

**U.S. Highway 50/El Dorado Hills Boulevard-Latrobe Road
Interchange**

**Addendum No. 3
To the
Environmental Impact Report**

El Dorado County, California

February 2012

PURPOSE OF THE ADDENDUM

A Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the U.S. Highway 50/El Dorado Hills Boulevard-Latrobe Road Interchange (SCH #98072050) (Project) was certified by the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors on July 22, 2003. This third Addendum is intended to address the environmental impacts associated only with the minor changes to Phase 2B to comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), (PRC §21000, et seq.). El Dorado County is the lead agency for the Project for purposes of environmental review under CEQA.

The applicable CEQA section authorizing the use of this Addendum is reproduced below:

15164. Addendum to an EIR or Negative Declaration

(a) The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in §15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

(b) An addendum to an adopted EIR may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in §15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

(c) An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.

(d) The decision making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.

(e) A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency's findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.

Pursuant to §15164 (e) set forth above, the following is a brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent ND or EIR pursuant to §15162.

(a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

Discussion: As demonstrated in the attached CEQA Checklist, no new significant environmental effects or increase in the severity of previously identified effects will occur as a result of the Project.

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

Discussion: As demonstrated in the attached CEQA Checklist, no substantial changes have occurred that require major revisions to the 2003 EIR.

(3) New information of substantial importance not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Discussion: No new information of substantial importance has been received or discovered since adoption of the 2003 EIR. This Addendum addresses the minor changes to Phase 2B. As demonstrated in the attached CEQA Checklist, no new impacts result from these revisions and no new mitigation measures are warranted.

BACKGROUND

A Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (EIR) (SCH #98072050) was prepared for this project in November 1999. Additionally, since the County planned to use federal funds for construction, the Federal Highway Administration acted as federal lead agency for this project under the National Environmental Policy Act.

The Draft EIR for the Project was certified on May 11, 2000. A petition for writ of mandate was subsequently filed by the Citizens Against Roadway Encroachment (C.A.R.E.). Pursuant to a Superior Court issued writ of mandate, the Board clarified their previous action accordingly and re-adopted the EIR on July 22, 2003 (hereafter referred to as the 2003 EIR).

The 2003 EIR identified two phases for construction of the project. Subsequent to re-adopting the 2003 EIR, two addendums have been certified, with minor modifications to phasing and design elements that have been incorporated into the project. Addendum No. 1 to the EIR, approved by the Board on April 19, 2005, covered changes to Phase 1 and created three sub-phases (described below) all which have been constructed.

Addendum No. 2 to the EIR, approved by the Board August 26, 2008, created two new sub-phases to Phase 2 (Phase 2A and Phase 2B, described below) and addressed project elements which were modified and constructed under Phase 2A.

PHASE 1 AS APPROVED IN THE 2003 EIR:

- Construction of a new westbound loop off-ramp in the northwest quadrant of the interchange and elimination of the existing westbound diagonal off-ramp. (Added to Phase 2 per Addendum No. 1.)
- Replacement of the existing westbound diagonal on-ramp in the northwest quadrant with a new 3-lane (including high occupancy vehicle bypass lane) diagonal on-ramp across from the east leg of Saratoga Way. (Added to Phase 2 per Addendum No. 1)

- Addition of a second left-turn lane for northbound El Dorado Hills Blvd. traffic to the westbound on-ramp.
- Relocation of the west leg of Saratoga Way to align with Park Drive with a tangent alignment that is adjacent to existing residences in the northwest quadrant.
- Widened southbound El Dorado Hills Blvd. for dual left-turn lanes to eastbound on-ramp,
- Widened eastbound on-ramp to 3 lanes and transition to 2 lanes at ramp entrance.

