

Appendix E

Text Changes to Draft EIR and Recirculated Partial Draft EIR

Introduction

CEQA Guidelines Section 15132 provides that a Final EIR must include, among other things, the Draft EIR or a revision of the draft. This chapter identifies the text changes that have been made to the TGPA/ZOU Draft EIR and Recirculated Partial Draft EIR. The changes are arranged by the chapter or section of the Draft EIR in which they are found and referenced by page number. For the reader's convenience, the changes are presented in the context of the paragraph in which they are found. Additions are shown as underlined text; deletions are shown as strikethroughs.

The Recirculated Partial Draft EIR superseded some portions of the Draft EIR. The chapters and sections belonging to the Recirculated Partial Draft EIR are identified as such.

Note that these changes do not include revisions to the Executive Summary or the Introduction chapter. The Executive Summary has been rewritten to reflect the combining of the Draft EIR and Recirculated Partial Draft EIR and precedes Chapter 1, *Introduction*, of this Final EIR. The Introduction has been updated to explain the organization of the Final EIR document. In addition, the whole of the Draft EIR text has been revised to identify it as the Final EIR, and those editorial changes are not presented in this chapter.

Chapter 2, Project Description (Recirculated Partial Draft EIR)

Page 2-1, the first paragraph is revised as follows:

The project consists of targeted amendments to the El Dorado County General Plan (TGPA), a comprehensive zoning ordinance update (ZOU), and design standards and guidelines, including those for mixed-use development. The TGPA and the ZOU considered together (TGPA/ZOU) constitute the proposed project (Project) being analyzed in this Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). El Dorado County is illustrated in Figure 2-1. The project applies to those areas that are under County jurisdiction (Figure 2-2).

Page 2-3, the ninth bullet is revised as follows:

- 1 Expand allowed uses in the agricultural and rural land zones (including forest resource and TPZ) to provide opportunities for agricultural support, recreation, and rural commerce.

Page 2-7, second to last paragraph from the bottom is corrected as follows:

Policy 2.2.1.2: High Density Residential. The requirement for a planned development application on projects of three or more dwelling units per acre to allow for additional moderate income housing options would be deleted.

~~Policy 2.2.1.2: Open Space. The policy to refer to General Plan Objective 7.6.1 and to allow for additional moderate income housing options would be amended.~~

Page 2-9, insert the following after the tenth paragraph:

Policy 5.2.1.3: Amend this policy to make optional the connection of medium-density residential, high-density residential, multifamily residential, commercial, industrial and research and development projects to public water systems when located within Community Regions and to either a public water system or to an approved private water systems in Rural Centers.

Policy 5.3.1.1: Amend this policy to make optional the connection of high-density and multifamily residential, commercial, and industrial projects to public wastewater collection facilities. It is currently optional in Rural Centers and areas designated as Platted Lands and that is not proposed for change. The policy that long term development of public sewer service shall be encouraged in Pollock Pines would also be unchanged.

Page 2-9, second to the last paragraph is deleted as follows:

~~Policy 6.4.1.4 and 6.4.1.5: New Parcels in Flood Hazard Areas. Reference to the flood insurance rate maps would be removed from these policies to address recommendations by the Office of Emergency Services and Homeland Security regarding dam failure inundation.~~

Page 2-10, the first paragraph is revised as follows:

~~Objective 6.7.1 and 6.7.5: Air Quality. These~~This objective would be amended to reflect updated air quality plan opportunities and add new policies and implementation measure that support the adoption of an Air Quality–Energy Conservation Plan.

Page 2-10, insert the following before 2.4.2 Zoning Ordinance Update:

Policy 10.2.1.5: This policy requires preparation of a public facilities and services financing plan for specific plans and large residential, commercial, and industrial development projects. The proposal would amend this policy to state that such plans *may* be required.

Page 2-15, the first paragraph under Section 2.4.3 Community Design Standards has been revised as follows:

The County is developing a new and/or updated Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM)/Land Development Manual (LDM), or successor document that will set out development standards to augment those already in the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances. While the DISM/LDM, or successor document, is still under development, the County is adopting specific standards on the following subjects: 1) landscaping and irrigation, 2) mobile home parks, 3) outdoor lighting, 4) parking and loading, and 5) research and development. These standards would be adopted by resolution at the same time as adoption of the new Zoning Ordinance. A full copy of the proposed ~~language~~ community design standards is available on the County's website <http://www.edc.gov.us/Government/LongRangePlanning/LandUse/TGPA-ZOU_Main.aspx> (in the ~~Zoning Ordinance Update~~ Community Design Standards tab), and at the County offices.

Section 2.5.3 was added on page 2-22:

2.5.3 Draft EIR Reviews

The DEIR was released for public review and comment for an extensive period of 120 days from March 21, 2014 through July 23, 2014. Notice was provided from the County's notification list. As a result of the comments received, the County prepared and released for review and comment a Recirculated Partial DEIR (RPDEIR) for the 45-day period from January 29, 2015 through March 16, 2015. The RPDEIR included additional analyses of groundwater supplies, energy use, and revisions to the community design manual. This FEIR responds to the comments received on both the DEIR and the RPDEIR.

Chapter 3, Impact Analysis

Page 3-2, the second bullet is revised and additional bullets are added as follows:

- | Section 3.10, *Water Supply*, including groundwater supply
- | Section 3.11, *Energy*
- | Section 3.12, *Community Design Standards*

Page 3-2, the delete Hydrology and Water Quality and the accompanying paragraph as follows:

~~None of the proposed changes in General Plan policy or Zoning Ordinance regulations would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. In addition, the project will not substantially alter or degrade groundwater supplies, existing drainage patterns, or water quality. Water supply will be addressed in the DEIR (Section 3.10, *Water Supply*).~~

Section 3.1, Aesthetics

Page 3.1-11, insert the following after the fourth paragraph:

In addition, the expanded provisions for Home Occupations would allow certain business uses in residential zones either by right, by administrative permit (where student instruction or horse riding lessons and horse training exceed specified limits), or where more intensive, by discretionary permit on parcels exceeding one acre in area. A home occupation is defined as a business operated out of a residential dwelling or accessory structure or outdoors on the residential parcel, by a resident of the premises, and that is compatible with surrounding residential and agricultural uses. Home occupations may include, but are not limited to, work performed by telephone, mail, or by internet, or appointment; home offices; Cottage Food Operations (CFO), small scale production and repair, handicrafts, parts assembly; or work or craft that is the activity of creative artists, music teachers, academic tutors, trainers, or similar instructors. More intensive uses that may be allowed by conditional use permit include businesses such as motor vehicle repair, motor vehicle storage, cabinet making, veterinary services, commercial kennels, medical/dental offices and clinics, medical laboratories, welding and machining, large-scale upholstery, and food preparation and sales.

Page 3.1-14, insert the following after the third paragraph under Project Analysis:

The aesthetics impact of future home occupations, absent information about the type of use, existing visual setting and its intensity, and the extent to which the use may degrade the setting, cannot be known at the site level. However, because these uses may be applied for in rural areas that are of high visual quality, that there may be instances where a home occupation that would be allowed by right under Section 17.40.160 could adversely affect the aesthetics of its surroundings. The same would be true for more intensive home occupations requiring a discretionary permit. Although more intensive uses would require a conditional use permit and would be subject to CEQA analysis, that does not assure that the use would not result in a significant impact.

Page 3.1-15, revise the first paragraph under Project Analysis as follows:

As discussed under Impact AES-1, it is reasonably foreseeable that the proposed ZOU provisions described above could result in new development that adversely affects existing scenic resources. ~~No other~~This part of the project would have that has the greatest potential to affect scenic resources, although future development consistent with the General Plan will also play a major role.

Section 3.2, Agricultural and Forestry Resources

Page 3.2-7, the second to the last paragraph is revised as follows:

Timberland that is subject to the Forest Taxation Reform Act of 1976 is zoned TPZ. Land uses are generally restricted to resource uses, and a residence is allowed only upon approval of a special use permit. Timber harvesting is not restricted to TPZ parcels. For example, timber harvesting and production is also allowed ~~on properties zoned and AE~~within many zoning districts including, but not limited to TPZ, Transportation Corridor (TC), FR, RL, PA, AG, and RR. Timber harvesting is regulated by the state, as described above.

