself does not approve projects on a site specific basis. The Master Plan guidelines state that any land that is constrained by the presence of special-status species or other protected resources may not be suitable for future park site development. The Master Plan also states that in no case shall such protected resources be adversely impacted by the proposed use unless appropriate mitigation is provided as determined by the regulatory entity with jurisdiction over the resource. The potential for significant impacts related to special-status species as a result of the Master Plan would be determined at the time individual projects are brought forward for planning, design and relative appropriate CEQA review. Mitigation Measures BIO – 1 and BIO – 2 are proposed as general mitigation to be incorporated into project design relevant to potential impacts to special-status species. Compliance with Mitigation Measures BIO – 1 and BIO – 2 would ensure that a Biological Resource Assessment is conducted for identifying the potential occurrence of special-status species; therefore impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: Riparian habitats generally provide a high level of species diversity and habitat values. The structure of riparian habitat is typically multi-leveled and provides food, cover, and reproductive value as well as dispersal and migration corridor habitat for a variety of species. Riparian habitat supports plant species that are adapted to living in moist conditions and riparian habitat often occurs adjacent in association with streams, creeks, rivers, and floodplains.

Regulatory Setting

State Regulations

The CDFG is a Trustee Agency with jurisdiction under Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code. Under Section 1602, a private party must notify the CDFG if a proposed project will “substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake designated by the department, or use any material from the streambeds except when the department has been notified pursuant to Section 1601.” If an existing fish or wildlife resource may be substantially adversely affected by the activity, the CDFG may propose reasonable measures that will allow protection of those resources. If these measures are agreeable to the party, they may enter into an agreement with the CDFG identifying the approved activities and associated mitigation measures.

Impact Analysis

The Parks and Trails Master Plan sets forth goals, policies and standards to provide guidance to be implemented during the planning, design, and approval phases required for each project that may be proposed in the future. The Master Plan document itself does not approve projects on a site specific basis. The Master Plan states that land that is constrained by the presence of wetlands or other protected resources may not be suitable for future park site development. The Master Plan also states that in no case shall such protected resources be adversely impacted by the proposed use unless appropriate mitigation is provided as determined by the regulatory entity with jurisdiction over the resource. The potential for significant impacts related to waterways, creeks, or riparian habitat subject to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Codes as a result Master Plan implementation would be determined at the time projects are brought forward for planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation. Mitigation Measure BIO – 3 is proposed as general mitigation to be incorporated relevant to any identified potential impacts to resources regulated by Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Codes. Compliance with Mitigation Measures BIO – 3 would ensure that the County coordinates with CDFG related to any impacts to CDFG jurisdictional resources and requires the County to enter into a Streambed Alteration Agreement with CDFG if needed; therefore impacts are considered less than significant.

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 wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: Implementation of the El Dorado County parks and Trails Master Plan may result in future development in areas containing federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Regulatory Setting

Federal Regulations

The Corps regulates discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S. under § 404 of the CWA. “Discharges of fill material” is defined as the addition of fill material into waters of the U.S., including, but not limited to the following: placement of fill that is necessary for the construction of any structure, or impoundment requiring rock, sand, dirt, or other material for its construction; site-development fills for recreational, industrial, commercial, residential, and other uses; causeways or road fills; fill for intake and outfall pipes and subaqueous utility lines [33 C.F.R. §328.2(f)]. In addition, § 401 of the CWA (33 U.S.C. 1341) requires any applicant for a federal license or permit to conduct any activity that may result in a discharge of a pollutant into waters of the United States to obtain a certification that the discharge will comply with the applicable effluent limitations and water quality standards.

Waters of the U.S. include a range of wet environments such as lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, and wet meadows. Boundaries between jurisdictional waters and uplands are determined in a variety of ways depending on which type of waters is present. Methods for delineating wetlands and non-tidal waters are described as:

- Wetlands are defined as “those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support and under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions” [33 C.F.R. §328.3(b)]. Presently, to be a wetland, a site must exhibit three wetland criteria: hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology existing under the “normal circumstances” for the site.
- The lateral extent of non-tidal waters is determined by delineating the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) [33 C.F.R. §328.4(c)(1)]. The OHWM is defined as “that line on shore established by the fluctuations of water and indicated by physical character of the soil, destruction of terrestrial vegetation, the presence of litter and debris, or other appropriate means that consider the characteristics of the surrounding areas” [33 C.F.R. §328.3(e)].

Impact Analysis

The Parks and Trails Master Plan sets forth goals, policies and standards to provide guidance to be implemented during the planning, design, and approval phases required for each project that may be proposed in the future. The Master Plan document itself does not approve projects on a site specific basis. The Master Plan states that land that is constrained by the presence of wetlands, waters of the U.S. potentially subject to Section 404 of CWA, or other protected resources may not be suitable for future park or trail site development. The Master Plan also states that in no case shall such protected resources be adversely impacted by the proposed use unless appropriate mitigation is provided as determined by the regulatory entity with jurisdiction over the resource. The potential for significant impacts related to wetlands, waters of the U.S. potentially subject to Section 404 of CWA as a result of Master Plan implementation would be determined at the time individual projects are brought forward for planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation. Mitigation Measures BIO – 4 and BIO – 5 are proposed as general mitigation to be incorporated into project design relevant to potential impacts to wetlands and waters of the U.S. potentially subject to Section 404 of CWA. Compliance with BIO-4 and BIO-5 would ensure that the County evaluates the potential presence of jurisdictional waters through the preparation of a jurisdictional delineation, requires Corps verification of the delineation; and requires the County to obtain Section 404 and Section 401 authorization for the placements of fill in any jurisdictional waters. Impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: Wildlife movement and migratory corridors within El Dorado County typically occur along riparian corridors with well-developed riparian vegetation and surrounding undeveloped lands.

Impact Analysis

The Parks and Trails Master Plan sets forth goals, policies and standards to provide guidance to be implemented during the planning, design, and approval phases required for each project that may be proposed in the future. The Master Plan document itself does not approve projects on a site specific basis. The Master Plan states that land that is constrained by the presence of protected resources may not be suitable for future park site development. The Plan also states that in no case shall such protected resources be adversely impacted by the proposed use unless appropriate mitigation is provided as determined by the regulatory entity with jurisdiction over the resource. The potential for significant impacts related to protected resources would be determined at the time projects come forward with planning, design and appropriate CEQA review. Mitigation Measures BIO – 1 through BIO – 6 are proposed as general mitigation to be incorporated into future planning, design and CEQA process relevant to potential impacts to protected biological resources. Compliance with BIO – 1 through BIO – 6 would ensure that the County evaluates the potential presence of these resources and requires the County to coordinate with resource agency having jurisdiction to obtain authorization under relevant federal and State regulatory requirements. Impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: The term “oak woodland” is defined in the Oak Woodland Conservation Act (PRC §21083.4, Fish and Game Code §1361) as an oak stand with greater than ten percent canopy cover or that may have historically supported greater than ten percent canopy cover. The El Dorado County General Plan uses the term “oak woodland” interchangeably and in the same context as “oak canopy.”

Regulatory Setting

Through the OWMP, the County identifies areas where conservation easements may be acquired from willing sellers as a means to offset and mitigate the loss or fragmentation of oak woodlands in other areas as a result of implementation of the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan (General Plan). Additionally, the OWMP provides guidance for voluntary conservation and management efforts by landowners and land managers. Lastly, the OWMP sets forth further guidance on General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 Option A, which includes measures designed to encourage retention of existing oak canopy in areas planned for development.

Impact Analysis

The Parks and Trails Master Plan sets forth goals, policies and standards to provide guidance to be implemented during the planning, design, and approval phases required for each project that may be proposed in the future. The Master Plan document itself does not approve projects on a site specific basis. The Master Plan states that land that is constrained by the presence of protected resources may not be suitable for future park site development. The Plan also states that in no case shall such protected resources be adversely impacted by the proposed use unless appropriate

mitigation is provided as determined by the regulatory entity with jurisdiction over the resource. The potential for significant impacts related to Oak Woodland Habitat would be determined at the time projects come forward with planning, design and appropriate CEQA review. Mitigation Measure BIO – 6 is proposed as general mitigation to be incorporated into future planning, design and CEQA process relevant to potential impacts to oak woodlands. Compliance with BIO-6 would ensure that the County evaluates and mitigates the potential presence of these resources to reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

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?.

No Impact: No state, regional, or federal habitat conservation plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans have been adopted for the County. The County is currently in the process of preparing an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, but it is not yet approved.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure BIO – 1: Prior to preparation of the CEQA document, and in conjunction with design and planning for the construction of park or trail facilities on undeveloped sites, a Biological Resources Assessment , field survey and technical report shall be prepared. The surveys and reports would be conducted by a qualified biologist, would identify the potential for special-status species to occur on the site (state or federally listed or California species of concern), would recommend measures to avoid impacts to these species and would provide recommendations for any further required studies or regulatory permitting that may be required for the site. The Biological Resources Assessment would also identify any sensitive habitat areas including potentially jurisdictional waters on the property that may be subject to federal of state jurisdiction.

Mitigation Measure BIO – 2: If construction is proposed during the raptor breeding season (March 1 to September 1), a pre-construction raptor nest survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist. If no active nests are found during the pre-construction survey, no further mitigation is required. If active nests are found, a quarter-mile (1320 feet) initial temporary nest disturbance buffer area shall be established. If project related activities within the temporary nest disturbance buffer are determined to be necessary during the nesting season (approximately March 1 to September 1), then an on-site biologist/monitor experienced with raptor behavior shall be retained by the project proponent to monitor the nest, and shall along with the project proponent, consult with CDFG to determine the best course of action necessary to avoid nest abandonment or take of individuals. Work may be allowed to proceed within the temporary nest disturbance buffer if raptors are not exhibiting agitated behavior. The designated on-site biologist/monitor shall be on-site daily or less if approved by CDFG while construction related

activities are taking place and shall have the authority to stop work if raptors are exhibiting agitated behavior.

If construction is proposed during the nesting season for non-raptor migratory birds (February 1 through August 15), a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist within 15 days of the start of project related activities. If nests of migratory birds are detected on site, or within 100 feet of the project site, the project proponent shall consult with CDFG to determine the size of a suitable buffer in which no new site disturbance is permitted until August 15, or until the qualified biologist determines that the young are foraging independently, or the nest has been abandoned.

Mitigation Measure BIO – 3: If it is determined that project development would affect the bed, bank or associated riparian vegetation (e.g. native oak trees) of any creek or stream on the project site, a Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be obtained from CDFG, pursuant to § 1600 of the California Fish and Game Codes prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit by El Dorado County. If required, the County shall coordinate with CDFG in developing mitigation appropriate for potential impacts to riparian and/or wetland impacts and shall abide by the conditions of any executed agreement.

Mitigation Measure BIO – 4: Prior to preparation of the CEQA document, and in conjunction with design and planning for the construction of park or trail facilities on undeveloped sites, if potentially jurisdictional wetland features occur on the site, the County shall comply with all USACOE regulatory requirements relevant to activities proposed within areas of jurisdictional aquatic features.

Mitigation Measure BIO – 5: If it is determined by park site design, that the placement of fill will occur in jurisdictional waters of the U.S., a Section 404 Clean Water Act permit from the Corps and a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) shall be obtained, as applicable, prior to commencement of development activities.

Mitigation Measure BIO – 6: Prior to preparation of the CEQA document, and in conjunction with design and planning for the construction of park or trail facilities on undeveloped sites, if it is determined that protected oak trees have a potential to occur on the undeveloped site, an Arborist Survey and Arborist Report shall be prepared for the site by an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA)-certified Arborist to determine any mitigation that may be required to maintain consistency with the El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan, which sets forth guidance on Policy 7.4.4.4 of the El Dorado County General Plan.