PHASE 1 AS MODIFIED BY ADDENDUM NO. 1

Addendum No. 1 included the addition of three sub-phases to Phase 1, and moved portions of work out into future phases as follows:

- Phase 1.1: Construction of sound barrier along the southern and eastern property lines of residences located in the northwest quadrant of the interchange.
- Phase 1.2A: Realignment of Saratoga Way, and addition of a third lane to southbound El Dorado Hill Blvd. from Park Drive to the westbound on-ramp. The third lane addition was originally approved to occur during Phase 2.
- Phase 1.2B with changes set forth EIR Addendum No. 1: Addresses operational deficiencies and continued growth in the area until the ultimate improvements are constructed and included:
 - Widened northbound El Dorado Hills Blvd. from the eastbound loop off-ramp to the existing westbound off-ramp to accommodate a dual left-turn lane from northbound El Dorado Hills Blvd. to the existing westbound on-ramp. This improvement was included in the 2003 EIR as part of Phase 1;
 - Addition of a third northbound lane to El Dorado Hills Blvd. between the eastbound loop off-ramp and Saratoga Way. This improvement was included in the 2003 EIR as part of Phase 2;
 - Widened existing westbound on-ramp to two lanes, merging into one lane and extended it by 500 feet. This improvement was not included in the 2003 EIR since this ramp was proposed for replacement;
 - Widened existing diagonal westbound off-ramp from two lanes to three lanes at the terminus, a single right, a through/left, and a left turn lane. This improvement was not included in the 2003 EIR since this ramp was proposed for replacement;
 - Right-turn and through/right turn lanes for southbound El Dorado Hills Blvd. traffic accessing the westbound on-ramp. The 2003 EIR included dual right-turn lanes at this location;
 - Restriped westbound Saratoga Way east of El Dorado Hills Blvd. to add a second left-turn lane, exiting the Raley's Plaza shopping center, southbound onto El Dorado Hills Blvd. A second left-turn lane was striped on this leg until 1999 when it was removed to address safety concerns. This restriping was not included in the 2003 EIR.

PHASE 2 AS APPROVED IN THE 2003 EIR:

- Construction of the mainline bridge and eastbound off-ramp bridge;
- Addition of a third lane to southbound El Dorado Hills Blvd. from Park Drive to the westbound on-ramp (Added to Phase 1.2B per Addendum No. 1);

- Addition of a third lane to southbound El Dorado Hills Blvd/Latrobe Rd from the westbound loop off-ramp to a dedicated right-turn lane into the Town Center West;
- Addition of a third northbound lane to El Dorado Hills Blvd. between the eastbound loop off-ramp and Saratoga Way (Added to Phase 1.2B per Addendum No. 1);
- Construction of a new eastbound, diagonal off-ramp (This was constructed prior to Addendum No. 1);
- Reconstruction of the eastbound loop off-ramp and structure (Added to Phase 2A per Addendum No. 2).

PHASE 2 AS MODIFIED BY ADDENDUM NO. 1:

- Construction of the mainline bridge and eastbound off-ramp bridge;
- Construction of a new westbound loop off-ramp in the northwest quadrant of the interchange and elimination of the existing westbound diagonal off-ramp;
- Replacement of the existing westbound diagonal on-ramp in the northwest quadrant with a new 3-lane (including high occupancy vehicle bypass lane) diagonal on-ramp across from the east leg of Saratoga Way;
- Addition of a third lane to southbound El Dorado Hills Blvd/Latrobe Rd from the westbound loop off-ramp to a dedicated right-turn lane into the Town Center West;
- Widened southbound El Dorado Hills Blvd. for dual left-turn lanes to eastbound on-ramp;
- Widened eastbound on-ramp to 3 lanes and transition to 2 lanes at ramp entrance.

PHASE 2 AS MODIFIED BY ADDENDUM NO. 2

Addendum No. 2 included the addition of two sub-phases to Phase 2, (Phase 2A and 2B) and moved portions of work out into future phases as follows:

- Phase 2A coincided with a separate project to add HOV lanes along U.S. Highway 50 and included:
 - Roadway Width and Lane Striping: The length of the two existing northbound and a single southbound turn lanes beneath the bridges, approaching the adjacent intersections with the interchange ramps, were extended for more storage capacity for turning traffic.

Roadway width on El Dorado Hills Blvd/Latrobe Road between interchange ramps was increased from 130 feet to a varying width of 130 feet to 190 feet to accommodate the lengthened turn lanes and to accommodate the additional through lane to be constructed in Phase 2A. Lane striping at the southbound approach to the El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Rd intersection with the eastbound ramps were modified to 4 through lanes and one dedicated left-turn lane.