Page 3.2-13, Table 3.2-4 is revised as follows:

Table 3.2-4 Agricultural Land with Medium or High Conversion Potential in 2004

Agricultural Land Category	Acres of Potential Conversion
Important Farmland	16,173 <u>21,954</u>
Grazing Land	21,689 <u>40,783</u>
Choice Soils	24,663 <u>36,658</u> ^a
Agricultural District/Ag Land	0
Williamson Act Contracted Land	242 <u>4,582</u> ^b
Total	63,307 <u>81,076</u>

^a “Choice soils” includes lands also identified as Important Farmland. To avoid double-counting, 50% of the choice soils acreage is not included in the total.

^b All Williamson Act lands are accounted for in the Important Farmland and Grazing Land acreages. To avoid double-counting, these lands are not included in the total.

Source: El Dorado County 2004.

Page 3.2-13, the following paragraph is inserted after Table 3.2-4 Agricultural Land with Medium or High Conversion Potential in 2004:

Table 3.2-4 has been modified since circulation of the Draft EIR to clarify the amount of agricultural land that had medium and high conversion potential in 2004. Table 3.2-4 is based on 2004 General Plan EIR Table 5.2-5. Table 5.2-5 inadvertently overstated this impact by double-counting some of the agricultural acreages. The category of “choice soils” included lands also identified in the categories constituting Important Farmland. Land under Williamson Act contracts, by definition, included lands also identified in the categories of Important Farmland and Grazing Land. The actual area of potential impact resulting from implementation of the 2004 General Plan is not precisely known, because the amount of overlap between choice soils and Important Farmland is not precisely known, although the amount of overlap is probably extensive.

For the purpose of providing general information, the total acreage in Table 3.2-4 no longer includes the land identified as being under Williamson Act, and the amount of land identified as choice soils in the total acreage has been reduced by 50 percent. In addition, because the adopted 2004 General Plan is primarily reflective 2004 Alternative 4 (1996 General Plan Alternative), combined with some features of Alternative 3 (Environmentally Constrained Alternative), the farmland numbers for 2004 Alternative 4 have been substituted for the Alternative 3 numbers reflected in Table 3.2-4 in the Draft EIR.

Page 3.2-14, the first paragraph is revised as follows:

The project’s proposed elimination of the Camino–Pollock Pines Community Region in favor of three Rural Centers encompassing the same area would have no impact on existing agricultural lands and would not increase the potential for future agricultural conversions because it does not propose any changes to existing land use designations. Establishing the Rural Centers may somewhat reduce the potential intensity of residential and commercial development that exists under the current Community Region development standards. This would in turn reduce potential development pressure on surrounding lands. However, given that the Camino/Pollock Pines Community Region currently lacks the necessary infrastructure and services to reach its potential development intensity, any actual reduction in development potential would likely be small (see Section 3.10, *Water Supply*). The impact would be less than significant.

Page 3.2-15, the second bullet on this page is revised as follows:

- Health Resort and Retreat Center use in the PA, AG, ~~and RL, FR, and TPZ~~ zones upon approval of a CUP. Lots adjacent to or within Agricultural zones must be reviewed by the County Agricultural Commission for compatibility with surrounding agricultural uses prior to consideration of the CUP. Nonetheless, the lack of a size limitation in the proposed ZOU raises the possibility of conflicts arising with agricultural operations over traffic and activity levels from this land use or conversion of a substantial amount of farmland to a nonagricultural use. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AG-1a would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The measure would place reasonable size limits on centers consistent with the requirements for Bed And Breakfast Inns.

Page 3.2-17, the third paragraph under Project Impacts is revised as follows:

The ZOU provides that Ranch Marketing would be allowed only in conjunction with and complementary to ongoing agricultural operations, subject to limitations on the amount of area that may be devoted to Ranch Marketing activities. Proposed Section 17.040.260.D provides that the total ranch marketing area cannot occupy more than five acres or 50 percent of the lot, whichever is less. The total amount of building space devoted to Ranch Marketing activities would be limited to 10,000 square feet on parcels from 10-20 acres in area, 40,000 square feet on parcels from 20-40 acres in area, and 60,000 square feet on parcels in excess of 40 acres in area. This would ensure that while a portion of an agricultural operation is used for Ranch Marketing, “substantial areas” of agricultural land would not be removed from production. The impact would be less than significant.

Page 3.2-19, the second paragraph under the first bullet on this page is revised as follows:

This type of use ~~is not consistent with the requirement that land within a TPZ be “enforceably restricted” to forestry in order to qualify for the preferential tax rate provided under the Forest Taxation Reform Act of 1976. Nor do any of these uses~~ does not explicitly fall within the list of “compatible uses” that may be allowed in a TPZ zone. The uses that could potentially be allowed would by their very nature result in the conversion of timberland, including lands currently in timber production and lands zoned for timber production, to non-forestry uses. The impact would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AG-4, which would revise the ZOU to not allow industrial uses in the TPZ zone, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Section 3.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases

Page 3.3-23, the first paragraph under Methods of Analysis is revised as follows:

Methods of Analysis

The project would not fundamentally change the projected level of development expected to occur under the current General Plan. Also, the project does not propose adding substantially more residences beyond the approximately 20,000 theoretically allowed under the current General Plan. The primary effects of the project would be on regional traffic and trip distribution. Consequently, this impact analysis focuses on the effects of the project on mobile source emissions. Because there are no development projects proposed as part of the project, the impacts on air quality and GHG emissions are examined at a general level in this DEIR.

Page 3.3-28, the discussion under EDCAQMD Greenhouse Gas Thresholds is revised as follows:

EDCAQMD Greenhouse Gas Thresholds

EDCAQMD’s *Guide to Air Quality Assessment* does not currently contain any guidance for the analysis of climate change impacts (El Dorado County Air Quality Management District 2002). However, EDCAQMD is part of an effort to develop regional GHG thresholds with members of Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD, Placer County Air Pollution Control District, Yolo-Solano AQMD, and Feather River AQMD utilizing guidance from California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA, 2008) to develop draft threshold concepts for evaluating project-level GHG emissions (Huss pers. comm.). The goal was to capture at least 90% of GHG emissions from new stationary source and land

development projects. The proposed draft regional GHG thresholds include the following project categories and emission levels.

- | **Stationary source projects:** 10,000 direct metric tons of CO₂e per year.
- | **Operation of a land development project:** 1,100 metric tons CO₂e per year.
- | **Construction of a project:** 1,100 metric tons CO₂e per year.

Land development projects with emissions exceeding the operational threshold must mitigate emissions down to the 1,100 metric tons CO₂e mass emissions threshold or demonstrate a 21.7% reduction from a projected no action taken (NAT) scenario¹ to show consistency with AB 32 reduction goals. The 21.7% reduction was derived by the air district threshold working group from ARB's recalculated 2020 business-as-usual (BAU) GHG forecast of 545 million metric tons CO₂e² and the statewide GHG reduction target of 427 million metric tons CO₂e.³ Projects that reduce GHG emissions below 1,100 metric tons or by 21.7%, relative to the NAT scenario, would result in a less-than-significant impact on global climate change.

Since there are no specific new land uses or stationary sources proposed as part of the project, the 10,000 metric ton CO₂e threshold does not apply to the proposed project. However, as changes in on-road motor vehicle activity would result from the project, the regional draft land development threshold (which accounts for motor vehicle trips) of 1,100 metric tons CO₂e was used to evaluate operational source emissions. Emissions in excess of this threshold are considered significant and would be required to be mitigated below 1,100 metric tons or reduced by 21.7%, relative to the NAT scenario, to result in a less-than-significant impact related to climate change.

The draft regional thresholds currently propose evaluating construction and operational emissions separately such that annual construction emissions are compared with the draft 1,100 metric ton CO₂e emissions threshold, and operational emissions are evaluated for reductions achieved relative to the NAT if they are in excess of the draft 1,100 metric ton CO₂e emissions threshold. However, consultation with EDCAQMD staff indicates that if construction emissions exceed the regional draft annual threshold of 1,100 metric tons CO₂e, the impact determination may consider an evaluation of combined construction and operational emissions in which construction emissions are amortized over the anticipated project lifetime (Baughman pers. comm.). This approach provides a method to assess whether the annual operational emissions savings that are achieved through project-level design and/or mitigation features are sufficient to reduce annual operational and amortized construction emissions by 21.7%, relative to the NAT. Projects that achieve annual reductions of 21.7%, relative to the NAT scenario, would result in a less-than-significant impact on global climate change.

¹ The NAT scenario does not include any State regulations designed to reduce GHG emissions, including improvements to the Title 24 standards, RPS, LCFS, or Pavley Rules. LRVSP policies that would reduce project-level GHG emissions (e.g., renewable energy development) are likewise excluded.

