

From: Eileen Crim

LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE 12/6/10

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY

2010 DEC -6 AM 9:35

Appendix A. Recirculation of "Chapter 4. Other CEQA Considerations"

This chapter replaces "Chapter 4. Other CEQA Considerations" published as part of the original draft EIR for the Master Plan. The original cumulative analysis relied on the County General Plan and related EIR. Since publication of the General Plan EIR, a court has found that the cumulative analysis included in the General Plan EIR is inadequate. To ensure that the Master Plan EIR does not rely on the findings contained in the General Plan EIR, the "Cumulative Impacts" section of this chapter has been revised and recirculated for public review. The cumulative impacts analysis contained in this chapter no longer relies on the General Plan EIR. This section instead relies on reasonably foreseeable development in the corridor as described in Table 4-1 and illustrated on Figure 4-1.

This chapter provides an assessment of four types of environmental impacts that are required content in an EIR. These include an assessment of irreversible environmental changes, cumulative impacts, growth-inducing impacts, and significant and unavoidable adverse impacts.

Irreversible Environmental Changes

Section 15126(f) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to include a discussion of significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from implementation of a project. Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would result in the commitment of nonrenewable natural resources (such as gravel, petroleum products, and others) and slowly renewable resources, such as wood products for individual project construction. Operation and maintenance of the corridor would also require further commitment of energy resources (in the form petroleum products for vehicle operations and herbicides). Regarding fiscal resources, because no individual projects are included with the Master Plan, this plan does not obligate the County to an expenditure of public funds. Maintenance of the corridor is a current obligation of the County under the Reciprocal Use and Funding Agreement between the member agencies of the SPTC-JPA. The commitment of public funds for individual projects, increased maintenance, or additional staff time (such as sheriff's department personnel) will be decided by the Board of Supervisors. Although the proposed Master Plan would result in the irreversible commitment of resources, implementation of the Master Plan would provide several public benefits, including enhanced recreational opportunities and preservation of a valuable corridor for future transportation use.

Cumulative Impacts

Requirements for Cumulative Impact Analysis

The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15130) requires a reasonable analysis of the significant cumulative impacts of a proposed project. Cumulative impact refers to “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15355). As defined by the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts are:

the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time (CEQA Guidelines Section 15355[b]).

Approach to Cumulative Impact Analysis

As noted in the initial study (Appendix A), the Master Plan has the potential to result in significant cumulative impacts. These cumulative impacts would result from the project-specific impacts identified in the DEIR in concert with other reasonably foreseeable projects in the project vicinity.

The basis for cumulative impacts can consist of a list of specific projects or a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan that is designated to evaluate regional or area-wide conditions (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130). As the status of the County General Plan and related EIR are uncertain, the cumulative impact analyses presented below rely on the “list” approach. Information on past, present, and probable future projects was obtained from El Dorado County staff. For purposes of this analysis, all projects within 1 mile of the corridor were considered to have potential cumulative effects, and were included in this analysis. Table 4-1 presents a list of projects considered in this cumulative analysis. The location of these projects is presented in Figure 4-1. These projects include:

- ◆ projects that have been approved but are not built or are under construction; and
- ◆ projects for which an application has been received.

Table 4-1.
Cumulative Development Projects (Major) within 1 Mile of the
Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor

Project	Type	Size	Status
Specific Plans			
Carson Creek Specific Plan	Age-restricted residential, commercial, research and development, parks, schools, stream corridors/wetlands	716 acres, 1,700 DUs	TM amended 09/99; not yet constructed
Valley View Specific Plan	Residential, commercial/office, public/semi-public, parks and recreation, and open space/buffer	2,037 acres, 2,840 DUs	Specific plan approved 9/99; no TM approval
Tentative Maps			
Royal Estates (TM 86-1060)	Residential, equestrian-oriented, trails, open space	148 acres, 72 DUs	First phase finalized; second phase expires 01/00
Ponderosa Fifty (TM 89-1156)	Residential, open space, park	90 acres, 90 DUs	In litigation
Sierra Gold Condominiums (TM 94-1291)	Residential	23 acres, 92 DUs	On hold
Marble Valley (TM 95-1298)	Residential	2,263 acres, 398 DUs	TM approved 6/97; not yet constructed
Kingsville Country Club (TM 97-1335)	Residential, 18-hole golf course	213 acres, 38 DUs	TM approved 6/98; not yet constructed
Sawmill Creek (TM 98-1350R)	Residential	144 acres, 24 DUs	On hold

Notes: DU = dwelling unit.
 TM = tentative map.

Source: El Dorado County 1999.

Table 1
 The 2008-2009 Performance Report (Miles) of the
 Department of Transportation

Category	2008	2009	2010	2011
Construction	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Operations	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Maintenance	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Administration	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Research	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Education	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Public Information	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Legal	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Information Technology	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Other	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000

Assessment of Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative Master Plan related impacts were analyzed for the same resource topics analyzed in Chapters 3A through 3J of this EIR. The cumulative impacts for each of these resource topics are described below.

Land Use and Aesthetics

The corridor is within a predominately rural area of the County. Land uses along the corridor range from rural agricultural along the western portion to more intensely developed areas along the eastern portion of the corridor. The reasonably foreseeable major projects within 1 mile of the Sacramento-Placerville transportation corridor include the Carson Creek Specific Plan, which encompasses 2,434 dwelling units in a mixed use development on 716 acres, and the Valley View Specific Plan, which proposes 2,840 dwelling units in a mixed use development on 2,037 acres. These projects would be located at the western end of the corridor. Six other tentative maps have been filed for residential developments dispersed along the length of the corridor and within 1 mile of the corridor. These developments range from 92 dwelling units on 23 acres to 398 dwelling units on 2,263 acres. A total of 5,254 dwelling units are planned within one mile of the corridor.

Uses proposed under the Master Plan including rail transport, utilities, and trail uses are compatible with existing and proposed future uses such as the residential and mixed use projects described above and listed in Table 4-1. The proposed Master Plan has been found to be compatible with these existing, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable projects. Therefore, cumulative land use and aesthetic impacts are considered *less than significant*.