- Bridge Type and Size: The original bridge, a 4-span, cast in place concrete box girders, with open end abutments, was replaced with 2- span, precast concrete box girders, with closed end abutments. The bridge dimensions changed from 241.5 feet long and 163.67 feet wide, to 200 feet long and 141 feet wide. The proposed EB off-ramp bridge changed from 241.5 feet long to is 200 feet long. All replacement bridges were within the same footprint area.

- EB Off-Ramp (to northbound): The EB off-ramp loop radius was reduced from the ultimate configuration to an interim condition until the eastbound on-ramp is replaced in a future phase.
- Phase 2B, per Addendum No. 2, included all the remaining features identified in the 2003 EIR including ramp modification at all four quadrants, intersection modifications and:
 - Reconstruction of westbound on and off-ramps of the El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road Interchange on U.S. Highway 50 from post mile (PM) 0.20 to 1.40;
 - Constructing a new westbound diagonal on-ramp;
 - Construction of westbound loop off-ramp and bridge;
 - Installation of new signals at the westbound ramp intersection;
 - Modifications to the existing intersection at El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Saratoga Way just north of the existing ramp intersection.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO PHASE 2B

Due to funding limitations, Phase 2B is being divided into two sub phases, Phase 2B.1 and 2B.2. Phase 2B.1 segregates the westbound on- and off-ramps from the eastbound on- and off-ramps. Additionally, Phase 2B.1 is proposed to be slightly modified from the previously approved 2003 EIR as described below and as illustrated in Exhibit A.

Phase 2B.2, is proposed to address remaining eastbound on- and off-ramp improvements left to complete the ultimate interchange project as defined by the 2003 EIR.

Phase 2B.1

Westbound On-Ramp

- The merging taper from the on-ramp meter limit line to the freeway will be at 30:1, consistent with the Caltrans Highway Design Manual (HDM), (Exhibit B, figure 504.3G note 2), instead of original design of 15:1. The merge lane taper was increased to provide safer travel allowing drivers to merge over a longer distance (See Area #1, Exhibit A).
- The California Highway Patrol (CHP) enforcement area of the westbound on- ramp was reconfigured to provide a safer refuge for enforcement. The original proposal places the enforcement area 90 feet further down the on-ramp. The new proposal places the enforcement area in the location consistent with Caltrans HDM and provides standard 15-foot width (less paved area required) instead of the 23-foot width originally proposed in the 2003 EIR. A diagram from the Caltrans HDM, (Exhibit B), shows the current requirements for the design of the enforcement area. This reconfigured design results in a safer placement of CHP to enforce ramp metering (See Area #1, Exhibit A).
- Retaining Wall – A retaining wall is proposed along the on-ramp to avoid right of way impacts near the intersection and allow for a safe separation between the realigned

Saratoga Way and the on-ramp. The retaining wall was also needed to comply with the Caltrans HDM for fill slopes not to exceed a 4:1 instead of the 2:1 in the original design. The use of the retaining wall also provides for an area between the wall and Saratoga Way to convey drainage and perpetuate the existing drainage patterns (See Area #2, Exhibit A).

- Ramp Shoulder Width – Due to the need for the retaining wall location being adjacent to traffic lanes, Caltrans HDM section 309.1(3)(b)) mandated that shoulder widths be 10 feet instead of the 8 feet shown in the original design (See Area #2, Exhibit A).

Westbound Off-Ramp

- The westbound loop off-ramp to southbound Latrobe Road will have longer merging taper to allow for safer vehicular movements and will merge with through traffic prior to the signalized intersection with the eastbound diagonal off-ramp. During this interim phase the lane configuration for the westbound loop off-ramp will provide operational and safety improvements between the ramp intersections for traffic flow and merging vehicles (See Area #3, Exhibit A).
- The original design dimensions for the westbound off-ramp bridge in the June 2000 Project Study Report/Project Report (PSR/PR) were 241.5 feet long and 39 feet wide. The current proposal would construct the westbound off-ramp bridge with a structure that is 200 feet long and 39 feet wide (See Area #3, Exhibit A) and consistent with the bridge type specified in Addendum No. 2.