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

Environmental Setting

The west slope of El Dorado County lies in the ethnographic territory of the Nisenan Maidu (Southern Maidu). Traditionally this territory covered the area from Sacramento in the southwest, east to the Cosumnes River and up the foothills to the Sierra Nevada crest, north along the crest to the headwaters of the North Fork of the Yuba River, west along the Yuba River to the Feather River just above present day Marysville, and south to the confluence of the Feather River and the Sacramento River (North State Resources 2011a). The Nisenan had a loose political organization with six main tribelet or population centers based around several main villages, with smaller settlements and temporary camps as satellites. The foothills area between the Cosumnes River and the American River was one such tribelet. In the foothills, villages were located on large flats near creeks or on ridges. Resources associated with the Nisenan villages include bedrock mortars, textiles, baskets, and stone tools. Three years after the 1848 discovery of gold at Sutter’s sawmill on the American River, the entirety of the Nisenan territory was occupied by miners and settlers.

Due to the discovery of gold in the mid-1800s, El Dorado County became a focus of placer mining, and economic ventures in lumber and agriculture began to appear to support the mining. The discovery of gold created a rapid influx of fortune seekers and settlers pursuing gold or building farms, towns, and supporting infrastructure. During the late 19th and early 20th centuries the foothills were primarily an agricultural region dotted with stock raising ranches. Within the immediate vicinity of the APE, limited mining activity of small sluice and pick and pan operations took place during the early Gold Rush (1848-1855), and the main economic theme of the area focused on agriculture, particularly livestock grazing, during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. By the mid-20th century, urban in-filling of the Sierra Nevada foothills, had re-defined the modern landscape from rural agriculture to suburban community.

Discussion of Impacts

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

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: El Dorado County has a rich historic heritage. Implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan could ultimately result in planning and design of future parks and trails in areas containing significant historical resources.

Regulatory Setting

State Regulations

A substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the historical resource would be materially impaired (Section 15064.5 (b)(1), CEQA Guidelines).

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, historical resources include the following:

- A resource listed in, or eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (California Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.)
- A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code
- Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript, which:
 - is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
 - is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
 - embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic value; or
 - has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Impact Analysis

The Parks and Trails Master Plan sets forth goals, policies and standards to provide guidance to be implemented during the planning, design, and approval phases required for each project that may be proposed in the future. The Master Plan document itself does not approve projects on a site specific basis. The Master Plan states that land that is constrained by the presence historical resources or other protected resources may not be suitable for park or trail site development. The Master Plan also states that in no case shall such protected resources be adversely impacted by the proposed use unless appropriate mitigation is provided as determined by the regulatory entity with jurisdiction over the resource.

Improvements and future park facilities may have the potential to impact historic resources, depending on individual site locations and adjacent resources. Until such time as individual projects are determined, potential historic significance cannot be analyzed. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Compliance with Mitigation Measures CR – 1 and CR – 2 would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

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

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: El Dorado County is a culturally rich area inhabited by large populations of peoples, especially those portions within the Sierra Nevada Foothills and. These populations primarily inhabited areas along waterways, wetlands and streams. It is reasonable to assume that many archaeological resources still remain.

Regulatory Setting

California Public Resources Code

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21983.2(g), an archaeological resource shall be considered unique if "it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person."

Senate Bill 18 - Tribal Consultation Guidelines

Senate Bill 18 requires city and county governments to contact and consult with California Native American Tribes prior to adopting or amending a General Plan, or prior to designation of land as open space for the purpose of protecting Native American Cultural Places.

Impact Analysis

The Parks and Trails Master Plan sets forth goals, policies and standards to provide guidance to be implemented during the planning, design, and approval phases required for each project that may be proposed in the future. The Master Plan document itself does not approve projects on a site specific basis. The Master Plan states that land that is constrained by the presence historical resources or other protected resources may not be suitable for park or trail site development. The Master Plan also states that in no case shall such protected resources be adversely impacted by the proposed use unless appropriate mitigation is provided as determined by the regulatory entity with jurisdiction over the resource.

Improvements and future park facilities may have the potential to impact archaeological resources, depending on individual site locations and adjacent resources. Until such time as individual projects are determined, potential historic significance cannot be analyzed. Implementation of the Master Plan may involve eventual construction activities including excavation, trenching, grading, and other ground-disturbing activities which would have the potential to result in adverse changes to archaeological resources. Compliance with mitigation measures CR -1 through CR – 5 would reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

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

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: Implementation of the Master Plan would involve planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation and possible eventual construction activities including excavation, trenching, grading, and other activities which would have the

potential to result in adverse changes to paleontological resources. Therefore impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Compliance with Mitigation Measure CR – 4 would reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

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

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: Although unlikely, the discovery of human remains would be possible during ground disturbing activities associated with future projects determined after implementation of the Master Plan.

Regulatory Setting

California Health and Safety Code

Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code defines general provisions for the treatment of dead bodies, and requires that the County coroner be contacted in the event of the inadvertent discovery of human remains and all excavation or disturbance of the site or nearby areas be immediately ceased until such time as the Coroner has made a determination pursuant to Section 27491 of the Government Code. In the event that the Coroner recognizes or has reason to believe that the remains are of Native American ancestry, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours.

Impact Analysis

The Parks and Trails Master Plan sets forth goals, policies and standards to provide guidance to be implemented during the planning, design, and approval phases required for each park or trail project that may be proposed in the future. Improvements may have the potential to impact human remains with future projects determined after implementation of the Master Plan. Until such time as individual projects are determined, potential significance cannot be analyzed. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Compliance with Mitigation Measure CR-5 would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure CR – 1: Prior to preparation of the CEQA document, and in conjunction with design and planning for the construction of park or trail facilities on undeveloped sites the site shall be evaluated for the presence of historic resources. If it is determined that on-site resources have the potential for historic significance, as indicated by age or previous inclusion on a list of designated historic resources, a qualified professional architectural historian to evaluate the historical significance of on-site resources.

Mitigation Measure CR – 2: Prior to preparation of the CEQA document, and in conjunction with design and planning for the construction of park or trail facilities on undeveloped sites a qualified archaeologist shall conduct the following activities: (1) conduct a record search at the North Central Information Center located at California State University, Sacramento and other appropriate historical repositories, (2) conduct field surveys where appropriate, and (3) prepare technical reports, where appropriate, meeting California Office of Historic preservation Standards (Archaeological Resource Management

Reports). All recommendations to avoid adverse impacts to archaeological resources shall be incorporated into project design and construction as specified by a qualified archaeologist.

Mitigation Measure CR – 3: Should buried archaeological deposits or artifacts be inadvertently exposed during the course of any eventual construction activity, work shall cease in the immediate area and the County Parks and Recreation Department shall be immediately notified. A qualified archaeologist will be retained to document the find, assess its significance, and recommend further treatment.

Mitigation Measure CR – 4: If evidence of a paleontological site is uncovered during grading or other construction activities, work shall be halted within 100 feet of the find and the County Parks and Recreation Department shall immediately be notified. A qualified paleontologist shall be retained to conduct an on-site evaluation and provide recommendations for removal and/or preservation. Work on the project site shall not resume until the paleontologist has had a reasonable time to conduct an examination and implement mitigation measures deemed appropriate and necessary by the County to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure CR – 5: In the event that any human remains or any associated funerary objects are encountered during construction, all work will cease within the vicinity of the discovery and the County Parks and Recreation Department shall be immediately notified. In accordance with CEQA (Section 1064.5) and the California Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5), the Sacramento County coroner should be contacted immediately. If the human remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, who will notify and appoint a Most Likely Descendent (MLD). The MLD will work with a qualified archaeologist to decide the proper treatment of the human remains and any associated funerary objects. Construction activities in the immediate vicinity will not resume until a notice-to-proceed is issued.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS — Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

El Dorado County is in the Sierra Nevada geomorphic province of California between the Great Valley province to the east and the Basin and Range province to the west (El Dorado County 2003). The Sierra Nevada province consists of Pliocene and older deposits that have been uplifted as a result of plate tectonics, granitic intrusion, and volcanic activity. Subsequent glaciation and additional volcanic activity led to the general east-west orientation of stream channels.

Seismicity and Fault Systems

Seismic activity can cause hazards associated with seismically induced fault displacement and rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, lateral spreading, landslides, avalanches, and structural hazards, depending on soil and geologic conditions (El Dorado County 2003). Historical seismic activity and fault and seismic hazards mapping in the county indicate that the county has relatively low potential for seismic activity. No active faults have been mapped in the county, and none of the known faults has been designated as an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The distribution of

known faults in El Dorado County is concentrated in the western portion of the county, with several isolated faults in the central county area and the Lake Tahoe Basin.

The El Dorado County General Plan EIR, Section 5.9 – Geology Soils and Mineral Resources, describes the distribution of known faults a being concentrated in the western portion of the county, with several isolated faults in the central county area and the Lake Tahoe Basin. Fault systems mapped in western El Dorado County include the West Bear Mountains Fault; the East Bear Mountains Fault; the Maidu Fault Zone; the El Dorado Fault; the Melones Fault Zone of the Clark, Gillis Hill Fault; and the Calaveras–Shoo Fly Thrust. No active faults have been identified in El Dorado County.

Soils

Soils located on jurisdictional lands on the west slope of El Dorado County consist of well drained silt and gravelly loams divided into two physiographic regions, the Lower and Middle Foothills and the Mountainous Uplands (SCS 1974a). There are a total of eight soil associations in western El Dorado County. Five soil associations occur in the Lower and Middle Foothills region:

- Auberry-Ahwahnee-Sierra: Well-drained coarse sandy loams and sandy loams formed in material weathered from granitic rocks.
- Auburn-Argonaut: Well-drained silt loams and gravelly loams formed in material weathered from basic rocks and metasedimentary rocks.
- Boomer-Auburn: Well-drained silt loams and gravelly loams formed in material weathered from basic igneous rocks or metasedimentary rocks.
- Rescue: Well-drained sandy loams formed in material weathered from basic rocks.
- Serpentine Rock Land-Delpiedra: Excessively drained to somewhat excessively drained rock land and loams formed in material weathered from ultra-basic rocks.

Discussion of Impacts

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?

a i) No Impact: Lands within El Dorado County west slope area are not located within or crossing a delineated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.

Regulatory Setting

State Regulations

Building Standards

The State regulations protecting the public from geo-seismic hazards, other than surface faulting, are contained in California CR, Title 24, Part 2, the California Building Code and California Public Resources Code, Division 2, Chapter 7.8, the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act. These regulations apply to public buildings and a large percentage of private buildings intended for human occupancy. The California Building Code (CBC) is based on the Uniform Building Code (UBC). The CBC has been modified for California conditions with numerous more detailed and/or more stringent regulations. California Health and Safety Code 19100 et seq., the State Earthquake Protection Law, requires that structures be designed to resist stresses produced by lateral forces caused by wind and earthquakes.

.Specific minimum seismic safety and structural design requirements are set forth in Chapter 16 of the CBC. The CBC requires a site-specific geotechnical study to address seismic issues and identifies seismic factors that must be considered in structural design.

Because the project area is not in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, no associated provisions would be required for project development.

a ii) Strong seismic ground shaking

Less Than Significant Impact: The El Dorado County General Plan EIR, Section 5.9 – Geology Soils and Mineral Resources, describes the distribution of known faults a being concentrated in the western portion of the county, with several isolated faults in the central county area and the Lake Tahoe Basin. Fault systems mapped in western El Dorado County include the West Bear Mountains Fault; the East Bear Mountains Fault; the Maidu Fault Zone; the El Dorado Fault; the Melones Fault Zone of the Clark, Gillis Hill Fault; and the Calaveras–Shoo Fly Thrust. No active faults have been identified in El Dorado County. Seismic activity associated with these faults could cause ground shaking and could create a risk for people using park facilities or trails that may be planned in the future utilizing the Parks and Trails Master Plan guidelines. The potential for this type of risk is considered low based on historical activity; Designs of any structures are subject to adherence to the Caltrans and California Building Code requirements. Impacts associated with seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

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

a-iv) Landslides (seismic-related)

No Impact: No portion of El Dorado County is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone (i.e., regulatory zones that encompass areas prone to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides) based on the Seismic Hazards Mapping Program administered by CGS (DOC 2003). Therefore, El Dorado County is not considered to be at risk from liquefaction hazards. Lateral spreading is typically associated with areas experiencing liquefaction; because liquefaction hazards are not present in El Dorado County, it can be concluded that the county is not at risk from lateral spreading.

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

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

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

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

(b-e) Less Than Significant Impacts: Implementation of the Master Plan may involve eventual construction activities including excavation, trenching, grading, and other ground-disturbing activities which would have the potential to result in soil erosion, or the use of septic tanks or alternative methods of wastewater disposal.