Geology

Future development of the projects listed in Table 4-1 has the potential to increase erosion in the project vicinity. If the primarily residential future projects did not comply with the County's grading ordinance, cumulative erosion impacts could occur. As discussed in Chapter 3B, "Geology", erosion impacts related to construction were determined to be less than significant because each project will be required to comply with the County's grading ordinance, including the preparation of an erosion control plan. The application of this ordinance to other development in the area is assumed to also mitigate potential cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level.

In evaluating the proposed project, it was determined that off-trail activities could result in a significant erosion potential. With application of the mitigation measure included in this EIR (Mitigation Measure GEO-1.1), erosion impacts will be isolated within the corridor and will not create a cumulative impact with other surrounding land uses. Therefore, cumulative impacts on geology are considered *less than significant*.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Future development of the projects listed in Table 4-1 has the potential to expose people to flood hazards, increase stormwater runoff, and increase discharge of surface pollutants. As described in Chapter 3C, "Water Resources", over the last several years, large flood flows have overwhelmed or bypassed drainage corridors designed into the rail corridor. As part of the proposed program, drainage facilities will direct flood flows into their planned channels, and undersized conduits will be properly sized and maintained. On a cumulative basis, these improvements should have a beneficial impact on surrounding properties and on the handling of any drainage to the area from future cumulative projects. Increases in stormwater runoff resulting from the proposed program will not add a significant amount to regional drainages and will not significantly add to other regional flows to form a cumulative impact. Regarding surface water pollutants, the proposed program will generate potential contamination from small oil and fuel discharges leaked into the railbed by train operations and some herbicide residue. The amounts of potential contaminants from the program is expected to be small and distributed through a number of drainages in the area. The contamination is likely to be similar to a small roadway, and is not expected to add significantly with other projects in the area. Therefore, cumulative impacts on water resources were determined to be *less than significant*.

Air Quality

Currently El Dorado County is classified as nonattainment for the state and federal ozone standards, the state 24-hour PM10 standard, and is unclassified for CO. The proposed program was evaluated based on standards designed by the El Dorado County APCD and the state to assess a program's overall impact on a project and cumulative basis. Given the levels of development contained in the cumulative projects assessed, these will combine with the proposed program on a regional basis, and lead to a cumulative *significant* impact on air quality resources.

Transportation and Circulation

Future development of the projects listed in Table 4-1 has the potential to increase traffic and affect circulation in the project vicinity. The future projects are primarily residential projects and also include open space and recreational uses. These other projects would likely affect traffic at different times of the day (commuter traffic) than the traffic generated by the Master Plan (recreation-oriented). Traffic impacts within the proposed Master Plan corridor are assessed in Section 3E, "Transportation and Circulation", of this EIR and focus on traffic delays and parking. Impacts from traffic delays are related to potential detours or lane closures while work is done on roadway crossings and would be temporary in nature. Although project timing is not known at this time, future projects, as described in Table 4-1, could be under construction simultaneously in the area that could add cumulatively to temporary construction delays. Given the short duration of these expected delays, and the need to coordinate any work with the El

Dorado County Department of Transportation, no significant cumulative impacts are expected. For impacts related to parking, the demand for parking is specific to the proposed program (because of its isolated location) and is not expected to cumulatively add to the impacts of other projects. Therefore, cumulative impacts will be *less than significant*.

Biological Resources

Future development of the projects listed in Table 4-1 has the potential to damage or destroy sensitive habitats and to impact sensitive species. In evaluating cumulative impacts, the 28-mile corridor can be seen as a transect through this portion of the County. All of the habitats and species suspected of being within the corridor are likely to occur in the surrounding area as well. As the areas around the corridor develop, their potential impacts are likely to be similar to the proposed program.

As defined in Chapter 3F, "Biological Resources", the proposed program was found to have potentially significant impacts related to damage or destruction of sensitive habitats and potential adverse impacts on sensitive species. The Master Plan program is designed to reduce significant impacts on habitats and species, and would represent an individually minor project. However, the proposed project, in conjunction with the development of 2,753 acres associated with the Carson Creek and Valley View Specific Plans and an additional 2,881 acres associated with other projects, would result in a considerable effect on sensitive habitats and species.

The project and other projects within 1 mile of the transportation corridor would include mitigation measures to reduce impacts on sensitive habitats and sensitive species. However, the Master Plan program would add to a significant cumulative impact, and is therefore *significant and unavoidable*.

Public Health and Safety

Future development of the projects listed in Table 4-1 has the potential to impact public health and safety. However, as discussed in Chapter 3G of the EIR, most impacts would be isolated to the corridor or the immediate vicinity. Thus, development of the project would not contribute to cumulative impacts from other projects. Because these materials are strictly regulated by state and federal agencies, the proposed Master Plan and other foreseeable developments along the corridor are assumed to comply with all pertinent regulations regarding the use of hazardous materials, thereby minimizing the likelihood of hazardous materials-related emergencies. Furthermore existing disclosure requirements and emergency response capabilities along the corridor would provide adequate response to events resulting from any cumulative development.

The Master Plan could also result in traffic hazards from road crossings with the corridor. While traffic associated with the development of future projects will incrementally increase the public safety impacts from the additional traffic conflicting with rail and trail users, these impacts can be mitigated with the same measures proposed in Chapter 3G. Therefore, the cumulative impact on public health and safety is considered to be *less than significant*.

Noise

In conjunction with development of the project, future development of the projects listed in Table 4-1 has the potential to increase cumulative noise levels in the project vicinity. Rail activities, proposed under the Master Plan, have the potential to increase existing noise levels and expose people to significantly higher levels of noise than is currently present in the area. Cumulative projects would also incrementally increase traffic in the program area, with associated noise increases, although cumulative traffic noise near the program corridor is not expected to result in a significant impact. Impacts related to vibration are not expected to add cumulatively with other development in the area as this cumulative development would be primarily residential.

Impacts on local residents near corridor/roadway crossings were found to be a significant unavoidable impact. Because noise impacts associated with operation of the rail component are considered significant and unavoidable (as discussed in Section 3H), the cumulative noise impacts of the project are also considered *significant and unavoidable*.