Median between Westbound On and Off-Ramps

- The separation between the off-ramp traffic and on-ramp traffic at the ramp intersection with El Dorado Hills Boulevard is increased from 4-feet to 14-feet. This modification (See Area #3, Exhibit A), was made at the request of Caltrans Headquarters Geometricians and accomplishes the following:
 - The wider median provides a safer separation distance between opposing traffic and addresses potential wrong way movement at the ramps.
 - Allows for proper channelization of vehicles into mixed flow lanes rather than trapping vehicles into the HOV bypass lane. HOV users can then select the preferential bypass lane after entering the ramp.
 - The wider median allows for a refuge area of at least 5 feet for bicyclists through the intersection in the southbound direction of El Dorado Hills Boulevard.

Northbound El Dorado Hills Blvd.

- Construct the third northbound through lane between the eastbound loop off-ramp and Saratoga Way as approved in the 2003 EIR.

Phase 2B.2

Phase 2B.2 is proposed to be constructed in the future due to funding limitations and consists of the remaining eastbound on- and off-ramp improvements left to complete the ultimate interchange project as defined by the 2003 EIR. Phase 2B.2 will include reconstruction of the eastbound diagonal on-ramp, eastbound on-ramp auxiliary lane, and ramp modifications to the

eastbound loop off ramp. No modifications are proposed in this Addendum to these features in Phase 2B.2 from those approved with the 2003 EIR.

SUMMARY

The modifications for both the on- and off-ramps for Phase 2B.1, resulting in the need for Addendum No. 3, were made to satisfy Caltrans design standards and:

- Provides a safer design allowing drivers to merge over a longer distance entering westbound U.S. Highway 50;
- Provides a safer configuration of the CHP enforcement area of the westbound on- ramp;
- Provide a safer design between the on and off – ramps.

The geometry of the proposed improvements has been modified slightly, but still remains within the footprint identified in the EIR.

Staff reviewed the original 2003 EIR and all the impacts analyzed. In particular, staff considered whether the changes proposed would increase the impacts a level of significance as illustrated in the attached CEQA Checklist. Staff concluded that none of the changes proposed to Phase 2B.1 and the addition of a Phase 2B.1 result in increased or new impacts, and that no new mitigation measures are necessary as a result of the proposed modifications.

LIST OF FIGURES

Exhibit A

Exhibit B

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: CEQA Initial Study/Environmental Checklist Form

ATTACHMENT A

CEQA Guidelines Appendix G

Environmental Checklist Form

- **Project title:** U.S. HIGHWAY 50/EL DORADO HILLS BOULEVARD-LATROBE ROAD INTERCHANGE PHASE 2B
- **Lead agency name and address:**
El Dorado County Department of Transportation
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
- **Contact person:** Janet Postlewait, Principal Planner, (530) 621-5993
janet.postlewait@edcgov.us
- **Location of Project:** The Project is located at the intersection of Latrobe Road/El Dorado Hills Boulevard and U.S. Highway 50 in the community of El Dorado Hills, El Dorado County
- **Other public agencies whose approval is required:** The El Dorado County Board of Supervisors has authority to approve the Project. No additional approvals are anticipated prior to construction.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Due to funding limitations, Phase 2B is being divided into two sub phases, Phase 2B.1 and 2B.2. Phase 2B.1 segregates the westbound on- and off-ramps from the eastbound on- and off-ramps. Additionally, Phase 2B.1 is proposed to be slightly modified from the previously approved 2003 EIR as described below and as illustrated in Exhibit A.

Phase 2B.2, is proposed to address remaining eastbound on- and off-ramp improvements left to complete the ultimate interchange project as defined by the 2003 EIR.