² Forecast does not include emissions benefits (i.e., reductions) from Pavley or the RPS.

³ AB 32 required ARB to adopt a Scoping Plan to describe the approach California will take to reduce greenhouse gases to achieve the goal of reducing emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The Final Supplement to the AB 32 Scoping Plan Functional Equivalent Document (FED) was prepared on August 19, 2011, and included a revision to the 2020 BAU forecast to adjust in part to account for the challenging economic conditions in California. Note that in February 2014, ARB released another update to the 2020 BAU forecast and revised the 1990 inventory. The update addressed changes in GWPs and did not affect underlying analysis assumptions; the revised forecast differs by less than 5%, relative to the FED. The regional draft GHG thresholds may be revised to reflect ARB's February 2014 analysis, but nothing formal has been released by the air district.

The regional GHG thresholds are draft thresholds and have not been formally adopted by the EDCAQMD Board⁴. However, the thresholds are consistent with AB 32 and thus can be used as a benchmark to evaluate the significance of project-level GHG emissions (see *Citizens for Responsible Equitable Environmental Development (CREED) v. City of Chula Vista* [July 2011, 197 Cal.App.4th 327]). It is also important to note that the mitigation target is based on the state’s 2020 reduction goal,⁵ whereas buildout of the proposed project would not occur until approximately 2035. It is reasonably foreseeable that as California approaches the AB 32 milestone for 2020, future targets will be developed. However, no formal policy beyond 2020 has been adopted that is applicable to the proposed project.

~~In the interim, consultation with district staff indicates that use of San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District’s (SLOAPCD) GHG thresholds, as identified in Table 3.3-9, are appropriate to evaluate impacts related to climate change (Baughman pers. comm.).~~

Table 3.3-9. SLOAPCD GHG Thresholds used by EDCAQMD to Evaluate Climate Change Impacts

GHG Emission Source Category	Operational Emissions
Non-stationary Sources	1,150 MTCO ₂ e/yr OR 4.9 MT CO ₂ e/SP/yr
Stationary Sources	10,000 MTCO ₂ e/yr

Source: Baughman pers. comm.

Page 3.3-33, the first paragraph under Project Impacts is revised as follows:

NOA is known to be present in El Dorado County, especially the western portion of the county. Grading and ground-disturbing activities in areas with a moderate likelihood of containing NOA, such as western El Dorado County, may disturb asbestiform-containing soils and generate asbestos dust. Future development projects under the General Plan will likely take place on NOA-laced soils. EDCAQMD’s Rule 223-2 and General Plan Policies Policy 6.3.1.1 through 6.3.1.3 (testing and avoidance, disclosure, and reporting requirements for NOA soils) would minimize exposure to NOA, reducing this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Page 3.3-37, revise the paragraph under Project Impacts as follows:

The adopted General Plan policies identified in Table 3.3-14, including Policies 2.2.5.20 and 2.2.5.21 that limit the approval of incompatible uses in proximity to one another, are anticipated to help minimize exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, but not to less-than-significant levels. Although the project would only minimally increase the number of future residents that may be exposed to substantial pollution concentrations, it would increase the number. Consequently, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Page 3.3-37, revise the paragraph under 2004 General Plan EIR Conclusions as follows:

The 2004 General Plan EIR indicated that development under the General Plan would result significant exposure of sensitive receptors to odors and identified Mitigation Measure 5.1-3(b) to help reduce the severity of this impact. This measure corresponds to General Plan Policy 2.2.5.21, which provides, in part: “Development projects shall be located and designed in a manner that avoids incompatibility with adjoining land uses that are permitted by the policies in effect at the

⁴ The SMAQMD adopted the regional GHG thresholds for application within Sacramento County on October 23, 2014.

⁵ The statewide 2020 GHG reduction target of achieving 1990 emissions levels by 2020 is outlined in AB 32.

time the development project is proposed.” With implementation of this policy, the 2004 General Plan EIR indicated this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Section 3.4, Biological Resources

Page 3.4-3, the following is inserted before State, as follows:

CWA Section 402 regulates construction-related stormwater discharges to surface waters through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program, administered by EPA. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) is authorized by EPA to oversee the NPDES program through the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Boards).

Page 3.4-21, Table 3.4-2. Special-Status Wildlife Occurring in El Dorado County is revised as follows:

Under Mammals, add the following species entry:

Species	Federal Status	California Status
<u>Ring-tailed cat</u> <u>Bassariscus astutus</u>	=	<u>FP</u>

Page 3.4-22, second and third bullets are revised for clarity, as follows:

- | *Policy 2.1.1.3* is proposed to be amended such that the maximum residential density allowed for mixed use development in a Community Region would increase from 16 dwellings per acre to 20 dwellings per acre. This would result in a small increase in the potential intensity of residential development in Community Regions. However, this does not substantially change the potential location of future development or the effect on biological resources. Future residential development under the General Plan would impact biological resources where it disrupts or destroys habitat and interferes with the life patterns of wildlife and plants. However, the proposed amendment to Policy 2.1.1.3 would not expand the area subject to this impact and, therefore, would not increase the potential for residential development to have this effect. The impact would be significant and unavoidable, the same as concluded in~~under~~ the 2004 General Plan EIR (~~significant and unavoidable~~).
- | *Policy 2.1.2.5* is proposed to be amended such that the maximum residential density allowed for mixed use development in a Rural Center would increase from 4 dwellings per acre to 10 dwellings per acre. This would result in a small increase in the potential intensity of residential development in Rural Centers. However, this does not substantially change the potential location of future development or the effect on biological resources. Future residential development would impact biological resources where it disrupts or destroys habitat and interferes with the life patterns of wildlife and plants. However, the proposed amendment to Policy 2.1.2.5 does not increase the potential for residential development to have this effect or expand the area subject to this impact. The impact would be significant and unavoidable, the same as concluded in~~under~~ the 2004 General Plan EIR (~~significant and unavoidable~~).

Page 3.4-23, second bullet under Zoning Ordinance Updates is revised as follows:

- | *Section 17.21.020* proposes land uses in the Agricultural, Rural Lands, Forest Resource, and ResourcesTPZ zones (as shown in Table 17.21.020 of the ZOU) including uses that could result in adverse effects on biological resources.

Page 3.4-30, the first heading on this page is revised as follows:

Proposed Zoning Ordinance Section 17.21.020 (land uses in Planned Agricultural, Rural Lands, Forest Resource, and Resources ~~TPZ~~ zones)

Page 3.4-30, the third and fourth full paragraphs are revised as follows:

Health Resort and Retreat Center is a proposed new use permissible in the PA, AG, ~~and RL, FR, and TPZ~~ zones upon approval of a CUP. Unless limited in size, it could result in the conversion or fragmentation of important habitat. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure AG-1a would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. The measure would limit the size of Health Resort and Retreat Centers, consistent with the requirements for Bed and Breakfast Inns. With this size limitation, the potential for adverse impact on important habitat is greatly reduced. In addition, General Plan Policy 7.4.2.2, which would require identification and avoidance of critical wildlife areas and mitigation corridors, would also limit this impact.

The other land uses in Planned Agricultural, Rural Lands, and Resources zones include some uses (e.g., Feed and Farm Supply Store; Industrial, General; Off-Road Vehicle Recreation Area) that are typically intensive and could require the conversion of a substantial area whereby most or all natural habitat must be removed in order to operate as designed. This is because these uses typically include parking lots, storage areas (covered or open air), large buildings or work areas, and require extensive grading (unless the site is already level). The impacts of an off-road vehicle recreation area result from the creation of a network of bare trails across the landscape. Even development of a Ski Area, which typically retains some tree cover, would require a large dedicated base and parking area, would remove a substantial number of trees to create ski runs, and would introduce substantial new human activity to the area. Such uses would only be allowed upon prior approval of a CUP or other use permit, and such processes would be subject to CEQA and related mitigation measures. However, given that the uses in Agricultural, Rural Lands, and Resources zones would typically be located in rural areas where important habitat is most likely to exist and that the uses would require the removal of habitat from most or all of the sites to some extent, it is reasonably foreseeable that in some cases the EIR prepared for such uses could conclude that there would be one or more significant and unavoidable impacts, including the conversion or fragmentation of habitat. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Page 3.4-33, Mitigation Measure BIO-1a is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Limit the relaxation of hillside development standards

Revise proposed Policy 7.1.2.1, existing Policy 7.4.1.6, and proposed Section 17.30.060, subsections C and D, as follows.