Public Services

No cumulative impacts are anticipated to occur to public services and utilities due to development of the program. Implementation of the primarily residential and some mixed use projects in the vicinity has the potential to impact the provision of fire and police services. For public services (such as police and fire), the cumulative projects have been mitigated to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. With the mitigations included in the Master Plan EIR and the cumulative projects, the cumulative impacts on public services are expected to be *less than significant*.

Cultural Resources

Future development of the projects listed in Table 4-1 has the potential to damage cultural resources that are located on or under the respective construction sites. If resources are found and are not properly recorded or removed, then a cumulative loss of cultural resources could occur.

As discussed in Chapter 3J, "Cultural Resources", the potential for unknown cultural resource sites within the corridor and areas surrounding the corridor is possible. With application of the mitigation measures provided in this EIR and standard discovery conditions included in project approvals, the cumulative impacts on cultural resources are expected to be *less than significant*.

Growth-Inducing Impacts

Pursuant to Section 15126 (g) of State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must address whether a project will directly or indirectly foster growth. Section 15126 reads as follows:

[An EIR shall] discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of waste water treatment plant, might, for example allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may further tax existing community service facilities so consideration must be given to this impact. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

As discussed in this section, this analysis evaluates whether the proposed Master Plan will directly or indirectly induce economic, population, or housing growth in the surrounding environment.

Direct Growth-Inducing Impacts in the Surrounding Environment

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan provides for an existing railroad right-of-way corridor to be incorporated into the County's regional trail plan and allows the corridor to be used for the development of rail, trail, maintenance, and underground utility activity. While certain aspects of the Master Plan have the potential to indirectly induce economic growth through increased visitation to the area, the proposed Master Plan would not result in the direct generation of population or housing growth. Job growth associated with the proposed Master Plan would be minimal. Workers performing future project-related construction would most likely come from local or nearby communities and would not create a need for short- or long-term or housing.

Indirect Growth-Inducing Impacts in the Surrounding Environment

At the present time, the County has not developed specific project proposals for use of the corridor. However, future development within the corridor may have the potential to indirectly induce commercial growth in areas near the corridor. Given the scale and types of uses planned for the corridor, future commercial growth caused by the proposed program is expected to be limited and will likely be an incremental addition to commercial demand already existing in the surrounding area. In locating potential commercial uses, the County would use the guidance provided in the El Dorado County General Plan:

The El Dorado County General Plan establishes Community Region and Rural Center Planning Concept areas which essentially serve as urban/suburban development limit lines. Since the corridor travels through the El Dorado Hills Community Region, Latrobe Rural Center, Shingle Springs Community Region, and the El Dorado/Diamond Springs Community Region, any proposals for commercial or other development in support of the corridor would be restricted to these areas in conformance with the General Plan. The portions of the corridor within the Rural Region Planning Concept Areas would not permit development of commercial or other uses not considered compatible with these areas. (Rivas pers. comm.)

Many times, the addition or substantial alteration of public services and/or infrastructure in an area may result in growth-inducing issues, whereas such alterations to facilities could facilitate (or accommodate) growth. The proposed Master Plan does not require the extension or substantial alteration to the infrastructure or public services in the area. The proposed Master Plan does allow for the placement of infrastructure within the Master Plan corridor, thereby encouraging the development of infrastructure trunk lines in this area as a result of the corridor's location and continuity. Depending on the type of infrastructure installed, this could provide additional services to the surrounding rural area.

Current development patterns in this area are driven by the desire of the County to maintain the rural nature of the area, and not by a lack of infrastructure. Therefore, it is not expected that this project would indirectly induce growth into the areas surrounding the Master Plan corridor. Therefore, the Master Plan is not considered to be growth inducing.

Impact Significance

Although the proposed program has the potential to increase the demand for commercial services related to corridor visitation, the El Dorado County General Plan provides specific guidance on the appropriate location of future commercial growth. Any commercial development induced by the development of the corridor would be restricted to areas in conformance with the General Plan. The General Plan also dictates the location and density of development in the areas surrounding the proposed Master Plan corridor, and the potential introduction of new infrastructure is not expected to induce indirect population growth. Therefore, the proposed Master Plan would have a *less-than-significant* impact relative to growth inducement.

Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

In accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15126[a], 15064, 15382, and Appendix G), an EIR must examine in detail all impacts that are potentially significant and must examine significance of the impacts in light of mitigation measures that can reduce the impact.

Before application of mitigation, the proposed Master Plan was found to have potentially significant or significant impacts. A summary of the environmental impacts associated with the proposed Master Plan are presented in Table ES-1. This table reflects the premitigation CEQA conclusions of significance, recommended mitigation measures, and postmitigation CEQA significance conclusions for each impact.

With application of the mitigation measures proposed in Chapters 3A through 3J, all program impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level with the exception of Impact N-2: Exposure of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Operations-Related Noise. Although mitigation measures were included in this EIR to reduce the adversity of this impact, no feasible mitigation was found to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact is therefore considered to be significant and unavoidable.

The first part of the paper is devoted to the study of the asymptotic behavior of the solutions of the system of equations (1) as $t \rightarrow \infty$. It is shown that the solutions of the system (1) are bounded and tend to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. The second part of the paper is devoted to the study of the asymptotic behavior of the solutions of the system (1) as $t \rightarrow 0$. It is shown that the solutions of the system (1) are bounded and tend to zero as $t \rightarrow 0$.

With the aid of the method of variation of constants it is shown that the solutions of the system (1) are bounded and tend to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. The method of variation of constants is used to obtain the asymptotic behavior of the solutions of the system (1) as $t \rightarrow \infty$. It is shown that the solutions of the system (1) are bounded and tend to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY
10:45 am, Dec 06, 2010

39

LATE DISTRIBUTION
Date 10:45 am, Dec 06, 2010

RECIRCULATION OF "CHAPTER 4. OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS"

FOR THE DRAFT PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE SACRAMENTO-
PLACERVILLE TRANSPORTATION
CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

PREPARED FOR:

County of El Dorado
Department of Transportation
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
Contact: Kris Payne
530/621-5900

PREPARED BY:

Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc.
2600 V Street, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95818-1914
Contact: Richard Rust, AICP
916/737-3000



NOVEMBER 1 1999

RECIRCULATION OF "CHAPTER 4. OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS"

FOR THE DRAFT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE SACRAMENTO-PLACERVILLE TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

This document is cited as:

Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc. 1999. Recirculation of "Chapter 4. Other CEQA considerations" for the program environmental impact report for the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor Master Plan. Draft. October. (JSA 98-054.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for El Dorado County Department of Transportation, Placerville, CA.