Phase 2B.1

Westbound On-Ramp

- The merging taper from the on-ramp meter limit line to the freeway will be at 30:1, consistent with the Caltrans Highway Design Manual (HDM), (Exhibit B, figure 504.3G note 2), instead of original design of 15:1. The merge lane taper was increased to provide safer travel allowing drivers to merge over a longer distance (See Area #1, Exhibit A).
- The California Highway Patrol (CHP) enforcement area of the westbound on- ramp was reconfigured to provide a safer refuge for enforcement. The original proposal places the enforcement area 90 feet further down the on-ramp. The new proposal places the enforcement area in the location consistent with Caltrans HDM and provides standard 15-foot width (less paved area required) instead of the 23-foot width originally proposed in the 2003 EIR. A diagram from the Caltrans HDM, (Exhibit B), shows the current requirements for the design of the enforcement area. This reconfigured design results in a safer placement of CHP to enforce ramp metering (See Area #1, Exhibit A).

- Retaining Wall – A retaining wall is proposed along the on-ramp to avoid right of way impacts near the intersection and allow for a safe separation between the realigned Saratoga Way and the on-ramp. The retaining wall was also needed to comply with the Caltrans HDM for fill slopes not to exceed a 4:1 instead of the 2:1 in the original design. The use of the retaining wall also provides for an area between the wall and Saratoga Way to convey drainage and perpetuate the existing drainage patterns (See Area #2, Exhibit A).
- Ramp Shoulder Width – Due to the need for the retaining wall location being adjacent to traffic lanes, Caltrans HDM section 309.1(3)(b)) mandated that shoulder widths be 10 feet instead of the 8 feet shown in the original design (See Area #2, Exhibit A).

Westbound Off-Ramp

- The westbound loop off-ramp to southbound Latrobe Road will have longer merging taper to allow for safer vehicular movements and will merge with through traffic prior to the signalized intersection with the eastbound diagonal off-ramp. During this interim phase the lane configuration for the westbound loop off-ramp will provide operational and safety improvements between the ramp intersections for traffic flow and merging vehicles (See Area #3, Exhibit A).
- The original design dimensions for the westbound off-ramp bridge in the June 2000 Project Study Report/Project Report (PSR/PR) were 241.5 feet long and 39 feet wide. The current proposal would construct the westbound off-ramp bridge with a structure that is 200 feet long and 39 feet wide (See Area #3, Exhibit A) and consistent with the bridge type specified in Addendum No. 2.

Median between Westbound On and Off-Ramps

- The separation between the off-ramp traffic and on-ramp traffic at the ramp intersection with El Dorado Hills Boulevard is increased from 4-feet to 14-feet. This modification (See Area #3, Exhibit A), was made at the request of Caltrans Headquarters Geometricians and accomplishes the following:
 - The wider median provides a safer separation distance between opposing traffic and addresses potential wrong way movement at the ramps.
 - Allows for proper channelization of vehicles into mixed flow lanes rather than trapping vehicles into the HOV bypass lane. HOV users can then select the preferential bypass lane after entering the ramp.
 - The wider median allows for a refuge area of at least 5 feet for bicyclists through the intersection in the southbound direction of El Dorado Hills Boulevard.

Northbound El Dorado Hills Blvd.

- Construct the third northbound through lane between the eastbound loop off-ramp and Saratoga Way as approved in the 2003 EIR.

Phase 2B.2

Phase 2B.2 is proposed to be constructed in the future due to funding limitations and consists of the remaining eastbound on- and off-ramp improvements left to complete the ultimate

interchange project as defined by the 2003 EIR. Phase 2B.2 will include reconstruction of the eastbound diagonal on-ramp, eastbound on-ramp auxiliary lane, and ramp modifications to the eastbound loop off ramp. No modifications are proposed in this Addendum to these features in Phase 2B.2 from those approved with the 2003 EIR.

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- x I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required other than this addendum to the previously approved EIR for the **U.S. HIGHWAY 50/EL DORADO HILLS BOULEVARD-LATROBE ROAD INTERCHANGE PROJECT**