Regulatory Setting

State Regulations

Although the primary purpose of regulations regarding Hydrology and Water Quality and standards is the protection of water quality from adverse effects related to land development (such as turbidity caused by sedimentation), measures included also reduce the potential for erosion. These regulations include, but are not limited to, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for management of construction and municipal storm water runoff, as part of the federal Clean Water Act and the State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act. NPDES is implemented at the State and local level through issuance of permits and preparation of site-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP) as regulated by the RWQCB.

Local Regulations

County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance

The County Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance (Grading Ordinance) (Chapter 15.14 of the County Code) establishes provisions for public safety and environmental protection associated with grading activities on private property. The ordinance does all of the following:

- sets forth rules and regulations to control excavation, grading, and earthwork construction, including fills and embankments;
- establishes the administrative procedures for issuance of permits; and
- provides for approval of plans and inspection of grading construction and all grading specific to single-parcel site improvements, except single-family residence construction, unless exceeding standards as defined in the County Design and Improvement Standards Manual.

Where the grading or earthwork involves multiple parcels, parcel maps, subdivisions, land divisions or roads, the Design and Improvement Standards Manual must be used for design purposes.

This ordinance requires grading permits for any grading activity that has the potential to:

- involve more than 250 cubic yards of grading material, or cuts and fills greater than 5 feet in vertical depth;
- create unstable or erodible slopes;
- denude more than 10,000 square feet of surface on a 10% or steeper grade;
- encroach into a perennial or seasonal watercourse that has a watershed larger than 50 acres or is designated by a solid or dashed blue line on a USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle map; or
- Occur within the Lake Tahoe Basin Special Restrictions and Exemptions area..

A grading plan, which must include an erosion and sediment control plan that complies with the provisions of the Grading Ordinance, is required as a part of the grading permit. The ordinance requires that sedimentation be contained on the construction site.

Design and Improvement Standards Manual

The *Design and Improvement Standards Manual* was adopted in 1986 with the purpose of regulating building standards for discretionary projects. The manual requires a Land Capability Report for tentative maps that “shall define the suitability for a tract with regard to waste discharge, building foundations, grading and drainage, traffic circulation, and passive solar opportunities.” The soils and geology component of the report is required to include the following information:

- groundwater effects on slope stability,
- seismic risks,
- earth movement unrelated to seismicity (e.g., landslides), and expansive soils

Impact Analysis:

The Parks and Trails Master Plan sets forth goals, policies and standards to provide guidance to be implemented during the planning, design, and approval phases required for each project that may be proposed in the future. The Master Plan document itself does not approve projects on a site specific basis. The Master Plan states that land that is constrained by the presence of or the potential for substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, collapse, expansive soil, or soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, may not be suitable for park or trail site development. All Improvements and future park facilities are subject to the provisions of the County’s Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance, the Design and Improvement Standards Manual. Additionally, all improvements are subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for management of construction and municipal storm water runoff, as part of the federal Clean Water Act and the State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act. NPDES is implemented at the State and local level through issuance of permits and preparation of site-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP) as regulated by the RWQCB.

Compliance these standards and ordinances would result in less than significant impacts.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS —		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS —		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:					
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

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

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

Chemical and physical properties cause a substance to be considered hazardous. Such properties include toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity, and reactivity (as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Sections 66261.20-66261.24). The release of hazardous materials into the environment could potentially contaminate soils, surface water, and groundwater supplies. Under Government Code Section 65962.5, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control maintains a list of hazardous substance sites. This list, referred to as the “Cortese List,” includes CALSITE hazardous material sites, sites with leaking underground storage tanks, and landfills with evidence of groundwater contamination. In addition, the El Dorado County Environmental Management Department maintains records of toxic or hazardous material incidents, and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) maintains files on hazardous material sites.

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

No hazardous substance sites from the Cortese List have been identified in El Dorado County.

Relative Policies from the El Dorado County General Plan are:

- Policy 6.6.1.2** Prior to the approval of any subdivision of land or issuing of a permit involving ground disturbance, a site investigation, performed by a Registered Environmental Assessor or other person experienced in identifying potential

hazardous wastes, shall be submitted to the County for any subdivision or parcel that is located on a known or suspected contaminated site included in a list on file with the Environmental Management Department as provided by the State of California and federal agencies. If contamination is found to exist by the site investigations, it shall be corrected and remediated in compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and standards prior to the issuance of a new land use entitlement or building permit.

Policy 6.8.1.1 All development within the Airport Safety Zones of the Placerville Airport, the Cameron Park Air Park Airport, the Georgetown Airport, and the City of South Lake Tahoe Airport shall comply with Airport Land Use Commission height, noise, and safety policies and maps as set forth in each airport's comprehensive land use plan. Where there is a difference between the County development standards and the development standards of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, as applied to proposed development, the standards that will most reduce airport-related safety hazards shall apply.

Discussion of Impacts

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan would not involve the development of land uses or facilities typically associated with the storage, use, disposal, or generation of hazardous materials or wastes. Routine maintenance activities occurring within recreational facilities may involve the occasional use of hazardous materials. Potentially toxic or hazardous compounds associated with maintenance activities typically consist of readily available solvents, cleaning compounds, paint, herbicides, and pesticides. These compounds are regulated by stringent federal and state laws mandating the proper transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials in accordance with product labeling. In addition, facilities surrounding proposed recreational facilities regularly handling or storing hazardous materials in quantity are required to prepare Risk Management Plans and are subject to monitoring and reporting requirements mandated by State law.

However, construction activities associated with implementation of the Master Plan project would involve the use of hazardous materials including diesel fuel, gasoline, oil, and grease.

Regulatory Setting

State Regulations

State agencies accept delegation of federal responsibility for hazardous materials and hazardous waste management pursuant to legislation granting such authority. The Clean Water Act is implemented at the State level through the State Water Resources Control Board, as well as the Regional Water Quality Control Board, pursuant to the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. The use of hazardous materials in the workplace is regulated by the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA), pursuant to the Occupational Health and Safety Act of 1970. Cal/OSHA regulations require appropriate training, availability of safety equipment, accident and illness prevention programs, hazardous substance exposure warnings and emergency action and fire prevention plan preparation in the workplace.

The transportation of Hazardous waste is required to be implemented only by a registered hazardous waste transporter, as defined and required by the California Health and Safety Code and the California Code of Regulations.

Impact Analysis

Implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan would not involve the development of facilities or land uses associated with hazardous materials handling, storage, or use, and existing federal, state and local regulations exist to ensure hazardous materials use, storage, and disposal associated with project area maintenance activities or adjacent facilities would not result in risk of hazardous materials exposure to humans or the environment. Best Management Practices would be required within the planning, design and CEQA documentation for each project that comes forward and ultimately implemented for construction activities to minimize impacts to the environment and public health. The transport, storage, and disposal of any hazardous materials used would be subject to federal, State, and local regulations. Temporary storage tanks necessary to store fuel and/or other flammable or combustible liquids required on the project site during construction would be regulated through the applicable federal, State and local regulations as well. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact: As discussed in detail above, implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan would not involve the development of facilities or land uses typically associated with hazardous materials handling, storage, or use, and existing federal, State and local regulations exist to ensure hazardous materials use, storage, and disposal associated with any proposed maintenance activities or adjacent facilities would not result in significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Compliance with federal, State, and County regulations and requirements would therefore ensure that impacts related to the accidental release of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the Master Plan would involve planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation that would lead to the development of future park and trail facilities within the proximity of existing and future school sites. In fact, the Master Plan encourages reciprocal shared arrangements between the County and school districts. However, as discussed in detail above, implementation of the Master Plan would not involve the development of facilities or land uses typically associated with hazardous materials handling, storage, or use, and existing federal, State and local regulations exist to ensure hazardous materials use, storage, and disposal associated with any proposed maintenance activities would not result in significant hazard to the public or the environment through exposure of school sites to hazardous materials or emissions. Compliance with federal, State, and County regulations and requirements would ensure that impacts related to the exposure of school sites to hazardous materials or emission would be considered less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The El Dorado County Environmental Management Department, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and the California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) maintain lists of contaminated sites within the El Dorado County west slope area.

Impact Analysis

As specified by the Master Plan: “a site may be deemed unsuitable for park land dedication if previous land uses have resulted in the presence of hazardous materials, excessive erosion, unstable ground, or any other condition that cannot be corrected without excessive remediation costs.” If potential future park sites were documented as contaminated by hazardous materials, the site would be considered unsuitable for park or recreational facility development, unless remediation of the site were possible. Any proposed remediation would be monitored and inspected pursuant to State and local regulatory requirements until acceptable environmental thresholds relevant to human health risks were achieved and the site was considered suitable for development as a public park or trail facility. Impacts related to development of future parks or trails on sites contaminated with hazardous materials are therefore considered less than significant.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impacts: The Placerville Airport, the Georgetown Airport and the Cameron Park Airport are all located within the western slope of El Dorado County. Currently, a revised Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan is being prepared to include all three airports.

Impact Analysis

The Parks and Trails Master Plan sets forth goals, policies and standards to provide guidance to be implemented during the planning, design, and CEQA approval phases required for each project that may be proposed in the future. The Master Plan document does not approve projects on a site specific basis. Any proposed park or trail facilities located within the flight safety zones of the Placerville, Georgetown or Cameron Park Airports would be subject to any limitations set forth in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan currently being prepared for these airports. Therefore impacts related to implementation of the Master Plan are considered less than significant.

g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less Than Significant Impact: The Master Plan document does not approve projects on a site specific basis. Any proposed park or trail facilities that may result would be subject to compliance with emergency access standards and requirements specified by State Fire Code, CCSD, and the County Zoning Code as well as the County General Plan. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation would be subject to standards and guidelines, assuring that proposed site configurations, points of ingress and egress, and circulation routes were adequate for the proposed use and would not result in inadequate emergency access. Similarly, any proposed modifications to points of ingress/egress or circulation routes would require review for compliance with State and County required standards. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact: The Master Plan document does not approve projects on a site specific basis. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park or trail facilities that may result would be subject to compliance with emergency access standards and requirements specified by State Fire Code, CCSF, and the appropriate fire districts relative to the site location as well as the California Department of Forestry. This would assure that proposed site locations, configurations, points of ingress and egress, and circulation routes were adequate for fire suppression and would not result in inadequate emergency access.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation is warranted.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY — Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) 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"/>
h) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY — Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
i) Inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less Than Significant Impact: Any discharge of pollutants to waters of the U.S. is unlawful unless the discharge is in compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

Regulatory Setting

Federal Regulations

The 1972 Federal Water Pollution Control Act, also known as the Clean Water Act (CWA), establishes the basic structure for the EPA to regulate discharges of pollutant into waters of the United States. The CWA’s primary intent is to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation’s waters.

Section 401 of the CWA (33 U.S.C. 1341) requires any applicant for a federal license or permit to conduct any activity that may result in a discharge of a pollutant into waters of the United States to obtain a water quality certification that assumes the discharge would comply with the applicable effluent limitations and water quality standards. This policy is intended to preserve wetland values or acres, and seeks to avoid adverse impacts and to offset unavoidable adverse impacts to existing aquatic resources through mitigation to achieve no net loss of wetland function and value.

The CWA was amended in 1987 with the addition of Section 402(p), which established a framework for regulating storm water discharges under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The NPDES permit system was established in the CWA to regulate point source pollution such as municipal and industrial discharges to surface waters of the United States. In California, the EPA has given the state authority to administer the NPDES program, which is implemented by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).

Nonpoint pollution sources originate over a wide area rather than from a definable point. Such nonpoint sources are generally exempt from federal NPDES permit program requirements with the exception of storm water discharges. Stormwater discharges during and after project construction can transport pollutants from impervious surfaces such as roads and parking lots to creeks and streams. NPDES municipal Phase II regulations require jurisdictions to initiate actions to prevent long term non-point pollution through appropriate design. The goal of the NPDES nonpoint source regulations is to improve the quality of storm water discharged to receiving waters to the “maximum extent practicable” through the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs).