Table of Contents

	Page
Recirculation of "Chapter 4. Other CEQA Considerations"	1
Purpose and Use of This Recirculated Chapter	1
Project Overview	2
Proposed Project	2
Existing Land Uses and Terrain	3
Proposed Program	3
Review and Availability of the Recirculated Chapter 4	5
Chapter 4. Other CEQA Considerations	4-1
Irreversible Environmental Changes	4-1
Cumulative Impacts	4-2
Growth-Inducing Impacts	4-7
Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts	4-9

Tables and Figures

	Page
Table	
4-1 Cumulative Development Projects (Major) within 1 Mile of the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor	Follows 4-2
Figure	
4-1 Major Projects within One Mile of the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor Right-of-Way	Follows 4-2

Recirculation of "Chapter 4. Other CEQA Considerations"

Purpose and Use of This Recirculated Chapter

The attached Chapter 4, "Other CEQA Considerations", is being recirculated as a replacement for the analysis of cumulative environmental impacts of El Dorado County's proposed Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor Master Plan (Master Plan), as outlined in the draft environmental impact report (EIR) published in October 1998. In the original Master Plan EIR, the assessment of cumulative impacts was based on the cumulative assessment contained in the County's General Plan's EIR. Since publication of the Master Plan EIR, the County's General Plan EIR has been in litigation. As part of this litigation, the court has found portions of the General Plan EIR to be inadequate, including the discussion related to cumulative impacts.

To remove reliance on the cumulative assessment presented in the General Plan EIR, this chapter provides an independent analysis of cumulative impacts associated with the Master Plan based on reasonable foreseeable development as listed in new Table 4-1 and illustrated in new Figure 4-1. Thus, this chapter of the Master Plan EIR no longer relies on the cumulative impact analysis included within the General Plan EIR.

Recirculation of an EIR, as described in Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, is required of a lead agency when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification. "Significant new information" includes a) a new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure, b) a substantial increase in the severity of an impact would result, c) a feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the impacts of the project but the project's proponents decline to adopt it, or d) the draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. If the revision is limited to a few chapters or portions of the EIR, the lead agency need only recirculate the chapters or portions that have been modified [Sec. 15088.5(c)].

Therefore, this chapter contains only that information necessary to make the previously prepared EIR adequate; that is, "Chapter 4. Other CEQA Considerations". Providing a new cumulative analysis avoids reliance on the general plan EIR. Within the revised Chapter 4, references to text or figures within other chapters can be found in the original draft Master Plan EIR.

Project Overview

The following section provides an overview of the proposed Master Plan program in order to give the reader a context for review of the revised Chapter 4 which follows. This program description is the same as the information presented in the original draft Master Plan EIR.

Proposed Project

The proposed project is located in the southwestern corner of El Dorado County, California. The project area is an approximately 28-mile-long railway corridor that extends from the El Dorado/Sacramento County line to the City of Placerville and has been divided into segments for planning purposes. In 1986, the Southern Pacific Transportation Company (SP) filed to abandon the Placerville Branch of the railroad from Diamond Springs to Apex, near Placerville in El Dorado County. Use of this line had been discontinued previously. The County began negotiating to acquire all of the SP right-of-way from the El Dorado County/Sacramento County line to Apex. In 1991, the SPTC-JPA was formed to purchase the corridor from Butterfield in Sacramento County to Apex in El Dorado County. The SPTC-JPA completed the purchase in September 1996. In determining the need for the acquisition, the County was guided by the following objectives:

- ◆ preserve the railroad right-of-way for its integration into a county and regional interim, multipurpose transportation corridor, which would include trail use; and
- ◆ protection of the corridor for the potential, future reinstatement of rail service, consistent with the National Trails System Act.

Each member agency of the SPTC-JPA has approved a Reciprocal Use and Funding Agreement. Under this agreement, El Dorado County has primary control of and responsibility for maintaining and developing the corridor within its jurisdiction. In approving the SPTC-JPA's intended purchase of the corridor (September 1996) under the "rails-to-trails" provision of the National Trails System Act, the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors directed County staff to prepare a master plan on the project. The County's intention in participating in the purchase of right-of-way was to ensure that a valuable corridor would be preserved so that, at a later date, it could be used as a transportation corridor in accordance with the federal "rails-to-trails" provisions.

Existing Land Uses and Terrain

To aid in the planning and development of the corridor, the rail corridor has been subdivided into four segments, based in part on surrounding land uses, as shown in Figure 2-1. Typical land uses and terrain features are described below for each segment.

- ◆ **Segment A (El Dorado/Sacramento County line to the Town of Latrobe)**—Segment A is located primarily in a rural area, surrounded by undeveloped grasslands and pastures. Future land uses surrounding the segment include low-density residential and industrial development.
- ◆ **Segment B (Town of Latrobe to the Shingle Springs Station, along Mother Lode Drive)**—Segment B is also primarily rural. From Latrobe to approximately 1 mile north of the spur to the limestone quarry, the corridor is surrounded by undeveloped grasslands, pastures, and oak woodlands. To the north, it is adjacent to several 5- to 10-acre ranchettes. The density of residential development increases as the corridor nears the Town of Shingle Springs. Commercial land uses adjoin the corridor in Shingle Springs.
- ◆ **Segment C (Shingle Springs Station to Missouri Flat Road)**—Land along Segment C is designated for a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial uses of varying densities. The corridor is interspersed with undeveloped areas containing a mixture of grasslands, oak woodlands, and other native flora.
- ◆ **Segment D (Missouri Flat Road to Apex, near Ray Lawyer Drive)**—Similar to Segment C, this segment is surrounded by a mixture of land uses. This is the only segment of the corridor that does not have existing railroad tracks.