Policy 7.1.2.1 Development or disturbance of slopes over 30% shall be restricted. Standards for implementation of this policy, including but not limited to a prohibition on development or disturbance where special-status species habitat is present and exceptions for access, reasonable use of the parcel, and agricultural uses shall be incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance.

Policy 7.4.1.6 All development projects involving discretionary review shall be designed to avoid disturbance or fragmentation of important habitats to the extent reasonably feasible. Development projects on slopes over 30% is prohibited where special-status species habitat is present. On slopes less than 30% where ~~where~~ avoidance is not possible, the

development shall be required to fully mitigate the effects of important habitat loss and fragmentation. Mitigation shall be defined in the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) (see Policy 7.4.2.8 and Implementation Measure CO-M).

The County Agricultural Commission, Plant and Wildlife Technical Advisory Committee, representatives of the agricultural community, academia, and other stakeholders shall be involved and consulted in defining the important habitats of the County and in the creation and implementation of the INRMP.

Section 17.30.060, subsection C. Development Standards applicable to slopes 30 percent or greater.

Development that will result in ground disturbance on slopes 30 percent or greater with a vertical height of 50 feet or more shall be prohibited, except where reasonable use of the property would be denied, as provided in subsection E, or the activity is exempt under subsection D, below.

Any development allowed on slopes 30 percent or greater with a vertical height of less than 50 feet shall require a grading or building permit and shall include an erosion and sediment control plan in compliance with the County Grading Design Manual. Development shall be prohibited where ground disturbance would adversely affect important habitat through conversion or fragmentation and shall comply with the provisions of General Plan Policy 7.4.1.6 regarding avoidance of important habitats. In order to demonstrate that adverse effects on important habitat will be avoided, the development proponent shall submit an independent Biological Resources Study, to be prepared by a qualified biologist, which examines the site for important habitat consistent with General Plan Implementation Measure CO-U.

Where required by the Grading Design Manual, technical studies from qualified professionals, such as soils or geotechnical reports to assess the erosion potential or slope stability may be required. Recommendations for erosion control or slope stabilization measures contained in the technical reports shall be implemented as a requirement of the grading or building permit. A surety bond, cash deposit or other security acceptable to the county may be required to ensure that long term erosion control measures, such as slope landscaping, are permanently established.

Section 17.30.060, subsection D. Exemptions.

The following types of development are exempt from the provisions of this Section:

1. Development that will avoid disturbance of slopes 30 percent or greater;
- ~~2. Development on slopes 30 percent or greater which are less than 50 feet in vertical height;~~
- ~~3~~2. Construction of public or private streets and roads, emergency vehicle access or driveways;
- ~~4~~3. Development approved prior to the adoption of this ordinance which has identified the extent of allowable development. These include approved variances, tentative and final subdivision and parcel maps, planned developments or other actions;
- ~~5~~4. Disturbance of existing artificial slopes created under a permit issued by the county or for which a permit was not required at the time the slopes were created;
- ~~6~~5. Repair of existing infrastructure, or replacement or repair of existing structures in substantially the same footprint;

- ~~76.~~ Disturbance on slopes necessary for public safety, such as ~~removal of poisonous or noxious plants,~~ controlled removal or thinning of vegetation as part of a fire protection program when not adversely affecting habitat, or other public safety purpose;
- ~~87.~~ Development of a public trail comprising a component of the county's regional parks and trails master plans;
- ~~98.~~ Projects located in the Tahoe Basin. Such projects are subject to the policies and regulations of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Code of Ordinances;
- ~~109.~~ Underground utilities with accessory above ground components, utility poles and guy wires, and other similar features;
- ~~110.~~ Agricultural activities that utilize BMPs, as recommended by the County Agricultural Commission and adopted by the Board.

Page 3.4-37, the third and fourth full paragraphs are revised as follows:

Health Resort and Retreat Center is a proposed new use permissible in the PA, AG, ~~and RL, FR, and TPZ~~ zones upon approval of a CUP. Unless limited in size, it could result in conflicts with special-status species. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure AG-1a would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. The measure would place reasonable size restrictions on centers consistent with the requirements for Bed and Breakfast Inns. With this size limitation, the potential for adverse impact on special-status species is greatly reduced.

The other land uses in Planned Agricultural, Rural Lands, and Resources zones include some uses (e.g., Feed and Farm Supply Store; Industrial, General; Off-Road Vehicle Recreation Area) that are typically intensive and could require the conversion of a substantial area whereby most or all natural habitat must be removed in order to operate as designed. This is because these uses typically include parking lots, storage areas (covered or open air), large buildings or work areas, and require extensive grading (unless the site is already level). The impacts of an off-road vehicle recreation area result from the creation of a network of bare trails across the landscape. Even development of a ski area, which typically retains some tree cover, requires a large dedicated base and parking area, would remove a substantial number of trees to create ski runs, and would introduce substantial new human activity to the area. Such uses would only be allowed upon prior approval of a CUP or other use permit, and such processes would be subject to CEQA and related mitigation measures. However, given that the uses in Agricultural, Rural Lands, and Resources zones would typically be located in rural areas where special-status species are most likely to exist and that the uses would require the removal of habitat from most or all of the sites to some extent, it is reasonably foreseeable that in some cases the EIR prepared for such uses would conclude that there would be one or more significant and unavoidable impacts, including adverse impacts on special-status species. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Section 3.5, Cultural Resources

Page 3.5-3, add the following after the second paragraph under Tribal Consultation:

Assembly Bill 52

Assembly Bill (AB) 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) will require that the County offer California Native American Tribes the opportunity to consult during the CEQA process for projects that will require preparation of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report (EIR). This statute will apply to any such project for which a notice of availability of

the proposed negative declaration or notice of preparation for the draft EIR has not been issued by July 1, 2015. It does not apply to the TGPA/ZOU EIR.

Page 3.5-7, revise the second paragraph under El Dorado County Historic Design Guide as follows:

The County also has a Sierra Design Guide and a design guide for the community of ~~Shingle Springs~~ Missouri Flat. However, those guides are not focused on historic buildings.

Page 3.5-11, revise the first paragraph as follows:

The project includes amendments to the General Plan policies and Zoning Ordinance provisions that currently prohibit development on slopes of 30% or greater with limited exceptions. The project would remove the prohibition and instead add regulations intended to minimize the adverse effects of development on steep slopes. Cultural resources, particularly archaeological resources, are unlikely to exist on slopes of 30% or greater because steep slopes are not suited to habitation or meeting sites. Therefore, this component of the project would not have a reasonably foreseeable adverse effect on cultural resources and need not be discussed further.

Section 3.6, Land Use Planning

Page 3.6-13, end of third paragraph is revised for clarity, as follows:

The intensity (e.g., height, lighting, signage), typical components (e.g., parking lots, signs, permanent structures), and typical operational impacts (e.g., traffic, noise, lighting) of these types of uses would not be amenable to sufficient moderation to avoid this substantial alteration because they would be so different ~~than~~ from their surroundings. This impact is significant and unavoidable.

Page 3.6-14, add the following revision to Policy 2.2.5.2 to Mitigation Measure LU-4a [double underlining identifies the revision to the policy]:

Revise Policy 2.2.5.2 as follows to clarify its application.

Policy 2.2.5.2 All applications for discretionary projects or permits including, but not limited to, General Plan amendments, zoning boundary amendments, tentative maps for major and minor land divisions, and special administrative use permits, minor use permits, conditional use permits, and permits for ranch marketing uses, shall be reviewed to determine consistency with the policies of the General Plan. No approvals shall be granted unless a finding is made that the project or permit is consistent with the General Plan. In the case of General Plan amendments, such amendments can be rendered consistent with the General Plan by modifying or deleting the General Plan provisions, including both the land use map and any relevant textual policies, with which the proposed amendments would be inconsistent.

Page 3.6-14, revise Mitigation Measure LU-4b as follows [double underlining identifies the revision to the policy]:

Revise Section 17.40.260.A.3., Ranch Marketing, as follows.

3. Agricultural production is the primary use or function of the property. The Agricultural Commissioner may review the proposed Ranch Marketing area to ensure that the site conforms to the standards 17.40.260.D.2.

Ranch marketing activities proposed within Agricultural Districts, as identified on the General Plan land use maps, on or adjacent to land zoned Planned Agriculture (PA), Limited Agriculture (LA), Agricultural Grazing (AG), Forest Resource (FR), or Timber Production (TPZ) must be reviewed by the Planning Director for consistency with General Plan Policy 2.2.5.2 and by the Agricultural Commissioner for compatibility with surrounding agricultural land uses or on agriculturally zoned lands prior to action by the review authority.