Signature


Date

Janet Postlewait
Printed Name

El Dorado County Department of Transportation
For

CEQA Environmental Checklist

U.S. Highway 50/El Dorado Hills Boulevard-Latrobe Road Interchange Addendum No. 3 to to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The revisions to the westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1, as set forth in the Project Description will be contained within the same project footprint that was analyzed in the 2003 EIR. Any applicable mitigation measures set forth in the EIR are still applicable to these minor changes. These changes do not significantly increase or create new significant impacts not already analyzed in the approved EIR with regard to aesthetic impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: To determine if impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The revisions to westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1, as set forth in the Project Description, will be contained within the existing project footprint as those identified in the 2003 EIR. The same mitigation measures set forth in the EIR are still applicable to these minor changes. These changes do not significantly increase or create new significant impacts not already analyzed in the approved 2003 EIR with regard to Agriculture.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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) Create greenhouse gas emissions and contribute to global climate change | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The proposed revisions to westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1, will be contained within the same project footprint and therefore could not occur closer to sensitive receptors than those analyzed in the original EIR. There are no capacity increasing changes that could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant than those analyzed in the original EIR. The same applicable mitigation measures set forth in the EIR are still applicable to these minor changes to Phase 2B.1. These changes do not significantly increase or create new significant impacts not already analyzed in the approved EIR with regard to Air Quality.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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, regulations or by the CA Department of Fish and Game or US 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 per Section 404 of the CWA (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal) through 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The improvements proposed with revisions to westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1, will be contained within the existing project footprint as analyzed in the original 2003 EIR for Biological Resources. Therefore, the changes proposed in Phase 2B would not result in any additional loss of a. sensitive or special status species; b. riparian habitat or sensitive natural community, or; c. any federally protected wetlands. Applicable mitigation measures set forth in the 2003 EIR are still applicable to these minor changes to Phase 2B.1. There are no significant increases or new significant impacts not already analyzed in the approved EIR with regard to Biological Resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The Revised westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1, as set forth in the Project Description will be contained within the existing project footprint as analyzed in the 2003 EIR. Therefore, the changes proposed in Phase 2B would not result in any additional, a. changes in a historical resource; b. changes in an archaeological resource; c.. Ability to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site or unique geologic feature, or; d. disturbance of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. The same applicable mitigation measures set forth in the 2003 EIR would still applicable to these minor changes. These changes do not significantly increase or create new significant impacts not already analyzed in the approved EIR with regard to cultural resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 unstable or potentially unstable soil, that could result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the UBC creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The revised improvements proposed for the westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1, will be contained within the existing project footprint analyzed in the 2003 EIR. The same applicable mitigation measures set forth in the 2003 EIR and the same local, state and federal standards are still applicable to these minor changes to Phase 2B.1. As set forth in the 2003 EIR, the Project must be constructed in accordance with the County's Grading Ordinance and Storm Water Management Plan for Western El Dorado County. The contractor must prepare a construction-related Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), consistent with section 402 of the Clean Water Act, and construction activities will include implementation of stormwater runoff best management practices (BMPs) identified in the SWPPP. Application of these requirements and measures would prevent substantial erosion or topsoil loss. These changes do not significantly increase or create new significant impacts not already analyzed in the approved EIR.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create significant hazard to the public or environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed revision to westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1, as set forth in the Project Description, will be contained within the existing project footprint. As set forth in the original 2003 EIR, small amounts of hazardous materials would be used during construction activities (i.e., equipment maintenance, fuel, solvents, roadway resurfacing and re-striping materials), and are required to comply with all applicable local, state, and federal standards associated with the handling and storage of hazardous materials. Use of hazardous materials in accordance with applicable standards ensures that any exposure of the public to hazard materials would have a less-than-significant impact. The same mitigation state, local and federal standards as well as mitigation measures set forth in the EIR are still applicable to these minor changes to Phase 2B.1. Project modifications to Phase 2B do not significantly increase or create new significant impacts not already analyzed in the approved EIR with regard to Hazardous Materials.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 lower the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter existing drainage pattern, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase rate or amount of surface runoff 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 which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed revision to westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1, as set forth in the Project Description, will be contained within the existing project footprint analyzed in the original EIR. No overall increases to impervious surface area will occur as a result of modifications to Phase 2B.1 and therefore are not expected to contribute to a substantial increase in water runoff from the site than those anticipated in the 2003 EIR. As set forth in the original EIR, water quality during Project construction will be protected by adherence to construction provisions, precautions, and stipulations as described in the NPDES, Section 404, Section 401, and 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement permits as applicable. Applicable mitigation measures set forth in the EIR are still applicable to these minor changes. These changes do not significantly increase or create new significant impacts not already analyzed in the approved EIR with regard to Hydrology and Water Quality.