In accordance with NPDES regulations, to minimize the potential effects of construction runoff on receiving water quality, the SWRCB requires that any construction activity affecting one acre or more must obtain coverage under the General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit (General Permit). Permit applicants are also required to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that specifies erosion and sediment control BMPs to reduce or eliminate construction-related impacts on receiving water quality. Construction of specific Greenway projects that would disturb one acre or more will be required to obtain coverage under the General Permit, develop and implement a SWPPP and perform regular inspections of all BMPs.

Examples of construction BMPs identified in SWPPPs include: using temporary mulching, seeding or other measures to protect uncovered soils; storing materials and equipment to ensure that spills or leaks cannot enter the storm drain system or surface water; developing and implementing a spill prevention and cleanup plan, installing traps, filters, or other devices at drop inlets to prevent contaminants from entering storm drains; and using barriers, such as straw wattles or silt fencing to minimize the amount of uncontrolled runoff that could enter storm drain inlets or surface water.

State Regulations

The SWRCB and the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Boards) are designated responsibility for ensuring implementation and compliance with the provision of the federal CWA through the provisions of California's Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Regional Boards have the authority to implement water quality protection standards through the issuance of permits for discharges to waters at locations within their jurisdiction and through multiple enforcement mechanisms.

Impact Analysis

Implementation of the Master Plan document itself does not approve projects on a site specific basis. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park or trail facilities that may result would be subject to compliance with the Statewide General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity, Order No. 99-08 DWQ and the Storm Water Management Plan for Western El Dorado County. A SWPPP would be prepared for any future project, and BMPs will be implemented during construction activities to reduce or minimize discharge of pollutants from construction activities to less than significant

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., 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)?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: Future park development may result in the need for water supply related to restroom facilities, public access to drinking water, and irrigation needs. The Master Plan Park Planning Standards specify that proposed park land should have access to appropriate infrastructure, including water supply. Master Plan Park Standards also specify that water conservation measures shall be incorporated into the planning and design of a park. In addition to a potential created demand for additional water supply, proposed recreational facilities would conserve areas of groundwater recharge through the preservation of open space and/or the development of recreational greenways.

Impact Analysis

Implementation of the Master Plan document does not automatically approve projects on a site specific basis. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park facilities that may result would be required to demonstrate adequate water supply prior to project approval. It is unlikely that trail development would require public access to drinking water and irrigation. It is unknown to what extent proposed future development of recreational facilities would result in a depletion of groundwater supplies. Therefore impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Compliance with mitigation measures HYDRO – 1 and HYDRO – 2 would reduce potential impacts related to groundwater supplies to less than significant levels.

c & 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 that would result in flooding or erosion and siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact: Any future proposed park or trail development may be near or cross over a bed, bank, or channel of a stream or river. This type of design would be subject to numerous and overlapping existing regulatory and statutory requirements implemented and enforced through resource agencies with expertise in affected resources, including the State Department of Fish and Game, Central Valley RWQCB, and others.

Impact Analysis

Existing enforceable regulatory requirements at the federal, State, and local level are established to protect existing and proposed future recreation and park sites and downstream areas from environmental impacts related to flooding, and/or erosion and siltation resulting from the alteration of streams or rivers. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that potential impacts related to flooding and/or erosion and siltation would be minimized pursuant to current regulatory standards; therefore impacts are considered less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact: Future park development may result in the increased impervious surfaces that in turn would result in the need for improved drainage systems. However, the development of parks generally preserves open space, limiting paved areas to parking, trails and sidewalks. The Master Plan Park Planning Standards specify that proposed park land should limit impervious surfaces in favor of landscaped areas and open space.

Impact Analysis

Implementation of the Master Plan document does not automatically approve projects on a site specific basis. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park facilities that may result would be required to demonstrate adequacy of storm water drainage systems through the preparation of a drainage plan pursuant to the County's Design and Improvement Standards Manual and the Grading Ordinance, prior to approval of the project and prior to certification of the CEQA document. Therefore impacts from implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan are considered less than significant.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the Master Plan document does not approve projects on a site specific basis. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park or trail facilities that may result would be subject to compliance with the Statewide General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity, Order No. 99-08 DWQ and the Storm Water Management Plan for Western El Dorado County. A SWPPP would be prepared for any future project, and BMPs will be implemented during construction activities to reduce or minimize discharge of pollutants to less than significant

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?

No Impact: Implementation of the Master Plan would not involve the development of residential land uses or the construction of housing; therefore no impact would result from implementation of the Proposed Project.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the Master Plan document itself does not approve projects on a site specific basis. The potential for flood hazards associated with inundation resulting from levee or dam failure are considered a low threat in El Dorado County therefore impacts are considered less than significant.

i) Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?

Less Than Significant Impact: El Dorado County is located inland from the coast in higher elevations. A threat of seiche or tsunami is not likely. Mudslides have been known to occur in steep mountainous areas after unusual weather events such as a forest fire followed by a 100 year storm event. However, it is highly unlikely that a mudslide would occur as a result of implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure HYDRO – 1:

The Planning and Design of future parks shall consider:

- Water-conserving building design and equipment in new construction;
- Water-conserving landscaping and other conservation measures as applicable to individual project sites; and
- Retrofitting of existing facilities with water-conserving devices.

Verification of water conservation measures in project design shall be documented by the Parks Department prior to project approval.

Mitigation Measure HYDRO – 2:

To the extent practicable, the County Parks Department shall incorporate the use of reclaimed water in the design of irrigation systems for new park facilities as well as proposed improvements to existing recreational/park facilities.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
X. 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 (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities' conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact: The Parks and Trails Master Plan sets forth goals, policies and standards to provide guidance to be implemented during the planning, design, and approval phases required for each project that may be proposed in the future. Implementation of the Master Plan would facilitate community interaction as well as interaction with regional community members. Park and Trail locations are intended to provide linkages to other park and trail facilities and to all neighborhoods and areas throughout the County. Therefore, no impact related to the physical division of established communities would result from implementation of the Master Plan.

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

No Impact: One purpose of the Parks and Trails Master Plan is to implement policies within the El Dorado County General Plan. Therefore, no impact related to General Plan Consistency would result from implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan. Relevant policies are listed below. Some of the policies are out of date in terms of documents titles and dates, but the intent of the policies are still in tact, as pointed out in discussions following some of the policies.

Policy 9.1.1.1 The County shall assist in the development of regional, community, and neighborhood parks, ensure a diverse range of recreational opportunities at a regional, community, and neighborhood level, and provide park design guidelines and development standards for park development. The following national standards shall be used as guidelines for the acquisition and development of park facilities:

Guidelines For Acquisition and Development of Park Facilities	
Park Types	Developed
Regional Parks	1.5 ac/1,000 population
Community Parks	1.5 ac/1,000 population

Neighborhood Parks	2.0 ac/1,000 population
<i>Specific Standards (Neighborhood and Community Parks)</i>	
Cameron Park Community Services District	5.0 ac/1,000 population
El Dorado Hills Community Services District	5.0 ac/1,000 population
Planned Communities	5.0 ac/1,000 population

Policy 9.1.1.2 Neighborhood parks shall be primarily focused on serving walk-to or bike-to recreation needs. When possible, neighborhood parks should be adjacent to schools. Neighborhood parks are generally 2 to 10 acres in size and may include a playground, tot lot, turf areas, and picnic facilities.

Policy 9.1.1.3 Community parks and recreation facilities shall provide a focal point and gathering place for the larger community. Community parks are generally 10 to 44 acres in size, are for use by all sectors and age groups, and may include multi-purpose fields, ball fields, group picnic areas, playground, tot lot, multi-purpose hardcourts, swimming pool, tennis courts, and a community center.

Policy 9.1.1.4 Regional parks and recreation facilities shall incorporate natural resources such as lakes and creeks and serve a region involving more than one community. Regional parks generally range in size from 30 to 10,000 acres with the preferred size being several hundred acres. Facilities may include multi-purpose fields, ball fields, group picnic areas, playgrounds, swimming facilities, amphitheaters, tennis courts, multi-purpose hardcourts, shooting sports facilities, concessionaire facilities, trails, nature interpretive centers, campgrounds, natural or historic points of interest, and community multi-purpose centers.

Policy 9.1.1.5 Parkland dedicated under the Quimby Act must be suitable for active recreation uses and:

- A. Shall have a maximum average slope of 10 percent;
- B. Shall have sufficient access for a community or neighborhood park; and
- C. Shall not contain significant constraints that would render the site unsuitable for development.

Policy 9.1.1.6 The primary responsibilities of the County as a recreation provider shall be the establishment and provision of a regional park system to serve the residents of and visitors to the County.

Policy 9.1.1.7 Encourage and support efforts of independent recreation districts to provide parks and recreation facilities. The joint efforts of Community Services Districts, independent recreation districts, school districts, cities, and the County to provide parks and recreation facilities shall also be encouraged.

Policy 9.1.1.8 The County shall prepare, implement, and regularly update a Parks Master Plan and Parks and Recreation Capital Improvement Program to meet current and future park and recreation needs.

Policy 9.1.1.9 The County will identify and secure funding sources, where possible, to implement the Capital Improvement Program to meet the needs identified in the *Interim Master Plan for Parks, Recreation Facilities, and Trails*.

Discussion: There is no document entitled *Interim Master Plan for Parks, Recreation Facilities, and Trails*. This reference could be replaced with *Parks and Trails Master Plan*.

Policy 9.1.1.10 As a priority, the County shall continue to plan for and develop existing County owned regional and community park sites.

Policy 9.1.1.11 Focus park acquisition on recreation oriented facilities.

Policy 9.1.2.1 The proposed El Dorado Trail/Pony Express Trail as well as trails connecting regional parks shall be the County's primary responsibility for trail establishment and maintenance.

Policy 9.1.2.2 The standards for the County trail system regarding general location, width, steepness, signage, offer of easement dedication, and other design standards are detailed in the Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan and should be updated as necessary.

Policy 9.1.2.3 The County will assume the responsibility, where possible, of acquiring and developing regional trails outside the boundaries of the cities, Community Service Districts, and park and recreation districts having park and recreation taxing authority and will assist areas such as the Georgetown Divide Recreation District with exceptionally large geographic areas with acquisition and development of trails.

Policy 9.1.2.4 Evaluate every discretionary application as well as public facilities planning with regard to their ability to implement the *Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan* and the *Bikeway Master Plan*.

Discussion: Both the *Hiking and Equestrian Trails Master Plan* and the *Bikeway Master Plan* are out dated. The *Bicycle Transportation Plan*, recently updated and approved by the Board in 2010, is being used instead.

Policy 9.1.2.5 All discretionary applications may be conditioned to provide an irrevocable offer of a trail easement dedication and construction of trails as designated on the Trails Master Plan provided it can be shown that such trails will serve as loops and/or links to designated or existing trails, existing or proposed schools, public parks and open space areas, and existing or proposed public transit nodes (e.g., bus stops, park and ride lots). Parkland dedication credit shall be given where applicable for provision of land and trail improvements that aid in implementing the Trails Master Plan.

Policy 9.1.2.6 A priority list of County trails for alignment delineation, acquisition, engineering, and development shall be developed. Trails with historical associations or essential trail linkages shall be given a higher priority in the Capital Improvement Plan.

Policy 9.1.2.7 Mapping of parcel specific regional trail alignments shall be completed by within one year of General Plan adoption so that trail easements may be acquired at the earliest possible date.

Discussion: The Parks and Trails Master Plan will provide maps of existing trails and a composite of trail routes discussed in the past. Conceptual alignments are discussed, but no site specific alignments not already within the County CIP are being recommended in the Master Plan. To do so would circumvent the approval process and therefore more appropriately accomplished when an alignment becomes an actual project.

Policy 9.1.2.8 Integrate and link, where possible, existing and proposed National, State, regional, County, city and local hiking, bicycle, and equestrian trails for public use.

Policy 9.1.2.9 The County shall update the *Bikeway Master Plan* and include the bikeways system on the Trails Master Plan Map within two years of General Plan adoption. The *Bikeway Master Plan* shall be reviewed annually for changes and possible updating. Major revision studies shall be conducted in accordance with Policy 2.9.1.2. The bicycle routes established in the *Bikeway Master Plan* are considered a part of both the Parks and Recreation Element and the Transportation and Circulation Element of the County General Plan.