Page 3.6-16, revise the first paragraph as follows:

None of ~~these~~ the above mitigation-derived policies are proposed to be amended by the TGPA, so they would remain in effect to ensure that land use decisions do not result in substantial incompatibilities between land uses. One objective of the Project is to make the Zoning Ordinance consistent with the provisions of the General Plan. The ZOU has been specifically drafted for that purpose. Accordingly, the Project would eliminate inconsistencies related to the Zoning Ordinance's implementation of the General Plan. Therefore, the effect of the TGPA would be less than significant.

Page 3.6-16, add the following after the last paragraph on the page:

The expanded provisions for Home Occupations (Section 17.40.160) would allow certain business uses in residential zones either by right, by administrative permit (where student instruction or horse riding lessons and horse training exceed specified limits), or, where more intensive by discretionary permit on parcels exceeding one acre in area. A home occupation is defined as a business operated out of a residential dwelling or accessory structure or outdoors on the residential parcel, by a resident of the premises, and that is compatible with surrounding residential and agricultural uses. Home occupations may include, but are not limited to, work performed by telephone, mail, or by internet, or appointment; home offices; Cottage Food Operations (CFO), small scale production and repair, handicrafts, parts assembly; or work or craft that is the activity of creative artists, music teachers, academic tutors, trainers, or similar instructors. More intensive uses that may be allowed by conditional use permit include businesses such as motor vehicle repair, motor vehicle storage, cabinet making, veterinary services, commercial kennels, medical/dental offices and clinics, medical laboratories, welding and machining, large-scale upholstery, and food preparation and sales.

The expanded provisions would increase the potential for introducing incompatible uses. Although the conditional use permit requirement for more intensive uses will provide for public notification of a permit application and environmental analysis of the proposed use under CEQA, that does not fully avoid the potential for such uses to result in a significant impact to nearby residences or rural uses due to land use incompatibilities.

Page 3.6-17, add the following mitigation measure [double underlining identifies the revision to the section being made by the mitigation measure]:

Mitigation Measure LU-5: Revise the Home Occupancy provisions to restrict the use of hazardous materials.

Revise Section 17.40.160C(10) for clarity as follows :

10. ~~Any~~All materials used or manufactured as part of the home occupation ~~may~~shall be subject to the review and approval of Environmental Management and the applicable fire department prior to issuance of a building permit or business license sign off by the Department, that would

enable the home occupation to proceed. No materials used or manufactured as part of the home occupation that would have the potential to pose a hazard to health or safety shall be allowed.

Section 3.7, Noise

The following table reference is corrected on page 3.7-6:

Policy 6.5.1.7 relates specifically to project-related increases in non-transportation noise. It states:

Noise created by new proposed non-transportation noise sources shall be mitigated so as not to exceed the noise level standards of Table 6-2 [Table ~~6.7-3~~ 3.7-4 in this FEIR] for noise-sensitive uses.

Section 3.8, Population and Housing

Page 3.8-7, revise the last paragraph on the page as follows:

Policies 2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.2, and 2.2.5.4 would be amended to revise the 30% open space requirement for Planned Development to exempt certain types of residential development from that requirement and to allow high-density residential planned developments to provide for half of their 30% open space requirement in private yards. The effect of these amendments would be to marginally increase the potential ~~density~~ extent of development on those properties that would no longer be subject to the 30% open space requirement. This would include: residential Planned Developments consisting of five or fewer lots or dwelling units; infill projects within Community Regions and Rural Centers on existing sites 3 acres or less in area; Multi-Family Residential developments; and Commercial/Mixed Use developments. It is not possible to estimate the number of additional residences that might be built as a result of this change—there are too many variables to support more than speculation. However, given that the amendment would allow the entire site to be developed, it is reasonably foreseeable that there would be situations where the amendments would result in an increase in the number of residences built on a qualifying parcel if the additional area would increase the area available for the on-site wastewater disposal system, for example. In light of the potential for residential development under the General Plan provisions absent these policy amendments (i.e., up to an additional 20,000 residential units), the number of additional residences that could result from implementation of the amendments is not expected to be a substantial increase.

Section 3.9, Transportation and Traffic (Recirculated Partial DEIR)

Page 3.9-5, revise Table 3.9-1 as follows:

Table 3.9-1. U.S. Highway 50 2014 TCR/CSMP Report Data

Segment	Description	County	Current LOS	20-Year Horizon Year Build Year LOS ^a	Ultimate Concept LOS ^b	Existing Facility ^{bc}	20-year Build Facility ^{ed}	Ultimate Facility ^{de}
1	I-80 to Yolo/ Sacramento County Line	Yolo	E	F	E	8F (6F btw Jefferson Blvd ramps)	8F+ITS	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes + ITS + ICM
2	Yolo/Sacramento County Line to State Routes (SR) 99 and 51	Sacramento	F	F	E	8F	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes + ITS + ICM
3	SR 99 and SR 51 to Watt Avenue	Sacramento	F	F	E	8F	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes + Transition + ITS + ICM
4	Watt Avenue to Zinfandel Drive	Sacramento	F	F	E	8F + 2HOV	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes + ITS + ICM
5	Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Blvd	Sacramento	E	F	E	8F + 2HOV	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS	8F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes + Transition + ITS + ICM
6	Sunrise Blvd to Folsom Blvd	Sacramento	F	F	E	6F+2HOV to Hazel Ave, 4F+2HOV to Folsom Blvd	8F+2HOV+ITS +Aux Lanes to Hazel Ave, 4F+2HOV+ITS +Aux Lanes to Folsom Blvd	8F+2HOV+ ITS + ICM + Aux Lanes to Hazel Ave.; 4F + 2HOV + ITS + ICM + Aux Lanes to Folsom
7	Folsom Blvd to Sacramento/ El Dorado County Line	Sacramento	F	F	E	4F+2HOV	4F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes +ITS + ICM
8	Sacramento/El Dorado County Line to Latrobe Road	El Dorado	F	F	E	4F + 2HOV	4F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes +ITS + ICM
9	Latrobe Road to Bass Lake Road	El Dorado	E	F	E	4F + 2HOV	4F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes +ITS + ICM
10	Bass Lake Road to Cameron Park Drive	El Dorado	D	D	E	4F + 2HOV	4F+2HOV+ Aux Lanes+ITS	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes +ITS
11	Cameron Park Drive to Ponderosa Road	El Dorado	D	D	E	4F	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes +ITS	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes +ITS
12	Ponderosa Road to Missouri Flat Road	El Dorado	C	C	E	4F	4F+2HOV+Aux Lanes + ITS to Greenstone Rd, 4F+ Aux Lanes + ITS to Missouri Flat Rd	4F + 2 HOV + Aux Lanes + ITS to Greenstone; 4F + Aux Lanes + ITS to Missouri Flat
13	Missouri Flat Road to End of Freeway in Placerville	El Dorado	D	E	E	4F	4F	4F+Aux Lanes + ITS

Segment	Description	County	Current LOS	20-Year Horizon Year Build Year LOS ^a	Ultimate Concept LOS ^b	Existing Facility ^{bc}	20-year Build Facility ^{ed}	Ultimate Facility ^{de}
14	End of Freeway in Placerville to Bedford Avenue	El Dorado	C	C	D	4E + Merge Lanes (Eastbound)	4E + Merge Lanes + ITS	4E + Merge Lanes + ITS + ICM
15	Bedford Ave to Cedar Grove Exit	El Dorado	C	C	E/D	4F to Smith Flat Rd, 4E to Camino	4F to Smith Flat, 4E to Camino	4F+Aux Lanes + ITS to Smith Flat; 4E + ITS to Camino
16	Cedar Grove Exit to 0.67 mile east of Sly Park Rd	El Dorado	B	C	E	4F	4F	4F + ITS
17	0.67 miles east of Sly Park Road to Ice House Road	El Dorado	B	C	D	3C, 2.0 miles 4E, 5.3 miles 3C, 0.3 mile	3C, 2.0 miles 4E, 5.3 miles 3C, 0.3 mile	4E 3C + ITS, 2.0; 4E + ITS, 5.3; 3C + ITS, 0.3 miles
18	Ice House Road to Echo Summit	El Dorado	E	F	D	2C; 0.35 mile of 2-wy left-turn lane	2C; 0.35 mile of 2-way left-turn lane	2C + ITS + ICM; 0.35 mile of 2-way left-turn lane
19	Echo Summit to SR 89 South	El Dorado	E	E	D	2C	2C	2C+ ITS + ICM + Bike Lanes
20	SR 89 South/Luther Pass Road to State Route 89 North/Lake Tahoe Blvd	El Dorado	E	F	D	3C, 0.86 miles; 2C, 3.64 miles; 5C, 0.61 mile	3C, 0.86 miles; 2C, 3.64 miles; 5C, 0.61 mile	3C + ITS + ICM, 0.86; 2C + ITS + ICM, 3.64; 5C + ITS + ICM, 0.61 miles
21	SR 89 North/Lake Tahoe Blvd to State of Nevada	El Dorado	E	F	E	5C	5C	5C + ITS + ICM + Bike Lanes

Source: California Department of Transportation 2014b.