Proposed Program

As development of alternatives proceeded, the four segments were divided further into sections. Using these sections, four alternatives (including the No-Project Alternative) were developed to be considered as part of the decision-making and environmental assessment processes. The alternatives are differentiated by the types of uses proposed within the corridor rather than by any physical change in the location of a section or the corridor itself. Consequently, the sections shown in Figure 2-2 are the same for all the alternatives. Figure 2-2 shows the location of each section and Figure 2-3 illustrates allowable uses by section. The following paragraphs provide an overview of the uses proposed for each section under the Preferred Project Alternative:

- ◆ **Section A1 (El Dorado/Sacramento County line to approximately 1 mile south of Deer Creek crossing)**—Uses on Section A1 would include excursion rail service (with possible linkage into Folsom) and personal rail car use. Excursion rail service would be limited to two round trips per day during

daylight hours on weekends and holidays only. The excursion rail and personal rail cars would use the appropriate sections of the corridor by permit only. Operation of these rail uses would not start before 8 a.m. and would end at dusk or 8 p.m., whichever is earlier. This section would also be available for underground utility easements and corridor maintenance activities (e.g., vegetation control, litter cleanup).

- ◆ **Section A2 (approximately 1 mile south of Deer Creek crossing to Town of Latrobe)**—Uses along Section A2 would include excursion rail service and personal rail car use (same operations as described for Section A1), underground utility easements, and equestrian trail use. Equestrian use would be permitted along a natural trail that would be cleared of brush and graded where appropriate, although no pavement or base material would be used. Routine corridor maintenance would also occur.
- ◆ **Section B1 (Town of Latrobe to 500 feet north of South Shingle Road crossing near Amber Fields Road)**—Uses along Section B1 would include excursion rail service, personal rail car use, underground utility easements, a natural trail for equestrian use only, and routine corridor maintenance.
- ◆ **Section B2 (500 feet north of South Shingle Springs Road crossing near Amber Field Road to historic Shingle Springs Depot site)**—Uses proposed along Section B2 include natural trails (for equestrian, pedestrian, and mountain bike use), underground utility easements, and routine corridor maintenance activities. Existing tracks in this segment would be temporarily removed until such time that future rail use is reinstated consistent with federal law.
- ◆ **Section C1 (Shingle Springs Depot site to Slate Creek crossing)**—Uses along Section C1 would include equestrian, pedestrian, and mountain bike use along parallel natural and improved/semihard-surfaced trails (e.g., decomposed granite with no adhesive or gravel). Underground utility easements and routine corridor maintenance would also be permitted.
- ◆ **Section C2 (Slate Creek crossing to Missouri Flat Road)**—Uses along Section C2 would include equestrian, pedestrian, and mountain bike use along a natural trail and pedestrian and bicycle use along a parallel paved trail (e.g., covered with decomposed granite with an adhesive or asphalt/concrete mix). Underground utility easements and routine corridor maintenance would also be permitted.

*Bad
idea*

Segment D (Missouri Flat Road to Apex, near the City of Placerville)—Uses along Segment D would include equestrian, pedestrian, and mountain bike use along a natural trail and pedestrian and bicycle use along a parallel paved trail. Underground utility easements and routine corridor maintenance would also be permitted. Remaining tracks in this segment would be temporarily removed until future rail use is reinstated consistent with federal law.

Review and Availability of the Recirculated Chapter 4

As described earlier, reviewers should limit their comments to the revised Chapter 4, "Other CEQA Considerations". Comments received on this chapter and comments previously submitted on the draft EIR will be responded to in the final EIR.

The package containing this introduction and the revised Chapter 4 is available for review or purchase at the El Dorado County Department of Transportation public counter. The County can be contacted at:

El Dorado County
Department of Transportation
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5900

During the public review period for the revised Chapter 4, the revised chapter is also available for public review at each of the El Dorado County libraries. These are located as follows:

Cameron Park Branch
2500 Country Club Drive
Cameron Park, CA 95682
(530) 621-5500

Georgetown Branch
6880 Orleans Street
Georgetown, CA 95634
(530) 333-4724

Oak Ridge H.S. Joint-Use Library
1120 Harvard Way
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
(916) 933-6982

Placerville Main Library
345 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5540

Pollock Pines Branch
6210 Pony Express Trail
Pollock Pines, CA 95726
(530) 644-2498

South Lake Tahoe Branch
1000 Rufus Allen Boulevard
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
(530) 573-3185

The original draft Master Plan EIR was distributed directly to numerous agencies, organizations, and interested groups and persons for comment during the formal review period for the draft EIR. The original draft Master Plan EIR continues to be available for review or purchase at the El Dorado County Department of Transportation public counter. During the public review period for the original draft Master Plan EIR, this document was also available for public review at each of the El Dorado County libraries.

The County will respond to all written comments received on the revised Chapter 4 and comments previously received on the original draft EIR in a final EIR. The El Dorado County Planning Commission will review the final EIR before making a

recommendation to the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors on this project. Public comment is encouraged at all public hearings before the planning commission and Board of Supervisors. Information concerning the public review schedule for the chapter and Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors agendas can be obtained by calling the El Dorado County Department of Transportation at (530) 621-5900.

Chapter 4. Other CEQA Considerations

This chapter replaces "Chapter 4. Other CEQA Considerations" published as part of the original draft EIR for the Master Plan. The original cumulative analysis relied on the County General Plan and related EIR. Since publication of the General Plan EIR, a court has found that the cumulative analysis included in the General Plan EIR is inadequate. To ensure that the Master Plan EIR does not rely on the findings contained in the General Plan EIR, the "Cumulative Impacts" section of this chapter has been revised and recirculated for public review. The cumulative impacts analysis contained in this chapter no longer relies on the General Plan EIR. This section instead relies on reasonably foreseeable development in the corridor as described in Table 4-1 and illustrated on Figure 4-1.

This chapter provides an assessment of four types of environmental impacts that are required content in an EIR. These include an assessment of irreversible environmental changes, cumulative impacts, growth-inducing impacts, and significant and unavoidable adverse impacts.