IX. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING:</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (ie: general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The revisions to westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1, as set forth in the Project Description, will be contained within the same project footprint as analyzed in the 2003 EIR. No capacity increasing changes will occur. The project is still consistent with applicable land use plans, policies and/or regulations. Any applicable mitigation measures set forth in the 2003 EIR are still applicable to these minor changes. These changes do not significantly increase or create new significant impacts not already analyzed in the approved EIR with regard to Land Use and Planning.

X. <u>MINERAL RESOURCES:</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site from a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The modifications to westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1, will be contained within the same project footprint that was analyzed in the 2003 EIR. The conclusion that this project would have no impacts on Mineral Resources is thus still valid. These changes do not significantly increase or create new significant impacts not already analyzed in the approved 2003 EIR with regard to Mineral Resources.

XI. NOISE: Would the project result in:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 2 miles of a public airport, would the project expose people 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 located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The modified westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1, will be contained within the same project footprint that was analyzed for noise impacts in the 2003 EIR. The modifications are not capacity increasing and are necessary to meet current Caltrans Design Standards and improve the overall safety of the Project. The modifications to the westbound on ramp, including the increase in the merge lane taper, the reduced width of the CHP enforcement area, the new retaining wall and the 2' increase in ramp shoulder width will not result in any increased noise impacts to sensitive receptors in the area. The same mitigation measures set forth in the 2003 EIR are still applicable and will still reduce any impacts to less than significant. These changes do not significantly increase or create new significant impacts not already analyzed in the approved EIR with regard to Noise.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The modified westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1, will be contained within the same project footprint that was analyzed in the 2003 EIR. The modifications are not capacity increasing, will not induce population growth and will not displace any housing. These changes do not significantly increase or create new significant impacts in the approved 2003 EIR with regard to Populations and Housing.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion The modified westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1 will be contained within the same project footprint that was analyzed in the 2003 EIR. The modifications are not capacity increasing, will not induce population growth that could cause additional impacts to public services that were not previously considered in the 2003 EIR.

XIV. RECREATION:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The modified westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1, will be contained within the same project footprint that was analyzed in the 2003 EIR. The modifications are not capacity increasing, will not induce population growth that could result in additional impacts to recreation that were not previously considered in the 2003 EIR.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, volume to capacity ratio, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including increase in traffic levels or change in location resulting in safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The revisions to westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1 will not create any additional impacts or require any additional mitigation measures that were not previously considered in the 2003 EIR. The revisions are necessary to meet current Caltrans Design Standards and improve safety. a. No increase in traffic will occur; b. no reduction in level of service standard will result; d. the 2B.1 modifications address potential hazards by improving safety, and; g. will not conflict with alternative transportation policies or plans.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project of adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The modified westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1 will be contained within the same project footprint that was analyzed in the 2003 EIR. The modifications are not capacity increasing, will not induce population growth that could result in additional impacts or the need for new utility systems that were not previously considered in the 2003 EIR. The same applicable local or state requirements and/or mitigation measures set forth in the 2003 EIR with regard to storm water drainage facilities or solid construction waste removal are still applicable and will still reduce any impacts to less than significant. These changes do not significantly increase or create new significant impacts not already analyzed in the approved 2003 EIR.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 incremental effects are considerable when viewed in connection with effects of past projects, other current projects, and 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 which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The revisions to westbound portions of Phase 2B, Phase 2B.1, as set forth in the Project Description, will be contained within the same project footprint as analyzed in the 2003 EIR. No capacity increasing changes will occur. The project is still consistent with applicable land use plans, policies and/or regulations. Any applicable mitigation measures set forth in the 2003 EIR are still applicable to these minor changes. These changes do not significantly increase or create new significant impacts not previously considered in the approved 2003 EIR.

Mitigation Monitoring Program

The previous mitigation monitoring program developed for the U.S. Highway 50/EDH Boulevard-Latrobe Road Interchange is relevant with no proposed changes as a result of Addendum #3.