^a ~~Horizon Year~~ ~~20-Year~~ Build Year = 2035

^b ~~Ultimate~~ Concept LOS: The minimum acceptable LOS over the next 20 years.

^{bc} Facility Type Codes: C = Conventional Highway; E = Expressway; F = Freeway; HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle lanes; Aux = Auxiliary lanes.

^{ed} Concept Facility: The future roadway with improvements needed in the next 20 years. If LOS F, no further degradation of service from existing F is acceptable, as indicated by delay performance measurement.

^{de} Ultimate Facility: The future roadway with improvements needed beyond a 20-year timeframe.

Page 3.9-23, the following paragraphs are inserted after the third paragraph under the State Highways heading as follows:

Caltrans staff analyzed the LOS based on the volume contained in Caltrans' *Traffic Volumes on California State Highways* document, also known as the "Count Book". The 2008 through 2013 count books indicate the peak hour two-way volume at the County line is 8,600 vehicles. Caltrans staff assumed that 65% of all traffic is travelling in the peak direction and approximately 1,000 vehicles are travelling in the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane. According to these assumptions, the peak hour volume is 4,590 vehicles in the peak direction in the general-purpose lanes.

Caltrans staff assumed in their analysis that the peak hour is westbound in the morning. Therefore, the LOS analysis assumes only two general-purpose lanes, resulting in LOS F. However, Caltrans Performance Measurement System (PeMS) data and subsequent count data indicates that the actual peak hour for this location is eastbound in the evening. The eastbound direction operates as three general-purpose lanes. When accounting for the additional lane (while holding all other inputs constant), this section of U.S. Highway 50 operates at LOS C in the PM peak hour.

The table below summarizes the various results from the Basic Freeway Segment LOS Operation Analysis that were reviewed for the project. Caltrans staff, in their letter dated May 5, 2015, supplied the Spring (March – May)/Fall (September – October) 2010 and 2012 peak hour volumes for the westbound direction of the segment of U.S. Highway 50 between El Dorado Hills Blvd./Latrobe Road and the County line. Using the information provided and supplementing the data with 2014 volumes, County staff ran the Highway Capacity Software (HCS) 2010 for the Basic Freeway Segment Operational Analysis with inputs and assumptions identical to those used by Caltrans for the 2014 TCR/CSMP, changing only the volume input. The results from the various volumes are summarized below. As shown, six of the seven outcomes result in an LOS below Caltrans' recommended or preferred LOS of "E", including Caltrans' recommended volume for the segment of 3,200 vehicles per hour (vph) which results in an LOS of "D". Using the volume of 4,590 vph, that was derived from the Caltrans 2011 Count Book is the only scenario that leads to an LOS of "F".

The County disagrees with Caltrans that the 2011 volume of 4,590 vph from the 2011 Count Book accurately reflects this U.S. Highway 50 Westbound segment (i.e., El Dorado Hills Blvd./Latrobe Road to County line General Purpose Lanes) during the AM Peak Hour (7:00 AM – 7:59 AM) west of Latrobe Mainline Station 316653. The County chooses not to rely on the number of 4,590 vph for its LOS calculations for two reasons: this volume is substantially different from the other volumes observed and calculated for this segment, and the volume is less reliable because the 2011 Count Book does not specify the direction of travel or peak hour that this volume represents.

Table 3.9-A. Results of Basic Freeway Segment LOS Operational Analysis

<u>U.S. Highway 50 Westbound, El Dorado Hills Blvd./Latrobe Road to County line</u> <u>General Purpose Lanes – AM Peak Hour (7:00 AM – 7:59 AM)</u> <u>W. of Latrobe Mainline Station 316653</u>					
<u>Year</u>	<u>Volume (vehicles per hour)</u>	<u>Data Source</u>	<u>Density</u>	<u>LOS</u>	<u>Notes:</u>
2010	<u>2,860</u>	<u>PeMS (March 2010)</u>	23.7	C	(E. of Scott Road mainline Station 316993) Initial volumes used in RDEIR (total of general purpose lanes and HOV lane volume)
2010	<u>2,955</u>	<u>PeMS</u>	24.7	D	Updated volume used in FEIR based on Caltrans comment letter
?	<u>3,200</u>	<u>?</u>	27.4	D	Caltrans recommended volume for segment (Caltrans' May 5, 2015 letter)
2010	<u>3,348</u>	<u>PeMS (4-15-10)</u>	29.3	D	Caltrans supplied PeMS data (highest 2010 Spring/Fall volume)
2012	<u>3,393</u>	<u>PeMS (5-15-12)</u>	29.8	D	Caltrans supplied PeMS data (highest 2012 Spring/Fall volume)
2014	<u>3,012</u>	<u>PeMS (9-8-14)</u>	25.3	C	Highest 2014 Spring/Fall volume
2011	<u>4,590</u>	<u>Caltrans 2011 Count Book</u>	54.3	F	Caltrans volume used in various State Reports. Unclear if this was for the westbound direction, or which Peak Hour
<u>Note: All calculations used the same PHF, terrain type, % trucks, Driver Population factor, and flow rate as the Caltrans analysis</u>					

Page 3.9-27, fourth bullet, the first sentence is revised as follows:

- The ZOU includes various uses that may be allowed by right or upon approval of a discretionary, administrative, or CUP (e.g., off-highway vehicle use on residential parcels over 5 acres, CUP for industrial use in a Timberland Preserve Production Zone (TPZ) that are either not allowed by right or with a discretionary permit under the existing ordinance.

Page 3.9-28, the following paragraph is inserted after the second paragraph under Methods of Analysis:

The county applied the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2010 planning method for analyzing circulation impacts of the proposed project. This level of analysis was specifically developed by the Highway Capacity Committee for programmatic level application, such as adoption of a general plan. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Traffic Engineering Handbook, 6th Edition, also supports the use of planning level analysis for large scale or “big picture” projects. In practice, this level of analysis is “used to produce estimates of operation conditions in the early planning states of projects. This level of analysis provides a reasonable assessment of future capacity for situations in which forecasted traffic volumes have limited accuracy and is helpful to assess potential levels of delay and the ability of a road system to accommodate anticipated future development. Because planning-level analyses are used for broad estimate purposes, the input data requirements are less detailed than for operational analyses.” (ITE Traffic Handbook, 6th Edition, Chapter 4) The HCM provides the following explanations of its recommended methodology:

Planning analyses are applications of the HCM generally directed toward broad issues such as initial problem identification (e.g., screening a large number of locations for potential operations deficiencies), long-range analyses, and statewide performance monitoring. An analyst often must estimate the future times at which the operation of the current and committed systems will fall below a desired LOS” (HCM 2010, Chapter 2).

Planning and preliminary engineering analyses typically involve situations in which not all of the data needed for the analysis are available. Therefore, both types of analyses frequently rely on default values for many analysis inputs. Planning analyses may default nearly all inputs – for example, through the use of generalized service volume tables” (HCM 2010, Chapter 2).

When studying traffic, it is also important to define the framework of the analysis. At times, the needs of engineers and planners can be addressed with an understanding of large-scale or “big picture” view of traffic. For example, when a road improvement such as a lane addition is under study, it is often sufficient to have aggregate or overall average measures of traffic conditions, such as an hourly rate of vehicles or a mean traffic speed during the peak hour. In such cases, a macroscopic framework of the flow conditions is appropriate” (ITE Traffic Engineering Handbook, 6th Edition, Chapter 4).