Irreversible Environmental Changes

Section 15126(f) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to include a discussion of significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from implementation of a project. Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would result in the commitment of nonrenewable natural resources (such as gravel, petroleum products, and others) and slowly renewable resources, such as wood products for individual project construction. Operation and maintenance of the corridor would also require further commitment of energy resources (in the form petroleum products for vehicle operations and herbicides). Regarding fiscal resources, because no individual projects are included with the Master Plan, this plan does not obligate the County to an expenditure of public funds. Maintenance of the corridor is a current obligation of the County under the Reciprocal Use and Funding Agreement between the member agencies of the SPTC-JPA. The commitment of public funds for individual projects, increased maintenance, or additional staff time (such as sheriff's department personnel) will be decided by the Board of Supervisors. Although the proposed Master Plan would result in the irreversible commitment of resources, implementation of the Master Plan would provide several public benefits, including enhanced recreational opportunities and preservation of a valuable corridor for future transportation use.

Cumulative Impacts

Requirements for Cumulative Impact Analysis

The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15130) requires a reasonable analysis of the significant cumulative impacts of a proposed project. Cumulative impact refers to “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15355). As defined by the State CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts are:

the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time (CEQA Guidelines Section 15355[b]).

Approach to Cumulative Impact Analysis

As noted in the initial study (Appendix A), the Master Plan has the potential to result in significant cumulative impacts. These cumulative impacts would result from the project-specific impacts identified in the DEIR in concert with other reasonably foreseeable projects in the project vicinity.

The basis for cumulative impacts can consist of a list of specific projects or a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan that is designated to evaluate regional or area-wide conditions (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130). As the status of the County General Plan and related EIR are uncertain, the cumulative impact analyses presented below rely on the “list” approach. Information on past, present, and probable future projects was obtained from El Dorado County staff. For purposes of this analysis, all projects within 1 mile of the corridor were considered to have potential cumulative effects, and were included in this analysis. Table 4-1 presents a list of projects considered in this cumulative analysis. The location of these projects is presented in Figure 4-1. These projects include:

- ◆ projects that have been approved but are not built or are under construction; and
- ◆ projects for which an application has been received.

Table 4-I.
Cumulative Development Projects (Major) within 1 Mile of the
Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor

Project	Type	Size	Status
Specific Plans			
Carson Creek Specific Plan	Age-restricted residential, commercial, research and development, parks, schools, stream corridors/wetlands	716 acres, 1,700 DUs	TM amended 09/99; not yet constructed
Valley View Specific Plan	Residential, commercial/office, public/semi-public, parks and recreation, and open space/buffer	2,037 acres, 2,840 DUs	Specific plan approved 9/99; no TM approval
Tentative Maps			
Royal Estates (TM 86-1060)	Residential, equestrian-oriented, trails, open space	148 acres, 72 DUs	First phase finalized; second phase expires 01/00
Ponderosa Fifty (TM 89-1156)	Residential, open space, park	90 acres, 90 DUs	In litigation
Sierra Gold Condominiums (TM 94-1291)	Residential	23 acres, 92 DUs	On hold
Marble Valley (TM 95-1298)	Residential	2,263 acres, 398 DUs	TM approved 6/97; not yet constructed
Kingsville Country Club (TM 97-1335)	Residential, 18-hole golf course	213 acres, 38 DUs	TM approved 6/98; not yet constructed
Sawmill Creek (TM 98-1350R)	Residential	144 acres, 24 DUs	On hold
<p>Notes: DU = dwelling unit. TM = tentative map.</p> <p>Source: El Dorado County 1999.</p>			

Table 1
 List of the 100 most important (by number of citations) articles in the field of
 organizational behavior (1970-2000)

Rank	Year	Author(s)	Citations
1	1977	Simon, H.A.	100
2	1977	Simon, H.A.	95
3	1977	Simon, H.A.	90
4	1977	Simon, H.A.	85
5	1977	Simon, H.A.	80
6	1977	Simon, H.A.	75
7	1977	Simon, H.A.	70
8	1977	Simon, H.A.	65
9	1977	Simon, H.A.	60
10	1977	Simon, H.A.	55
11	1977	Simon, H.A.	50
12	1977	Simon, H.A.	45
13	1977	Simon, H.A.	40
14	1977	Simon, H.A.	35
15	1977	Simon, H.A.	30
16	1977	Simon, H.A.	25
17	1977	Simon, H.A.	20
18	1977	Simon, H.A.	15
19	1977	Simon, H.A.	10
20	1977	Simon, H.A.	5

Assessment of Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative Master Plan related impacts were analyzed for the same resource topics analyzed in Chapters 3A through 3J of this EIR. The cumulative impacts for each of these resource topics are described below.

Land Use and Aesthetics

The corridor is within a predominately rural area of the County. Land uses along the corridor range from rural agricultural along the western portion to more intensely developed areas along the eastern portion of the corridor. The reasonably foreseeable major projects within 1 mile of the Sacramento-Placerville transportation corridor include the Carson Creek Specific Plan, which encompasses 2,434 dwelling units in a mixed use development on 716 acres, and the Valley View Specific Plan, which proposes 2,840 dwelling units in a mixed use development on 2,037 acres. These projects would be located at the western end of the corridor. Six other tentative maps have been filed for residential developments dispersed along the length of the corridor and within 1 mile of the corridor. These developments range from 92 dwelling units on 23 acres to 398 dwelling units on 2,263 acres. A total of 5,254 dwelling units are planned within one mile of the corridor.

Uses proposed under the Master Plan including rail transport, utilities, and trail uses are compatible with existing and proposed future uses such as the residential and mixed use projects described above and listed in Table 4-1. The proposed Master Plan has been found to be compatible with these existing, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable projects. Therefore, cumulative land use and aesthetic impacts are considered *less than significant*.

Geology

Future development of the projects listed in Table 4-1 has the potential to increase erosion in the project vicinity. If the primarily residential future projects did not comply with the County's grading ordinance, cumulative erosion impacts could occur. As discussed in Chapter 3B, "Geology", erosion impacts related to construction were determined to be less than significant because each project will be required to comply with the County's grading ordinance, including the preparation of an erosion control plan. The application of this ordinance to other development in the area is assumed to also mitigate potential cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level.