Discussion: The *Bicycle Master Plan* is replaced by the *Bicycle Transportation Plan* (BTP) and encourages linkages to recreation trails that can and should be used for commuting. Also, the *Bicycle Transportation Act* requires updates to BTP's every 5 years, not 1 year.

Policy 9.1.2.10 The County shall establish a procedure by which local trails can be recognized and designated.

Policy 9.1.2.11 Recognize the national historic trails that are located within the County and promote and pursue cooperative efforts with private, regional, State, and Federal agencies to develop and fund these trails on public and private land.

Policy 9.1.3.1 Linear parks and trails may be incorporated along rivers, creeks, and streams wherever possible.

Policy 9.1.3.2 On public lands and where trails can be developed, maintained, and managed; a system of trails along the American and Cosumnes River systems may be created to increase public access to scenic waterways.

Policy 9.1.3.3 Coordinate with Federal, State, other agencies, and private landholders to provide public access to recreational resources, including rivers, lakes, and public lands.

Policy 9.1.3.4 To the extent possible, maximize the use of the regional park and trail system by the physically handicapped and developmentally disabled as detailed in the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act.

Policy 9.1.3.5 Recognize that segments of the California and Pony Express National Historic Trails are located within public and private land areas of the County. Give priority to County activities that will establish contiguous recreational trails along these alignments and pursue funding to construct and maintain trails along these alignments.

Policy 9.1.3.6 Support the establishment of a California National Historic Trail interpretive and visitor's center in El Dorado County.

Policy 9.1.4.2 Support the acquisition of a public river access adjacent to the Marshall Gold Discovery State Historic Park.

Discussion: The County should evaluate if this policy is still relevant. There is already a public put in access at Henningson Lotus Park.

Policy 9.1.5.1 Encourage the formation of independent rural recreation districts to provide rural community and neighborhood parks for those areas desiring a higher level of service.

Policy 9.2.2.1 The Parks and Recreation Commission shall review all tentative subdivision maps of 50 parcels or more outside community service districts and special recreation districts boundaries and will provide recommendations to the Planning Commission for appropriate provision of recreation services.

Policy 9.2.2.2 New development projects creating community or neighborhood parks shall provide mechanisms (e.g., homeowners associations, or benefit assessment districts) for the ongoing development, operation, and maintenance needs of these facilities if annexation to an existing parks and recreation service district/provider is not possible.

Policy 9.2.2.3 The County will cooperate with cities and independently funded districts to help acquire land and develop facilities for neighborhood and community parks as funding allows.

Policy 9.2.2.4 The County shall work with local districts and County services area recreation advisory committees to secure neighborhood park sites by use of the Quimby Act Implementing Ordinance.

Policy 9.2.2.5 The County shall establish a development fee program applicable to all new development to fund park and recreation improvements and acquisition of parklands such that minimum neighborhood, community, and regional park standards are achieved. This fee is in addition to Quimby Act requirements that address parkland acquisition only. The fee will be adjusted

periodically to fully fund the improvements identified in the Parks and Capital Improvement Program concurrent with development over a five-year period.

Policy 9.3.6.2 Move the fairground site to a location that can safely serve the current and projected population of El Dorado County (recognizing that the current fairground site is inadequate) and potentially accommodate a West Slope Regional Park facility or Sports Complex.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities' conservation plan?

No Impact: No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans have been developed for El Dorado County

		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XI. 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 the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Environmental Setting

El Dorado County in general is considered a mining region capable of producing a wide variety of mineral resources. Metallic mineral deposits, including gold, are considered the most significant extractive mineral resources.

Discussion of Impacts

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

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

Less Than Significant Impacts: Implementation of the Master Plan document does not automatically approve projects on a site specific basis. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park or trail facilities that may result would be required to demonstrate site feasibility and compatibility. The Plan states that site planning of parks or trails should avoid proximity to potentially unsafe situations or incompatible uses. Review of the County General Plan Mineral Resource zones prior to approval of the project and prior to certification of the CEQA document would insure avoidance of loss of regional or locally known mineral resources. Therefore impacts from implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan are considered less than significant.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XII. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport of 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"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

Noise is commonly defined as unwanted sound in the environment. This definition reflects a subjective reaction to the characteristics of the physical phenomenon of noise. People judge the relative magnitude of sound sensation in subjective terms such as “noisiness” or “loudness.” Although elevated noise levels can result in physiological damage and hearing loss, excessive noise in the environment more commonly impairs general human well being by contributing to psychological stress and irritation. Such health effects can result when noise interferes with everyday human activities such as sleep, talking, recreation, relaxation, and tasks requiring concentration. When noise is either disturbing or annoying, whether by its pitch or loudness, it may be considered objectionable.

The overall noise level associated with a given noise environment is called the “ambient” noise level. Ambient noise can be generated by a number of sources, including mobile sources such as automobiles, trucks, trains, and airplanes, and stationary sources such as construction sites, machinery, and industrial operations. Other contributing noise sources, often referred to as “background” sources, can include the sound of birds, people talking, occasional vehicles passing by, or televisions and radios.

Sound pressure magnitude is measured and quantified using a logarithmic ratio of pressures, the scale of which gives the level of sound in decibels (dB). Environmental sound levels are usually measured in A-weighted decibels, or dBA, which is a method of taking into account the sensitivity of the human ear to various frequencies in the sound spectrum. In general, a difference of three

decibels is barely perceptible to the human ear, while a difference of 10 decibels is perceived as a doubling of loudness. A common statistical tool used to measure the ambient noise level is the average, or equivalent, sound level (L_{eq}), which is the sound level corresponding to a steady-state, A-weighted sound level containing the same total energy as a time-varying signal over a given period (usually one hour).

Factors that affect the transmission of noise between the noise source and the receptor include:

- Line of sight: Barriers, such as topography, sound walls and other structures, between a noise source and recipient can provide varying degrees of noise attenuation, particularly when placed near the noise source.
- Distance: A reduction in noise level of roughly 6 dBA occurs with each doubling of distance from a noise source, depending on the hardness of intervening surfaces.

Existing noise sources within the County include both transportation sources and non-transportation sources. Transportation sources include roadway traffic, railroads, and airplane flights. Non-transportation sources include industrial facilities, commercial locations, outdoor recreational facilities, and HVAC units.

Regulatory Setting

Federal – The federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) defines potentially harmful noise exposure (the level at which hearing loss may occur from long-term exposure) as exposure to greater than 90 dBA averaged over eight hours. For noise greater than 90 dBA, the allowable exposure time is correspondingly shorter.

State – The State of California sets interior residential standards for multifamily dwellings at 45 dBA Ldn. This interior residential standard is meant primarily for sleep and speech protection.

Local - The County General Plan Noise Element identifies several policies that regulate construction-related noise and establish acceptable noise levels and standards. Policy 6.5.1.7 requires mitigation to keep non-transportation noise below acceptable standards identified in the General Plan. Policy 6.5.1.11 outlines standards for daytime construction and applies to construction-related noise associated with the project. In residential communities, such as El Dorado Hills, maximum noise levels for non-transportation sources are 70 decibels (dB) during daytime hours, 60 dB during evening hours, and 55 dB during nighttime hours. Relevant General Plan Policies are:

Policy 6.5.1.2 Where proposed non-residential land uses are likely to produce noise levels exceeding the performance standards of Table 6-2 at existing or planned noise-sensitive uses, an acoustical analysis shall be required as part of the environmental review process so that noise mitigation may be included in the project design.

Policy 6.5.1.3 Where noise mitigation measures are required to achieve the standards of Tables 6-1 and 6-2, the emphasis of such measures shall be placed upon site planning and project design. The use of noise barriers shall be considered a means of achieving the noise standards only after all other practical design-related noise mitigation measures have been integrated into the project and the noise barriers are not incompatible with the surroundings.

Policy 6.5.1.13 When determining the significance of impacts and appropriate mitigation to reduce those impacts for new development projects, including ministerial development, the following criteria shall be taken into consideration:

- A. In areas in which ambient noise levels are in accordance with the standards in Table 6-2, increases in ambient noise levels caused by new nontransportation noise sources that exceed 5 dBA shall be considered significant; and

B. In areas in which ambient noise levels are not in accordance with the standards in Table 6-2, increases in ambient noise levels caused by new nontransportation noise sources that exceed 3 dBA shall be considered significant.

Discussion of Impacts

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: Implementation of the Master Plan document does not automatically approve projects on a site specific basis. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park or trail facilities that may result would be required to design and locate parks and trails in areas sensitive to surrounding noise sensitive land uses. The Plan states that site planning of parks or trails should be located away from noise- and privacy-sensitive uses, particularly residences, to the extent necessary to prevent intrusion. In addition to physical distance, earthen berms and plant materials may be utilized to further screen trailheads and trails from adjoining uses.

The majority of noise sources from the ultimate implementation of the Master Plan would consist of construction noise and noise from uses of the recreational facilities. The noise sources from use of the facilities would be a combination of traffic noise created by facility users. Construction noise would be temporary and subject to restrictions set forth in General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11. Depending upon the specific location of proposed individual projects, construction noise could impact sensitive land uses. This would be a potentially significant impact without mitigation. Compliance with Mitigation Measure Noise – 1 would reduce impacts from construction noise to less than significant.

Generally, noise associated with the use of local trails and Neighborhood Park facilities would be associated with local residents and it is not anticipated that the use of these classifications would generate significant noise impacts. However, development of new Community Parks and Regional Park Facilities may include improvements, amenities, and specialized facilities that would result in use by non-residents and may include sports events and special events. Noise generated from the use of Community and Regional parks may result in levels that could be a significant impact, especially in the evening hours. Compliance with Mitigation Measure Noise – 2 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: Implementation of the Master Plan document does not automatically approve projects on a site specific basis. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park or trail facilities that may result would be required to design and locate parks and trails in areas sensitive to surrounding noise sensitive land uses. Operation of the Master Plan projects, including ball fields, trails, and typical park recreational activities, would not be likely to generate ground borne vibration and/or ground borne noise. However, construction activities may result in temporary vibration and ground borne noise. Due to the minimal size of proposed ground disturbance activities for linear, pocket, and neighborhood parks, it is unlikely that construction activities would expose people to excessive ground borne vibration or excessive ground borne noise levels. The location (and therefore site-specific conditions) future facilities has not yet been determined, the exact types of construction activities and equipment cannot yet be determined. Therefore, exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground born vibration or ground borne noise, although unlikely, could result from

implementation of the Master Plan. Compliance with Mitigation Measure Noise – 2 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: As stated in b) above, noise generated from the use of Community and Regional parks may result in levels that could be a significant impact, especially in the evening hours when ambient noise levels decrease. Compliance with Mitigation Measure Noise – 2 would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: As stated in a) above, the primary source of temporary noise levels due to implementation of the Master Plan would be construction noise. Construction noise would be temporary. Depending upon the specific location of proposed individual projects, construction noise could impact sensitive land uses. This would be a potentially significant impact without mitigation. Compliance with Mitigation Measure Noise – 1 would reduce impacts from construction noise to a less than significant level.

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

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

No Impact. The proposed project does not include the construction of residential uses and is therefore not applicable

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure Noise – 1: Pursuant to General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11, the standards outlined in Tables 6-3, 6-4, and 6-5 of the County General Plan shall apply to those activities associated with actual construction of a project as long as such construction occurs between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on weekends, and on federally-recognized holidays. Exceptions are allowed if it can be shown that construction beyond these times is necessary to alleviate traffic congestion and safety hazards.

b) All construction equipment shall be fitted with factory installed muffling devices and all construction equipment shall be maintained in good working order.

c) Locate stationary construction noise sources (e.g. generators, compressors) as far away from noise sensitive land uses as is feasible.

d) Locate equipment staging areas (e.g. equipment storage, warm-up areas) as far away from noise sensitive land uses as is feasible.

Mitigation Measure Noise – 2: Planning and Design of future Parks and Trails proposing potential noise generating activities (baseball fields, basketball courts, group

picnic facilities, etc.), an acoustical analysis shall be prepared by a qualified professional consistent with the requirements outlined in the County General Plan. If potentially significant impacts are identified, the noise analysis will identify mitigation measures required to reduce all potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. The recommendations identified within the acoustical analysis shall be incorporated into final project design to the satisfaction of the El Dorado County Parks Department.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING — Would the project:		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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"/>
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

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

No Impact: Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would not result in the construction of new homes or businesses and would not facilitate the extension of infrastructure, and would therefore not induce substantial growth, either directly or indirectly. No impact would result from implementation of the Master Plan.