Page 3.9-30, the first paragraph under Caltrans Performance Standard is revised as follows:

U.S. Highway 50 is a Caltrans facility. Caltrans’ threshold for highway segments of U.S. Highway 50 in El Dorado County is LOS E and D. The thresholds for U.S. Highway 50 are established in the 2014 TCR/CSMP. This report describes the future or *concept* LOS for the segments in El Dorado County. Table 3.9-1 summarizes the concept LOS for U.S. Highway 50 segments in El Dorado County. Note that the improvements identified in the 2014 TCR/CSMP have been incorporated into the Travel Demand Model (TDM) used to analyze the project. In addition to the Caltrans concept LOS designations, El Dorado County either matches or has a higher threshold for level of service on U.S. Highway 50. The threshold is LOS E in Community Regions, and LOS D in Rural Centers and Rural Regions.

Page 3.9-31, the third paragraph under Methodology Selected for This Analysis is revised and expanded as follows:

The TDM used to model traffic in the DEIR was revised in response to comments received during review of the Draft EIR. The County received formal Caltrans concurrence on the TDM on September 22, 2014. In its letter, Caltrans states that: “With the recent modifications the EDTDM conforms to the state-of-practice in travel demand modeling, meets overall traffic assignment validation standards suggested by Caltrans and the Federal Highways Administration, and is an appropriate tool for the County’s long range planning purposes.” The revised TDM was re-run for all of the scenarios with the updated network requested by Caltrans. The results were presented in the Recirculated Partial DEIR and are included in the FEIR.

Caltrans was not requested to concur with the County’s growth forecast and/or model results stemming from the County’s growth forecast, as local land use planning is outside of Caltrans’ responsibility and authority.

State agencies, the RTPA or MPO do not have land use authority thus any comments on El Dorado County forecasts would be informational and El Dorado County does not require approval of the future forecast scenarios of the County’s General Plan by Caltrans. Caltrans Planning FAQs website, <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/faqs.html> states, “...Planning, Zoning, and Development Law, which

gives Cities and County the authority to regulate land use requires that ‘a general plan contain a circulation element which is correlated with the land use element’... By virtue of this authority, the local agencies produce the land use forecasts which the county has to closely gauge for its transportation planning and fee programs as well as meeting other state mandates such as the Regional Housing Needs Assessment.

Page 3.9-31, the first full paragraph after the bullets is revised and expanded as follows:

The results of the new runs are reflected in Table 3.9-13 of this EIR. Note that Scenario 1 reflects existing conditions and is based on 2010 traffic counts, not the TDM model forecasts. As a result, its traffic counts and LOS results have not been changed from the DEIR except for the segment on U.S. Highway 50 between the County line and El Dorado Hills Boulevard to address Caltrans comments.

Page 3.9-32, the second complete paragraph is revised and expanded as follows:

That the TDM run and 2014 TCR/CSMP reached different conclusions may be attributed to a number of factors. First, Caltrans used SACOG’s SACSIM model and other data inputs for the CSMP, while El Dorado County used its updated TDM to model scenarios for the TGPA/ZOU project. SACOGs Sacramento Regional Travel Demand Model (SACMET) and SACSIM land use and roadway network assumptions are somewhat general, while the County’s TDM is specifically tailored to El Dorado County. The El Dorado County TDM consists of 625 Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs - 497 in El Dorado County and 128 in Sacramento and Placer Counties). This superior zonal resolution (four times many times more than the 126 TAZ’s in the SACMET/SACSIM) enables a much more detailed analysis of county roadways. In addition, future land uses in the TDM more accurately reflect the County’s adopted General Plan land use categories as well as overall land use growth control totals. This is not the case for the SACMET/SACSIM models developed and maintained by SACOG. For example, SACMET’s land use identified the El Dorado Hills Business Park as “retail,” whereas EDC’s TDM more accurately depicts its uses as “industrial” and “office.” SACMET also showed golf courses, churches, and storage facilities in EDC as retail. Since retail uses result in higher trip generation rates than industrial, office, golf course, and church uses, these discrepancies could lead to differences in roadway impacts if not corrected.

Page 3.9-33, the second paragraph is revised and expanded as follows:

Caltrans and El Dorado County also differ in determining the amount and distribution of future development. Caltrans determines the annual growth from all applicable travel demand models in the analysis area as well as linear regression analysis of historical traffic volumes and applies the traffic growth to the baseline conditions to determine the 20-year volumes. El Dorado County determines an appropriate 20-year residential growth forecast by considering the amount and distribution of growth that has historically occurred within the county, future demand and market trends, General Plan policies regarding how and where to accommodate future growth, location and availability of developable parcels, as well as other factors. The County’s TDM is used to model future transportation system performance based on forecasted residential, commercial, and employment growth and planned roadway improvements identified in the County’s 20-year CIP, which are consistent with General Plan policies inclusive of Policy TC-Xa (Measure Y).

El Dorado County’s Travel Demand Model (EDC TDM) has been extensively reviewed and found to be the appropriate tool for the County’s tasks. Throughout 2012 and 2013, numerous presentations and regular updates were given to the Board of Supervisors at their scheduled public meetings, including requests for input and direction on major assumptions of the model, including the roadway network used, updated traffic analysis zones, and direction on the growth scenarios (see

Legistar numbers: 12-0475, six different meetings; 12-1578; 13-1218, five different meetings; 13-1219; 14-0245). Throughout the review process, updated information was also made available to the public via the Travel Demand Model Phase I webpage. A final presentation on the EDC TDM was made to the Board of Supervisors during a special meeting on February 24, 2014 (see Legistar number 14-0245).

The EDC TDM was peer reviewed in 2013 by an independent traffic consultant. Their findings were included in the February 24, 2014 staff report and their memorandum is attachment F to Legistar item 14-0245. County staff had been working with both the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) travel demand modeling staff, and Caltrans travel forecasting and modeling staff on the TDM from the very beginning. This included the scope of work required to update the TDM in 2011. After the independent traffic consultant completed their peer review in May of 2013, County staff began evaluating growth scenarios at the direction of the Board of Supervisors, while continuing to address SACOG and Caltrans comments on the TDM as well as addressing public comments.

Both SACOG and Caltrans staff provided input on the scope and other technical assumptions for the update of the TDM. These inputs were garnered through several meetings, at least five meetings of which were dedicated to discussion of the TDM towards the request for a letter of concurrency and to achieve an understanding of the differences between the various models. Minutes of the meetings detailing specific LOS discussions are attached to El Dorado County Board of Supervisors update item number 32 on December 3, 2013 (see Legistar number 13-1218). The collaboration with Caltrans and SACOG also included approximately 30 email exchanges, and multiple letters between Caltrans and County staff beginning in August of 2012 through August 2014. SACOG staff participated in most of the meetings with Caltrans staff as well as independent meetings with County staff to address specific SACOG concerns.

The coordination with SACOG and Caltrans resulted in the County receiving a letter dated February 3, 2014 from SACOG, which states that they concur that the EDC TDM conforms to state-of-practice in subarea travel demand modeling, meets traffic assignment validations standards suggested by FHWA and Caltrans, and it is an appropriate tool for staff to analyze and forecast traffic for the County's long-range transportation planning. County staff received an initial letter of concurrence from Caltrans on February 14, 2014 and continued to work with Caltrans through the aforementioned meetings, email exchanges and letters to obtain a similar concurrency letter dated September 22, 2014.

Page 3.9-36, the first paragraph under Project Impacts is revised as follows:

The project would not substantially change the land use patterns set out in the current General Plan, nor does it propose any site-specific development projects that would generate traffic. As a result, the project impacts are not clearly distinguishable from the overall impacts of development (i.e., the impacts of forecast land use changes in comparison to existing conditions) pursuant to the current General Plan to the year 2035. As a result, the impacts identified in the following analysis discussions are almost fully the result of future development that could occur under the current General Plan, taking into account, where possible, the increment in traffic generation that would result from the TGPA's increase in density for mixed use projects.

Page 3.9-37, insert the following before the first paragraph under TRA-1:

El Dorado County does not have a congestion management program. However, the General Plan establishes LOS standards that identify acceptable levels of congestion. General Plan policies,

beginning with TC-Xa, establish a comprehensive program to avoid exceeding LOS standards on key roads. The objective of minimizing congestion is the basis for the County’s TIM fee and CIP programs. This impact is examined in that context.