In evaluating the proposed project, it was determined that off-trail activities could result in a significant erosion potential. With application of the mitigation measure included in this EIR (Mitigation Measure GEO-1.1), erosion impacts will be isolated within the

corridor and will not create a cumulative impact with other surrounding land uses. Therefore, cumulative impacts on geology are considered *less than significant*.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Future development of the projects listed in Table 4-1 has the potential to expose people to flood hazards, increase stormwater runoff, and increase discharge of surface pollutants. As described in Chapter 3C, "Water Resources", over the last several years, large flood flows have overwhelmed or bypassed drainage corridors designed into the rail corridor. As part of the proposed program, drainage facilities will direct flood flows into their planned channels, and undersized conduits will be properly sized and maintained. On a cumulative basis, these improvements should have a beneficial impact on surrounding properties and on the handling of any drainage to the area from future cumulative projects. Increases in stormwater runoff resulting from the proposed program will not add a significant amount to regional drainages and will not significantly add to other regional flows to form a cumulative impact. Regarding surface water pollutants, the proposed program will generate potential contamination from small oil and fuel discharges leaked into the railbed by train operations and some herbicide residue. The amounts of potential contaminants from the program is expected to be small and distributed through a number of drainages in the area. The contamination is likely to be similar to a small roadway, and is not expected to add significantly with other projects in the area. Therefore, cumulative impacts on water resources were determined to be *less than significant*.

Air Quality

Currently El Dorado County is classified as nonattainment for the state and federal ozone standards, the state 24-hour PM10 standard, and is unclassified for CO. The proposed program was evaluated based on standards designed by the El Dorado County APCD and the state to assess a program's overall impact on a project and cumulative basis. Given the levels of development contained in the cumulative projects assessed, these will combine with the proposed program on a regional basis, and lead to a cumulative *significant* impact on air quality resources.

Transportation and Circulation

Future development of the projects listed in Table 4-1 has the potential to increase traffic and affect circulation in the project vicinity. The future projects are primarily residential projects and also include open space and recreational uses. These other projects would likely affect traffic at different times of the day (commuter traffic) than the traffic generated by the Master Plan (recreation-oriented). Traffic impacts within the proposed Master Plan corridor are assessed in Section 3E, "Transportation and Circulation", of this EIR and focus on traffic delays and parking. Impacts from traffic delays are related to potential detours or lane closures while work is done on roadway crossings and would

be temporary in nature. Although project timing is not known at this time, future projects, as described in Table 4-1, could be under construction simultaneously in the area that could add cumulatively to temporary construction delays. Given the short duration of these expected delays, and the need to coordinate any work with the El Dorado County Department of Transportation, no significant cumulative impacts are expected. For impacts related to parking, the demand for parking is specific to the proposed program (because of its isolated location) and is not expected to cumulatively add to the impacts of other projects. Therefore, cumulative impacts will be *less than significant*.

Biological Resources

Future development of the projects listed in Table 4-1 has the potential to damage or destroy sensitive habitats and to impact sensitive species. In evaluating cumulative impacts, the 28-mile corridor can be seen as a transect through this portion of the County. All of the habitats and species suspected of being within the corridor are likely to occur in the surrounding area as well. As the areas around the corridor develop, their potential impacts are likely to be similar to the proposed program.

As defined in Chapter 3F, "Biological Resources", the proposed program was found to have potentially significant impacts related to damage or destruction of sensitive habitats and potential adverse impacts on sensitive species. The Master Plan program is designed to reduce significant impacts on habitats and species, and would represent an individually minor project. However, the proposed project, in conjunction with the development of 2,753 acres associated with the Carson Creek and Valley View Specific Plans and an additional 2,881 acres associated with other projects, would result in a considerable effect on sensitive habitats and species.

The project and other projects within 1 mile of the transportation corridor would include mitigation measures to reduce impacts on sensitive habitats and sensitive species. However, the Master Plan program would add to a significant cumulative impact, and is therefore *significant and unavoidable*.

Public Health and Safety

Future development of the projects listed in Table 4-1 has the potential to impact public health and safety. However, as discussed in Chapter 3G of the EIR, most impacts would be isolated to the corridor or the immediate vicinity. Thus, development of the project would not contribute to cumulative impacts from other projects. Because these materials are strictly regulated by state and federal agencies, the proposed Master Plan and other foreseeable developments along the corridor are assumed to comply with all pertinent regulations regarding the use of hazardous materials, thereby minimizing the likelihood of hazardous materials-related emergencies. Furthermore existing disclosure requirements and emergency response capabilities along the corridor would provide adequate response to events resulting from any cumulative development.

The Master Plan could also result in traffic hazards from road crossings with the corridor. While traffic associated with the development of future projects will incrementally increase the public safety impacts from the additional traffic conflicting with rail and trail users, these impacts can be mitigated with the same measures proposed in Chapter 3G. Therefore, the cumulative impact on public health and safety is considered to be *less than significant*.

Noise

In conjunction with development of the project, future development of the projects listed in Table 4-1 has the potential to increase cumulative noise levels in the project vicinity. Rail activities, proposed under the Master Plan, have the potential to increase existing noise levels and expose people to significantly higher levels of noise than is currently present in the area. Cumulative projects would also incrementally increase traffic in the program area, with associated noise increases, although cumulative traffic noise near the program corridor is not expected to result in a significant impact. Impacts related to vibration are not expected to add cumulatively with other development in the area as this cumulative development would be primarily residential.

Impacts on local residents near corridor/roadway crossings were found to be a significant unavoidable impact. Because noise impacts associated with operation of the rail component are considered significant and unavoidable (as discussed in Section 3H), the cumulative noise impacts of the project are also considered *significant and unavoidable*.

Public Services

No cumulative impacts are anticipated to occur to public services and utilities due to development of the program. Implementation of the primarily residential and some mixed use projects in the vicinity has the potential to impact the provision of fire and police services. For public services (such as police and fire), the cumulative projects have been mitigated to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. With the mitigations included in the Master Plan EIR and the cumulative projects, the cumulative impacts on public services are expected to be *less than significant*.

Cultural Resources

Future development of the projects listed in Table 4-1 has the potential to damage cultural resources that are located on or under the respective construction sites. If resources are found and are not properly recorded or removed, then a cumulative loss of cultural resources could occur.

As discussed in Chapter 3J, "Cultural Resources", the potential for unknown cultural resource sites within the corridor and areas surrounding the corridor is possible. With application of the mitigation measures provided in this EIR and standard discovery

conditions included in project approvals, the cumulative impacts on cultural resources are expected to be *less than significant*.