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

No Impact: Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would not displace any existing housing and would therefore not result in the necessity for the construction of replacement housing at an alternate location(s). No impact would result from implementation of the Master Plan.

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

No Impact: Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction or replacement housing in any other location(s). No impact would result from implementation of the Master Plan.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation is warranted.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES — Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impact

a) 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 and other public facilities.

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: Implementation of the Master Plan document does not automatically approve projects on a site specific basis. No impacts to schools would occur given that the Parks and Trails Master Plan would not result in additional residential development. No adverse affect on Parks would occur. Rather, impacts are positively affected.

Fire, police and other public facilities may be affected. The Master Plan document states that planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park or trail facilities shall be required to design and locate parks and trails in areas with adequate access for fire, emergency, and safety vehicles and equipment. Larger regional park facilities may offer events that bring in larger groups of people, thus requiring increased public services. In order to be consistent with the Master Plan guidelines, planning and design of future Parks and Trails shall coordinate with public service providers to ensure adequate services are available prior to project approval. Impacts to fire, emergency, and safety vehicles are therefore considered a less than significant impact.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XV. RECREATION — Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***
- b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

Less Than Significant Impacts: As stated in the Master Plan document, the Plan’s purpose is to provide direction and implementation strategies to guide the acquisition, development, and operation of County-owned parks and trails in the Plan Area. Detailed planning or design for individual park or trail resources is not provided. Rather, it is concerned with how the overall system of parks and trails will be developed and managed to reflect the relative priorities and needs of the current and future County population. The Master Plan does recommend which parks and trails will need additional site-specific planning work, and describes the relative priority of completing these tasks.

This first comprehensive Parks and Trails Master Plan for El Dorado County is being developed at a time when funding sources are scarce, and demand for public services is increasing. Project phasing is emphasized to break large projects into smaller efforts that will provide near-term benefit while utilizing funding as it becomes available. Implementation priorities are expressed in relative terms rather than by specific dates to provide the flexibility to take advantage of focused funding and other resources that may unexpectedly appear. Lastly, implementation responsibility is focused on collaborative efforts involving the business community, park and trail users, and other significant stakeholders with County staff used to leverage these resources.

The framework for implementation includes three elements. Level of Service guidelines establish quantitative and qualitative targets the County seeks to achieve in order to provide high quality park and trail resources for residents and visitors. The framework also includes Feasibility Criteria against which future projects are to be evaluated as they move through from concept to implementation phases. The purpose of these criteria is to identify project issues and corresponding solutions as early as possible, and make sure the limited available resources are spent wisely. Design Standards provide direction to achieve consistency in the quality of park and trail projects for public safety, quality of experience, and sustainability.

With limited fiscal resources available for park and trail projects, careful consideration shall be given to each project’s potential for successful implementation before resources are committed. The

following feasibility considerations shall be factored into the process for the planning, design, and construction of new park or trail projects, or major enhancements to existing parks and trail.

- a. Consistency with the goals and policies of the El Dorado County General Plan
- b. Consistency with goals, policies, and implementation direction of the El Dorado County Parks and Trails Master Plan
- c. Consistency with other relevant plans and regulations
- d. Potential to implement the project in meaningful phases as funding allows
- e. Availability of required funding or likely potential to secure funding for project or phase(s) of project
- f. Site conditions that may require inordinately expensive or cost-prohibitive solutions to address
- g. Opportunity to identify and resolve unknown aspects of project or site conditions that may substantially influence feasibility with minimal up-front cost
- h. Sustainability of park/trail maintenance and operations
- i. Potential for cooperative partnering to share costs and operational responsibilities
- j. Degree of stakeholder support and community consensus on the merit of the project

Impact Analysis:

Implementation of the Master Plan document does not automatically approve projects on a site specific basis. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park facilities would be required to demonstrate consistency with the policies and guidelines set forth within the Master Plan prior to approval of any proposed parks or trails that may be brought forward in the future. Impacts are therefore considered less than significant.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC — Would the project:		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Substantially increase hazards 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting:

The El Dorado County roadway network is primarily rural in character but is rapidly urbanizing in the western portion of the county. U.S. Highway 50 is the primary transportation corridor extending through the county from west to east and serves all of the county’s major population centers, including El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Diamond Springs, Placerville, Camino, and South Lake Tahoe. Other state highways, county arterials, and a network of local public and private roads constitute the remainder of the roadway system. Access to property is either directly from a fronting arterial road or from public or private local roads, many of which are narrow and unpaved.

Discussion of Impacts

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

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: Implementation of the Master Plan document does not automatically approve projects on a site specific basis. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park facilities would be required to demonstrate consistency with Master Plan guidelines and policies as well as polices of the El Dorado County General Plan. Community Parks and Regional Park Facilities may propose to include improvements, amenities, and specialized facilities and public events that would result in use by non-residents and may include special events drawing large crowds. Development of Community and Regional parks

may have the potential to result in periodic substantial increases in traffic volumes, vehicle trips, and/or congestion. Impacts related to the development of these facilities would be considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRAF – 1 would ensure that potential increases in traffic resulting from development of Community and Regional Parks are evaluated, and that feasible mitigation measures are implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

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

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated:

Relevant General Plan Policies:

Policy TC-Xd: Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions except as specified in Table TC-2. The volume to capacity ratio of the roadway segments listed in Table TC-2 shall not exceed the ratio specified in that table. Level of Service will be as defined in the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council) and calculated using the methodologies contained in that manual. Analysis periods shall be based on the professional judgment of the Department of Transportation which shall consider periods including, but not limited to, Weekday Average Daily Traffic (ADT), AM Peak Hour, and PM Peak hour traffic volumes.

Policy TC-Xe: For the purposes of this Transportation and Circulation Element, “worsen” is defined as any of the following number of project trips using a road facility at the time of issuance of a use and occupancy permit for the development project:

- A. A 2 percent increase in traffic during a.m., p.m. peak hour, or daily
- B. The addition of 100 or more daily trips, or
- C. The addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. or p.m. peak hour.

Impact Analysis:

As described within the Master Plan document, future new recreational facilities are encouraged to be developed in concert with proposed residential and school development projects. Traffic associated with use of Park facilities would be generally associated with local residents and it is not anticipated that development of new facilities or improvements to existing facilities would generate volumes of traffic exceeding established level of service standards. In fact, parks of this nature generally encourage walking and bicycling rather than vehicle trips. However, as described above, development of new Community Parks and Regional Park Facilities may include improvements, amenities, and specialized facilities that would result in use by non-residents and may include sports events and special events drawing large crowds. Development of Community and Regional parks may have the potential to result in periodic substantial increases in traffic volumes, vehicle trips, and/or congestion. Impacts related to the development of these facilities would be considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRAF – 1 would ensure that potential increases in traffic resulting from development of Community and Regional Parks are evaluated, and that feasible mitigation measures are implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?

Less Than Significant Impact: Three airports serve the west slope of El Dorado County – the Placerville Airport, the Cameron Park Airport and the Georgetown Airport. None of these airports support commercial flights. It is not anticipated that implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan would result in an increase in air traffic patterns. Therefore this remains a less than significant impact.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less Than Significant Impact: Proposed recreational facilities may involve street crossings and other design features potentially resulting in hazards to pedestrians and bicyclists if not properly designed and constructed.

Impact Analysis

Implementation of the Master Plan document does not automatically approve projects on a site specific basis. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park and trail facilities would be required to demonstrate consistency with Master Plan guidelines and policies as well as policies of the El Dorado County General Plan with regard to safe access or incompatible uses. The Master Plan provides the following guidelines to be incorporated in the planning and design of any proposed future parks or trails:

- a. Adequate parking shall be provided at parks in accordance with anticipated levels of use. On-street parking shall not cause traffic congestion or interfere with parking for and access to adjoining land uses, particularly residential neighborhoods.
- b. The main entrance to the park should be located near public transit stops or crosswalks if possible.
- c. Park entrance improvements shall include a park name sign with hours of operation.
- d. Circulation for maintenance vehicles shall be provided that does not interfere with pedestrian or bicycle circulation in the park.
- e. Adequate access for fire, emergency, and safety vehicles and equipment shall be provided.
- f. An ADA accessible circulation route shall be provided connecting all accessible features in the park.
- g. The circulation route shall provide safe access to all improvements so that users do not create their own pathways through landscape or turf areas.
- h. Sight lines shall be maintained along circulation routes so that users have adequate opportunity to see oncoming pedestrians and cyclists and to eliminate blind spots

Proposed routes (or modifications to existing routes) of ingress and egress for existing and proposed recreational facilities would be subject to consistency with the State and County-required standards prior to approval of any proposed project that may come forward. Site-specific consistency with these standards and regulations would be verified during development plan review and approval by the County Department of Transportation. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact: Although the individual locations for proposed future recreational facilities is currently unknown, any proposed facility would be subject to compliance with

emergency access standards and requirements specified by State Fire Code, CCSD, and the County General Plan.

Impact Analysis

Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park and trail facilities would be required to demonstrate consistency with Master Plan guidelines and policies as well as polices of the El Dorado County General Plan with regard to adequate emergency access. Proposed site design and configuration would be subject to review by the County Department of Transportation for compliance with the standards and guidelines described above, assuring that proposed site configurations; points of ingress and egress, and circulation routes were adequate for the proposed use and would not result in inadequate emergency access. Similarly, any proposed modifications to points of ingress/egress or circulation routes would require review for compliance with State and County required standards. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

Less Than Significant Impact: Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park and trail facilities would be required to demonstrate consistency with Master Plan guidelines and policies as well as polices of the El Dorado County General Plan with regard to adequate parking facilities. Parking standards for parks or park-like facilities are provided in Chapter 17.18.040(D) of the County Code as needing to be determined by the approving authority as provided in Section 17.18.040(D) based on the size of the facility, number of activities provided, intensity of use and impacts to surrounding community. As such, impacts are considered less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure TRAF – 1: The Planning, Design and CEQA documentation of future proposed Community or Regional Parks shall require the preparation of a Traffic Study by a qualified professional. The Traffic Study shall characterize existing conditions, and shall present a quantitative analysis of the proposed project based on site-specific conditions and shall identify trip generation and trip distribution/assignment based on individually proposed facilities. If potentially significant impacts are identified, the Traffic Study will identify mitigation measures required to reduce all potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. The recommendations identified within the Traffic Study shall be incorporated into final project design and shall be reviewed and approved by the Department Transportation prior to project approval.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS — Would the project:		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

Within El Dorado County west slope, water is supplied by sources ranging from private wells for individual residences to water companies and districts. The largest of the water districts is the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID), which provides water to most of the Town of Placerville, most of Diamond Springs, Cameron Park, El Dorado Hills, and many other unincorporated areas of the County. Other agencies include the Georgetown Divide PUD and the Grizzly Flats PUD. Wastewater throughout the PRPD area is disposed by private onsite septic systems and sewer service provided by EID. Solid waste collection and disposal service is provided by private firms that contract with the County.