Growth-Inducing Impacts

Pursuant to Section 15126 (g) of State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must address whether a project will directly or indirectly foster growth. Section 15126 reads as follows:

[An EIR shall] discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of waste water treatment plant, might, for example allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may further tax existing community service facilities so consideration must be given to this impact. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

As discussed in this section, this analysis evaluates whether the proposed Master Plan will directly or indirectly induce economic, population, or housing growth in the surrounding environment.

Direct Growth-Inducing Impacts in the Surrounding Environment

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan provides for an existing railroad right-of-way corridor to be incorporated into the County's regional trail plan and allows the corridor to be used for the development of rail, trail, maintenance, and underground utility activity. While certain aspects of the Master Plan have the potential to indirectly induce economic growth through increased visitation to the area, the proposed Master Plan would not result in the direct generation of population or housing growth. Job growth associated with the proposed Master Plan would be minimal. Workers performing future project-related construction would most likely come from local or nearby communities and would not create a need for short- or long-term or housing.

Indirect Growth-Inducing Impacts in the Surrounding Environment

At the present time, the County has not developed specific project proposals for use of the corridor. However, future development within the corridor may have the potential to indirectly induce commercial growth in areas near the corridor. Given the scale and types of uses planned for the corridor, future commercial growth caused by the proposed program is expected to be limited and will likely be an incremental addition to commercial demand already existing in the surrounding area. In locating potential commercial uses, the County would use the guidance provided in the El Dorado County General Plan:

The El Dorado County General Plan establishes Community Region and Rural Center Planning Concept areas which essentially serve as urban/suburban development limit lines. Since the corridor travels through the El Dorado Hills Community Region, Latrobe Rural Center, Shingle Springs Community Region, and the El Dorado/Diamond Springs Community Region, any proposals for commercial or other development in support of the corridor would be restricted to these areas in conformance with the General Plan. The portions of the corridor within the Rural Region Planning Concept Areas would not permit development of commercial or other uses not considered compatible with these areas. (Rivas pers. comm.)

Many times, the addition or substantial alteration of public services and/or infrastructure in an area may result in growth-inducing issues, whereas such alterations to facilities could facilitate (or accommodate) growth. The proposed Master Plan does not require the extension or substantial alteration to the infrastructure or public services in the area. The proposed Master Plan does allow for the placement of infrastructure within the Master Plan corridor, thereby encouraging the development of infrastructure trunk lines in this area as a result of the corridor's location and continuity. Depending on the type of infrastructure installed, this could provide additional services to the surrounding rural area.

Current development patterns in this area are driven by the desire of the County to maintain the rural nature of the area, and not by a lack of infrastructure. Therefore, it is not expected that this project would indirectly induce growth into the areas surrounding the Master Plan corridor. Therefore, the Master Plan is not considered to be growth inducing.

Impact Significance

Although the proposed program has the potential to increase the demand for commercial services related to corridor visitation, the El Dorado County General Plan provides specific guidance on the appropriate location of future commercial growth. Any commercial development induced by the development of the corridor would be restricted to areas in conformance with the General Plan. The General Plan also dictates the location and density of development in the areas surrounding the proposed Master Plan corridor, and the potential introduction of new infrastructure is not expected to induce indirect population growth. Therefore, the proposed Master Plan would have a *less-than-significant* impact relative to growth inducement.

Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

In accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15126[a], 15064, 15382, and Appendix G), an EIR must examine in detail all impacts that are potentially significant and must examine significance of the impacts in light of mitigation measures that can reduce the impact.

Before application of mitigation, the proposed Master Plan was found to have potentially significant or significant impacts. A summary of the environmental impacts associated with the proposed Master Plan are presented in Table ES-1. This table reflects the premitigation CEQA conclusions of significance, recommended mitigation measures, and postmitigation CEQA significance conclusions for each impact.

With application of the mitigation measures proposed in Chapters 3A through 3J, all program impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level with the exception of Impact N-2: Exposure of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Operations-Related Noise. Although mitigation measures were included in this EIR to reduce the adversity of this impact, no feasible mitigation was found to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact is therefore considered to be significant and unavoidable.

The project is located within the Sacramento River watershed, which is a designated water quality control area. The project area is situated in the riparian zone, adjacent to the river. The project involves the construction of a transportation corridor, which may result in the removal of riparian vegetation and the alteration of the riparian habitat. The project area is also situated within the Sacramento River watershed, which is a designated water quality control area. The project area is situated in the riparian zone, adjacent to the river. The project involves the construction of a transportation corridor, which may result in the removal of riparian vegetation and the alteration of the riparian habitat.

Significance and Mitigation Measures

The project is located within the Sacramento River watershed, which is a designated water quality control area. The project area is situated in the riparian zone, adjacent to the river. The project involves the construction of a transportation corridor, which may result in the removal of riparian vegetation and the alteration of the riparian habitat. The project area is also situated within the Sacramento River watershed, which is a designated water quality control area. The project area is situated in the riparian zone, adjacent to the river. The project involves the construction of a transportation corridor, which may result in the removal of riparian vegetation and the alteration of the riparian habitat.

The project is located within the Sacramento River watershed, which is a designated water quality control area. The project area is situated in the riparian zone, adjacent to the river. The project involves the construction of a transportation corridor, which may result in the removal of riparian vegetation and the alteration of the riparian habitat. The project area is also situated within the Sacramento River watershed, which is a designated water quality control area. The project area is situated in the riparian zone, adjacent to the river. The project involves the construction of a transportation corridor, which may result in the removal of riparian vegetation and the alteration of the riparian habitat.

The project is located within the Sacramento River watershed, which is a designated water quality control area. The project area is situated in the riparian zone, adjacent to the river. The project involves the construction of a transportation corridor, which may result in the removal of riparian vegetation and the alteration of the riparian habitat. The project area is also situated within the Sacramento River watershed, which is a designated water quality control area. The project area is situated in the riparian zone, adjacent to the river. The project involves the construction of a transportation corridor, which may result in the removal of riparian vegetation and the alteration of the riparian habitat.