Discussion of Impacts

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park and trail facilities would be required to demonstrate adequate wastewater treatment capacity and to comply with RWQCB standards and requirements concerning waste discharges.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the Master Plan document does not automatically approve projects on a site specific basis. Ultimately, larger park facilities may place additional demands on water or on wastewater treatment facilities. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park and trail facilities would be required to demonstrate adequate capacity prior to project approval. This would be a less than significant impact.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the Master Plan document does not automatically approve projects on a site specific basis. Ultimately, larger park facilities may place additional demands on water or on storm water drainage facilities. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park and trail facilities would be required to demonstrate adequate capacity prior to project approval. This would be a less than significant impact.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the Master Plan document does not automatically approve projects on a site specific basis. Ultimately, larger park facilities may place additional demands on water supplies. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park and trail facilities would be required to demonstrate adequate water capacity prior to project approval. This would be a less than significant impact.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the Master Plan would not result in an increase in residential population or number of dwelling units. However, proposed future facilities, including regional parks, may include restroom facilities generating sewage and requiring some additional wastewater treatment capacity. According to the Master Plan, future park site development and improvements would be designed in such a manner as to ensure access to existing wastewater utilities, although the required additional capacity remains unknown until such time as individual future facilities are proposed for development. Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park and trail facilities would be required to demonstrate adequate wastewater treatment capacity prior to project approval. This would be a less than significant impact with implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park and trail facilities due to implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan would be required to demonstrate compliance with federal, state, and local regulations regarding adequate waste disposal permitted capacity.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park and trail facilities due to implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan would be required to demonstrate compliance with federal, state, and local regulations.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade 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 number or restrict range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that project’s incremental effects are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

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

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated: Implementation of the Proposed Project would have the potential to degrade the quality of the existing environment. Potential impacts have been identified related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Noise, Transportation and Traffic and Utilities and Service Systems. Mitigation measures have been identified related to individual potential resource-specific impacts. These measures would reduce the level of all project-related impacts to less than significant. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the Master Plan would facilitate the continued provision of recreational facilities within El Dorado County west slope area, pursuant to standards established by the Master Plan. Where applicable, this Initial Study identifies Mitigation Measures by individual resource area as relevant to potential environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Master Plan. Mitigation measures are proposed to reduce all project-related environmental impacts to less than significant; therefore impacts are considered less than significant.

c) Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact: Projects proposed in the El Dorado County Master Plan would be constructed to applicable building codes and regulations. The facilities would therefore pose no health or safety hazards for humans.

4. DETERMINATION

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

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the 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 project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the 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 project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.


 Signature
 Name and Title: Janet Postlewait, Principal Planner


 Date

5. REPORT PREPARATION AND REFERENCES

5.1. Report Preparation

El Dorado County Department of Transportation – CEQA Lead Agency

Janet Postlewait

Principal Planner

5.2. References

- California Department of Conservation. 2008. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program: El Dorado County Important Farmland 2008. Available at: <<ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2008/eld08.pdf>>.
- El Dorado County. 2003. El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report. Prepared by EDAW. State Clearinghouse No. 2001082030.
- El Dorado County. 2004. 2004 El Dorado County General Plan: A Plan for Managed Growth and Open Roads; A Plan for Quality Neighborhoods and Traffic Relief. Adopted July 19, 2004. Available at: <<http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/Planning/GeneralPlanAdopted.html>>.
- El Dorado County. 2005. Asbestos Review Areas, Western Slope, El Dorado County, California. Available at: <<http://www.edcgov.us/Government/AirQualityManagement/Asbestos.aspx>>. July 21, 2005.
- El Dorado County Air Quality Management District. 2002. Guide to Air Quality Assessment: Determining the Significance of Air Quality Impacts Under the California Environmental Quality Act. First Edition. February.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2011. FEMA Map Service Center, Current FEMA Issued Flood Maps: El Dorado County, California, unincorporated area, no. 06017C0704E. Available at: <<http://www.msc.fema.gov/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/CategoryDisplay?catalogId=10001&storeId=10001&categoryId=12001&langId=-1&userType=G&type=1&future=false>>.
- Governor's Office of Planning and Research. 2008. Technical advisory: CEQA and climate change: Addressing climate change through California Environmental Quality Act Review. Available at: <Sacramento, CA. <http://www.opr.ca.gov/ceqa/pdfs/june08-ceqa.pdf>>. June 19, 2008.
- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 2009. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), Rarefind Version 3.1.1.
- California Energy Commission. 2009. California Energy Commission's Climate Change Activities. Retrieved June 1, 2009 from: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/climatechange/index.html>.
- California Native Plant Society. 2001. *Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California* (sixth edition). Sacramento, CA;

This page is intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX A

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan

**Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan
for the**

**EL DORADO COUNTY
PARKS AND TRAILS MASTER PLAN**

**CEQA Lead Agency:
El Dorado County**

Prepared: January 2012

Adopted by Board of Supervisors on: _____

Introduction

Purpose

El Dorado County (County) Department of Transportation (DOT) has prepared an Initial Study (IS) and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the El Dorado County Parks and Trails Master Plan (Master Plan). The Master Plan provides direction and implementation strategies to guide the acquisition, development, and operation of County-owned parks and trails in the Plan Area. Goals and policies are set forth as guidance toward how the overall system of parks and trails will be developed and managed to best reflect the priorities and needs of the current and future population of El Dorado County. This Master Plan does not provide detailed planning or design for individual park or trail resources. That will occur on a site specific basis as projects come forward in the future.

As described in the IS/MND, the project incorporates a number of design and standard construction measures to minimize adverse effects on the environment. The IS/MND also identified several mitigation measures that are required to reduce potentially significant impacts to levels that are less than significant. This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) describes a program for ensuring that these mitigation measures are implemented in conjunction with the Project. The County DOT, as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), is responsible for overseeing the implementation and administration of this MMRP. The County will designate a staff member to manage the MMRP. Duties of the staff member responsible for program coordination will include conducting routine inspections and reporting activities, coordinating with the project construction contractor, coordinating with regulatory agencies, and ensuring enforcement measures are taken.

Regulatory Framework

California Public Resources Code § 21081.6 and California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15097 require public agencies to adopt MMRPs when they approve projects under an MND. The reporting and monitoring plans must be adopted when a public agency makes findings pursuant to CEQA so the mitigation requirements can be made conditions of project approval.

Format of This Plan

The MMRP summarizes impacts and mitigation measures identified and described in the project IS/MND. An impact number and statement are provided for each potentially significant impact based on the sequence in which they are discussed, and the corresponding specific mitigation measures are described in this MMRP. Mitigation measures are followed by an implementation description, the criteria used to determine the effectiveness of the mitigation, the timeframe for implementation, and the party responsible for monitoring the implementation of the measure.

Implementation of mitigation measures is ultimately the responsibility of the County Parks Department, currently under the purview of the Department of Transportation. Each mitigation measure in this plan contains a "Verified By" signature line, which will be signed by the County project manager when the measure has been fully implemented and no further actions or monitoring are necessary for the implementation or effectiveness of the measure.

EL DORADO COUNTY PARKS AND TRAILS MASTER PLAN MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION Impacts and Associated Monitoring or Reporting Measures

IMPACT BIO-a: Implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan may potentially have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on 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.

Mitigation Measures BIO – 1 and BIO – 2 are proposed as general mitigation to be incorporated into project design relevant to potential impacts to special-status species. Compliance with BIO-1 and 2 would ensure that a Biological Resource Assessment is conducted to identify potential occurrence of special-status species; therefore impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measure BIO – 1: Prior to preparation of the CEQA document, and in conjunction with design and planning for the construction of park or trail facilities on undeveloped sites, a Biological Resources Assessment, field survey and technical report shall be prepared. The surveys and reports would be conducted by a qualified biologist, would identify the potential for special-status species to occur on the site (state or federally listed or California species of concern), would recommend measures to avoid impacts to these species and would provide recommendations for any further required studies or regulatory permitting that may be required for the site. The Biological Resources Assessment would also identify sensitive habitat areas including potentially jurisdictional waters on the property that may be subject to federal or state jurisdiction.

Mitigation Measure BIO – 2: If construction is proposed during the raptor breeding season (March 1 to September 1), a pre-construction raptor nest survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist. If no active nests are found during the pre-construction survey, no further mitigation is required. If active nests are found, a quarter-mile (1320 feet) initial temporary nest disturbance buffer area shall be established. If project related activities within the temporary nest disturbance buffer are determined to be necessary during the nesting season (approximately March 1 to September 1), then an on-site biologist/monitor experienced with raptor behavior shall be retained by the project proponent to monitor the nest, and shall along with the project proponent, consult with CDFG to determine the best course of action necessary to avoid nest abandonment or take of individuals. Work may be allowed to proceed within the temporary nest disturbance buffer if raptors are not exhibiting agitated behavior. The designated on-site biologist/monitor shall be on-site daily or less if approved by CDFG while construction related activities are taking place and shall have the authority to stop work if raptors are exhibiting agitated behavior.

If construction is proposed during the nesting season for non-raptor migratory birds (February 1 through August 15), a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist within 15 days of the start of project related activities. If nests of migratory birds are detected on site, or within 100 feet of the project site, the project proponent shall consult with CDFG to determine the size of a suitable buffer in which no new site disturbance is permitted until August 15, or until the qualified biologist determines that the young are foraging independently, or the nest has been abandoned.

Implementation for BIO – 1 and BIO – 2: The County will retain the services of a qualified biologist to implement the measures as described above.

Effectiveness Criteria: The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying the implementation of the above referenced measures.

Timing: During preparation of environmental document, as well as Pre-Construction and Construction Phases

Verified By: _____ **Date:** _____
County Project Manager

Impact BIO-b: Implementation of the Parks and Trails Master Plan may have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mitigation Measure BIO – 3 is proposed as general mitigation to be incorporated relevant to any identified potential impacts to resources regulated by Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Codes. Compliance with Mitigation Measures BIO-3 would ensure that the County coordinates with CDFG related to any impacts to CDFG jurisdictional resources and requires the County to enter into a Streambed Alteration Agreement with CDFG if needed; therefore impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure BIO – 3: If it is determined that project development would affect the bed, bank or associated riparian vegetation (e.g. native oak trees) of any creek or stream on the project site, a Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be obtained from CDFG, pursuant to § 1600 of the California Fish and Game Codes prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit by El Dorado County. If required, the County shall coordinate with CDFG in developing mitigation appropriate for potential impacts to riparian and/or wetland impacts and shall abide by the conditions of any executed agreement.

Implementation for BIO – 3: The County will retain the services of a qualified biologist to implement the measures as described above.

Effectiveness Criteria: The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying the implementation of the above referenced measures.

Timing: During preparation of environmental document, as well as Pre-Construction and Construction Phases.

Verified By: _____ **Date:** _____
County Project Manager

Impact BIO-c: Implementation of the El Dorado County Parks and Trails Master Plan may result in future development in areas containing federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Mitigation Measures BIO – 4 and BIO – 5 are proposed as general mitigation to be incorporated into project design relevant to potential impacts to wetlands and waters of the U.S. potentially subject to Section 404 of CWA. Compliance with BIO-4 and BIO-5 would ensure that the County evaluates the potential presence of jurisdictional waters through the preparation of a jurisdictional delineation, requires Corps verification of the delineation; and requires the County to obtain Section 404 and Section 401 authorization for the placements of fill in any jurisdictional waters. Impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measure BIO – 4: Prior to preparation of the CEQA document, and in conjunction with design and planning for the construction of park or trail facilities on undeveloped sites, if potentially jurisdictional wetland features occur on the site, the County shall comply with all USACOE regulatory requirements relevant to activities proposed within areas of jurisdictional aquatic features.

Mitigation Measure BIO – 5: If it is determined by park site design, that the placement of fill will occur in jurisdictional waters of the U.S., a Section 404 Clean Water Act permit from the Corps and a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) shall be obtained, as applicable, prior to commencement of development activities.

Implementation for BIO – 4 and BIO – 5: The County will retain the services of a qualified specialist to implement the measures as described above.

Effectiveness Criteria: The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying the implementation of the above referenced measures.

Timing: During preparation of environmental document, as well as Pre-Construction and Construction Phases.

Verified By: _____ **Date:** _____
County Project Manager

Impact BIO-d: Implementation of the El Dorado County Parks and Trails Master Plan may 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.

Wildlife movement and migratory corridors within El Dorado County typically occur along riparian corridors with well-developed riparian vegetation and surrounding undeveloped lands. Mitigation Measures BIO – 1 through BIO – 6 are proposed as general mitigation to be incorporated into future planning, design and CEQA process relevant to potential impacts to protected biological resources. Compliance with BIO-1 through BIO-6 would ensure that the County evaluates the potential presence of these resources and requires the County to coordinate with resource agency having jurisdiction to obtain authorization under relevant federal and State regulatory requirements. Impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Implementation for BIO – 1 through 6: The County will retain the services of a qualified biologist to conduct a biological assessment to implement the measures as described above.

Effectiveness Criteria: The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying the implementation of the above referenced measures.

Timing: During preparation of environmental document, as well as Pre-Construction and Construction Phases.

Verified By: _____ **Date:** _____
County Project Manager

Impact BIO-e: Implementation of the El Dorado County Parks and Trails Master Plan may conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Mitigation Measure BIO – 6 is proposed as general mitigation to be incorporated into future planning, design and CEQA process relevant to potential impacts to oak woodlands. Compliance with BIO-6 would ensure that the County evaluates and mitigates the potential presence of these resources to reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure BIO – 6: Prior to preparation of the CEQA document, and in conjunction with design and planning for the construction of park or trail facilities on undeveloped sites, if it is determined that protected oak trees have a potential to occur on the undeveloped site, an Arborist Survey and Arborist Report shall be prepared for the site by an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA)-certified Arborist to determine any mitigation that may be required to maintain consistency with the El Dorado County Oak Woodland Management Plan, which sets forth guidance on Policy 7.4.4.4 of the El Dorado County General Plan.

Implementation for BIO – 6: The County will retain the services of a qualified arborist to conduct arborist surveys and report to implement the measure as described above.

Effectiveness Criteria: The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying the implementation of the above referenced measures.

Timing: During preparation of environmental document, as well as Pre-Construction and Construction Phases as appropriate.

Verified By: _____ **Date:** _____
County Project Manager

Impact CR-a: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5.

Improvements and future park facilities may have the potential to impact historic resources, depending on individual site locations and adjacent resources. Until such time as individual projects are determined, potential historic significance cannot be analyzed. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Compliance with Mitigation Measures CR – 1 and CR – 2 would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure CR – 1: Prior to preparation of the CEQA document, and in conjunction with design and planning for the construction of park or trail facilities on undeveloped sites the site shall be evaluated for the presence of historic resources. If it is determined that on-site resources have the potential for historic significance, as indicated by age or previous inclusion on a list of designated historic resources, a qualified professional architectural historian to evaluate the historical significance of on-site resources.

Mitigation Measure CR – 2: Prior to preparation of the CEQA document, and in conjunction with design and planning for the construction of park or trail facilities on undeveloped sites a qualified archaeologist shall conduct the following activities: (1) conduct a record search at the North Central Information Center located at California State University, Sacramento and other appropriate historical repositories, (2) conduct field surveys where appropriate, and (3) prepare technical reports, where appropriate, meeting California Office of Historic preservation Standards (Archaeological Resource Management Reports). All recommendations to avoid adverse impacts to archaeological resources shall be incorporated into project design and construction as specified by a qualified archaeologist.

Implementation for CR-1 and CR-2: The County will retain the services of a qualified professional architectural historian and a qualified archaeologist to implement the measure as described above and as appropriate.

Effectiveness Criteria: The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying the implementation of the above referenced measures.

Timing: During preparation of environmental document, as well as Pre-Construction and Construction Phases as appropriate.

Verified By: _____ **Date:** _____
County Project Manager

Impact CR-b: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.

Improvements and future park facilities may have the potential to impact archaeological resources, depending on individual site locations and adjacent resources. Until such time as individual projects are determined, potential historic significance cannot be analyzed. Implementation of the Master Plan may involve eventual construction activities including excavation, trenching, grading, and other ground-disturbing activities which would have the potential to result in adverse changes to archaeological resources. Compliance with mitigation measures CR – 1 through CR – 5 would reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure CR – 3: Should buried archaeological deposits or artifacts be inadvertently exposed during the course of any eventual construction activity, work shall cease in the immediate area and the County Parks and Recreation Department shall be immediately notified. A qualified archaeologist will be retained to document the find, assess its significance, and recommend further treatment.

Implementation for CR – 3: The County will retain the services of a qualified professional archaeologist to implement the measure as appropriate as described above.

Effectiveness Criteria: The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying the implementation of the above referenced measures.

Timing: During Construction Phases as appropriate.

Verified By: _____ **Date:** _____
County Project Manager

Impact CR-c: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.

Implementation of the Master Plan would involve planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation and possible eventual construction activities including excavation, trenching, grading, and other activities may have the potential to result in adverse changes to paleontological resources. Therefore impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Compliance with Mitigation Measure CR – 4 would reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure CR – 4: If evidence of a paleontological site is uncovered during grading or other construction activities, work shall be halted within 100 feet of the find and the County Parks and Recreation Department shall immediately be notified. A qualified paleontologist shall be retained to conduct an on-site evaluation and provide recommendations for removal and/or preservation. Work on the project site shall not resume until the paleontologist has had a reasonable time to conduct an examination and implement mitigation measures deemed appropriate and necessary by the County to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Implementation for CR – 4: The County will retain the services of a qualified professional paleontologist to implement the measure as appropriate as described above.

Effectiveness Criteria: The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying the implementation of the above referenced measures.

Timing: During Construction Phases as appropriate.

Verified By: _____ **Date:** _____
County Project Manager

Impact CR-d: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Although unlikely, the discovery of human remains would be possible during ground disturbing activities associated with future projects determined after implementation of the Master Plan. Improvements may have the potential to impact human remains with future projects determined after implementation of the Master Plan. Until such time as individual projects are determined, potential significance cannot be analyzed. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Compliance with Mitigation Measure CR – 5 would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure CR – 5: In the event that any human remains or any associated funerary objects are encountered during construction, all work will cease within the vicinity of the discovery and the County Parks and Recreation Department shall be immediately notified. In accordance with CEQA (Section 1064.5) and the California Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5), the Sacramento County coroner should be contacted immediately. If the human remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, who will notify and appoint a Most Likely Descendent (MLD). The MLD will work with a qualified archaeologist to decide the proper treatment of the human remains and any associated funerary objects. Construction activities in the immediate vicinity will not resume until a notice-to-proceed is issued.

Implementation for CR – 5: The County will retain the services of a qualified professional to implement the measure as appropriate as described above.

Effectiveness Criteria: The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying the implementation of the above referenced measures.

Timing: During Construction Phases as appropriate.

Verified By: _____ **Date:** _____
County Project Manager

Impact HYDRO –b: Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., 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).

Planning, design and appropriate CEQA documentation of any proposed park facilities that may result would be required to demonstrate adequate water supply prior to project approval. It is unlikely that trail development would require public access to drinking water and irrigation. It is unknown to what extent proposed future development of recreational facilities would result in a depletion of groundwater supplies. Therefore impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Compliance with mitigation measures HYDRO – 1 and HYDRO – 2 would reduce potential impacts related to groundwater supplies to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure HYDRO – 1: The Planning and Design of future parks shall consider:

- Water-conserving building design and equipment in new construction;
- Water-conserving landscaping and other conservation measures as applicable to individual project sites; and
- Retrofitting of existing facilities with water-conserving devices.

Verification of water conservation measures in project design shall be documented by the Parks Department prior to project approval.

Mitigation Measure HYDRO – 2: To the extent practicable, the County Parks Department shall incorporate the use of reclaimed water in the design of irrigation systems for new park facilities as well as proposed improvements to existing recreational/park facilities.

Implementation for HYDRO -1 and HYDRO - 2: The County staff in charge of the Planning and Design of future parks shall demonstrate conformance with the above measures. .

Effectiveness Criteria: The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying the implementation of the above referenced measures.

Timing: Prior to project approval as appropriate.

Verified By: _____ **Date:** _____
County Project Manager

Impact NOISE – a: Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies.

Depending upon the specific location of proposed individual projects, construction noise could impact sensitive land uses. This would be a potentially significant impact without mitigation. Compliance with Mitigation Measure Noise – 1 and Noise 2 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure Noise – 1: Pursuant to General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11, the standards outlined in Tables 6-3, 6-4, and 6-5 of the County General Plan shall apply to those activities associated with actual construction of a project as long as such construction occurs between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on weekends, and on federally-recognized holidays. Exceptions are allowed if it can be shown that construction beyond these times is necessary to alleviate traffic congestion and safety hazards.

b) All construction equipment shall be fitted with factory installed muffling devices and all construction equipment shall be maintained in good working order.

c) Locate stationary construction noise sources (e.g. generators, compressors) as far away from noise sensitive land uses as is feasible.

d) Locate equipment staging areas (e.g. equipment storage, warm-up areas) as far away from noise sensitive land uses as is feasible.

Mitigation Measure Noise – 2: Planning and Design of future Parks and Trails proposing potential noise generating activities (baseball fields, basketball courts, group picnic facilities, etc.), an acoustical analysis shall be prepared by a qualified professional consistent with the requirements outlined in the County General Plan. If potentially significant impacts are identified, the noise analysis will identify mitigation measures required to reduce all potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. The recommendations identified within the acoustical analysis shall be incorporated into final project design to the satisfaction of the El Dorado County Parks Department.

Implementation for NOISE – 1 and NOISE -2: The County staff in charge of the Planning and Design and construction of future parks shall demonstrate conformance with the above measures.

Effectiveness Criteria: The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying the implementation of the above referenced measures.

Timing: Prior to project approval as appropriate.

Verified By: _____ **Date:** _____
County Project Manager

Impact NOISE – b: Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels.

Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground born vibration or ground borne noise, although unlikely, could result from implementation of the Master Plan. Compliance with Mitigation Measure Noise – 2 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Impact NOISE – c: A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As stated in b) above, noise generated from the use of Community and Regional parks may result in levels that could be a significant impact, especially in the evening hours when ambient noise levels decrease. Compliance with Mitigation Measure Noise – 2 would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure Noise – 2: Planning and Design of future Parks and Trails proposing potential noise generating activities (baseball fields, basketball courts, group picnic facilities, etc.), an acoustical analysis shall be prepared by a qualified professional consistent with the requirements outlined in the County General Plan. If potentially significant impacts are identified, the noise analysis will identify mitigation measures required to reduce all potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. The recommendations identified within the acoustical analysis shall be incorporated into final project design to the satisfaction of the El Dorado County Parks Department.

Implementation for NOISE – 2: See Implementation for Impact NOISE-a above.

Impact NOISE – d: A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As stated in Impact a) above, the primary source of temporary noise levels due to implementation of the Master Plan would be construction noise. Construction noise would be temporary. Depending upon the specific location of proposed individual projects, construction noise could impact sensitive land uses. This would be a potentially significant impact without mitigation. Compliance with Mitigation Measure Noise – 1 would reduce impacts from construction noise to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure Noise – 1: Pursuant to General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11, the standards outlined in Tables 6-3, 6-4, and 6-5 of the County General Plan shall apply to those activities associated with actual construction of a project as long as such construction occurs between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on weekends, and on federally-recognized holidays. Exceptions are allowed if it can be shown that construction beyond these times is necessary to alleviate traffic congestion and safety hazards.

b) All construction equipment shall be fitted with factory installed muffling devices and all construction equipment shall be maintained in good working order.

c) Locate stationary construction noise sources (e.g. generators, compressors) as far away from noise sensitive land uses as is feasible.

d) Locate equipment staging areas (e.g. equipment storage, warm-up areas) as far away from noise sensitive land uses as is feasible.

Implementation for NOISE – 1: See Implementation for Impact NOISE - a above.

Impact TRAF – a: Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections).

Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRAF – 1 would ensure that potential increases in traffic resulting from development of Community and Regional Parks are evaluated, and that feasible mitigation measures are implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

Impact TRAF – b: Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

Compliance with Mitigation Measure TRAF – 1 would ensure that potential increases in traffic resulting from development of Community and Regional Parks are evaluated, and that feasible mitigation measures are implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure TRAF – 1: The Planning, Design and CEQA documentation of future proposed Community or Regional Parks shall require the preparation of a Traffic Study by a qualified professional. The Traffic Study shall characterize existing conditions, and shall present a quantitative analysis of the proposed project based on site-specific conditions and shall identify trip generation and trip distribution/assignment based on individually proposed facilities. If potentially significant impacts are identified, the Traffic Study will identify mitigation measures required to reduce all potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. The recommendations identified within the Traffic Study shall be incorporated into final project design and shall be reviewed and approved by the Department Transportation prior to project approval.

Implementation for TRAF – 1: The County staff in charge of the Planning and Design and construction of future parks shall demonstrate conformance with the above measures.

Effectiveness Criteria: The County will prepare and keep on file documentation verifying the implementation of the above referenced measures.

Timing: Prior to project approval as appropriate.

Verified By: _____ **Date:** _____
County Project Manager