Page 3.9-38, revise Table 3.9-7 as follows:

Table 3.9-7. Study Scenario 1 (2010 Baseline Conditions)—2010 Conditions; Includes 2010 Road Network

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class ^a – Exist, 2, and 5	Minimum LOS	Scenario 1 - Existing Conditions (2010)				Impact? (Y/N)
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
44	Green Valley Rd ^b	<u>100 ft W of El Dorado Hills Boulevard approx. 100 ft E of County line</u>	2A	E	1,060	1,650	D	F	Y
47	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of China Garden Rd	2A	E	1,250	1,580	D	E	N
151	Green Valley Rd ^b	<u>200 ft E of County Line Approx. 200 ft W of El Dorado Hills Boulevard</u>	2A	E	1,730	<u>2,050</u> <u>2,350</u>	F	F	Y

Page 3.9-39, revise bullets as follows:

- 1 Segment ID 44 – widen Green Valley Road to a 4 lane roadway. The Community Development Agency’s Capital Improvement Program Project GP178 proposes to widen Green Valley Road between Francisco Drive and El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Salmon Falls Road to a 4 lane roadway. This widening project is also included in the current County’s Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program. The City of Folsom received a Flexible Funds Program grant from SACOG in December 2013 to widen Green Valley Road from East Natoma Street to Sophia Parkway to a 4 lane roadway. Construction is anticipated to begin in 2016.
- 1 Segment ID 151 - widen Green Valley Road to a 4 lane roadway. The City of Folsom received a Flexible Funds Program grant from SACOG in December 2013 to widen Green Valley Road from East Natoma Street to Sophia Parkway to a 4 lane roadway. Construction is anticipated to begin in 2016. The Community Development Agency’s Capital Improvement Program Project GP178 proposes to widen Green Valley Road between Francisco Drive and El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Salmon Falls Road to a 4 lane roadway. This widening project is also included in the current County’s Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program.

Page 3.9-39, revise Table 3.9-8 as follows:

Table 3.9-8. Study Scenario 2 (Project 2035 Impact)—2035 Land Use Buildout (with Existing Road Network) + Project TGPA/ZOU Buildout Assumption) with 2010 CIP/RTP/MTP Improvements

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class ^a – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Minimum LOS ^b	Scenario 2				Impact? (Y/N)
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
1	U.S. Highway 50-EB GP	W of Latrobe Rd	2FA	E	2,490	4,920	B	E	N
2	U.S. Highway 50-WB GP	W of Latrobe Rd	2F	E	4,000	2,950	E	D	N
	U.S. Highway 50-EB GP	W of Silva Valley Pkwy	2FA	E	2,300	5,010	B	E	N
	U.S. Highway 50-WB GP	W of Silva Valley Pkwy	2F	E	3,750	3,040	E	D	N
5	U.S. Highway 50-EB GP	W of Bass Lake	2FA	F/ED/E ^c	2,300	5,010	B	E	NY
6	U.S. Highway 50-WB GP	W of Bass Lake	2F	D/E ^c	3,750	3,040	E	D	YN
	U.S. Highway 50-EB GP	W of Cambridge Rd	2F	D/E ^c	2,100	3,670	C	E	Y
9	U.S. Highway 50-EB GP	W of Cameron Park	2F	D/E	2,140 3,750	3,680 3,040	C	E	YN
13	U.S. Highway 50-EB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	D/E	2,410	3,660	EC	E	YN
14	U.S. Highway 50-WB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	D/E	3,610	3,230	E	D	YN
32	Cameron Park Dr	200 ft N of Oxford Rd	2A	E	1,420	1,710	D	F	Y
38	El Dorado Hills Bl	300 ft S of Francisco Dr	2A	E	1,390	1,620	D	E	N
44	Green Valley Rd ^{ed}	100 ft W of El Dorado Hills Boulevard approx 100 ft E of County line	2A	E	1,370 1,290	2,050 2,060	D7	F	Y
47	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of China Garden Rd	2A	FE	1,350	1,600	D	E	N
55	South Shingle Rd	100 ft S of Mother Lode Dr	2A	E	1,230	1,590	D	E	N
56	Cameron Park Drive	100 ft N of Robin Ln	2A	F ^{de}	1,060	1,610	D	E	N

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class ^a – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Minimum LOS ^b	Scenario 2				Impact? (Y/N)
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
151	Green Valley Rd ^{ed}	200 ft E of County line ~200 ft W of El Dorado Hills Boulevard	2A	E	2,270 2,000	2,230 2,230	F	F	Y
226	White Rock Rd	At County Line	2A	E	1,060	1,910	D	F	Y

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2014.

^a Roadway Classification - See Table 3.9-3 for additional detail.

^b The minimum LOS values for U.S. Highway 50 represent the ~~20-year concept/ultimate concept~~ LOS from the Caltrans 2014 TCR/~~CSMSCP~~ because the model includes the 20-year concept facility improvements shown in Table 3.9-1.

^c The minimum acceptable operations is LOS D on this segment of US Highway 50 according to County standards. The Caltrans Concept LOS is LOS E. Impacts are identified based on the most stringent threshold (LOS D).

^{ed} Traffic Volumes for this roadway are estimates based on adjacent roadway volumes

^{de} This roadway segment is included in the list of roadway segments allowed to operate at LOS F as shown in Table 3.9-4.

- 2R, W20, W18 = Minor Two-Lane Highway
- 2U = Major Two-Lane Highway
- 2A = Two-Lane Arterial
- 4AU = Four-Lane Arterial, Undivided
- 4AD = Four Lane Arterial, Divided
- 6AD = Six-Lane Arterial, Divided

- 2F = Two Freeway Lanes (3)
- 2FA = Two Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)
- 3F = Three Freeway Lanes (3)
- 3FA = Three Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)
- 4F = Four Freeway Lanes (3)

Note: "GP" stands for General Purpose Lanes (includes auxiliary lanes)

Page 3.9-40, revise text as follows:

Study Scenario 2 examines the potential impact of future development under the General Plan to 2035, with the TGPA/ZOU amendments, absent any additional road improvements. This is a worse-case scenario that would occur in the absence of the road improvements that would otherwise be funded by the TIM and CIP requirements. This is provided solely as a point of comparison; there is no intent on the part of the County to rescind the TIM and CIP requirements. As shown, four County-maintained roadway segments (IDs 32, 44, 151, and 226) would change to an unacceptable LOS F. These roadway segments are not on the list of roadways that are allowed to operate at LOS F pursuant to the General Plan (see Table 3.9-4). The decrease in LOS to LOS F on these roadway segments would be a significant impact. Under this scenario, two segments of Green Valley Road would continue to operate at LOS F with the addition of project traffic. Adding additional traffic to roads operating at LOS F would be a significant impact. Three segments of U.S. Highway 50 (IDs 5, 6, and the segment West of Cambridge Rd~~9, 13, 14~~) would operate at LOS E. In each case, the LOS

would exceed the County’s LOS D threshold for Rural Regions, but not Caltrans’ ~~20-year e~~Concept LOS (LOS E), but not the ultimate concept LOS. The decrease from LOS D to LOS E on this segment of U.S. Highway 50 for the 2035 planning period would be a significant impact.

Page 3.9-41, revise Table 3.9-9 as follows:

Table 3.9-9. Study Scenario 3 (2025 Baseline Conditions)—2010 Road Network with 2025 CIP/RTP/MTP Improvements

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class ^a – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Minimum LOS	Scenario 3				Impact? (Y/N)
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
14	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	D /E ^b	3,440	3,260	D	D	N
32	Cameron Park Dr	200 ft N of Oxford Rd	2A	E	1,310	1,660	D	F	Y
47	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of China Garden Rd	2A	E	1,300	1,470	D	D	N
49	Missouri Flat Rd	400 yds N of Forni Rd	4AD	F ^c	2,390	3,120	D	D	N

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2014.

^a Roadway Classification - See Table 3.9-3 for additional detail

2R, W20, W18 = Minor Two-Lane Highway
 2U = Major Two-Lane Highway
 2A = Two-Lane Arterial
 4AU = Four-Lane Arterial, Undivided
 4AD = Four Lane Arterial, Divided

6AD = Six-Lane Arterial, Divided
 2F = Two Freeway Lanes (3)
 2FA = Two Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)
 3F = Three Freeway Lanes (3)
 3FA = Three Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)
 4F = Four Freeway Lanes (3)

^b These minimum LOS values for U.S. Highway 50 represent the ~~20-year e~~Concept LOS from the Caltrans 2014 TCR/~~CSM~~SCP because the model includes the 20-year ~~concept/ultimate~~ concept facility improvements shown in Table 3.9-1.

^c This roadway segment is included in the list of roadway segments allowed to operate at LOS F as shown in Table 3.9-4.

Note: “GP” stands for General Purpose Lanes (includes auxiliary lanes)

Page 3.9-41, revise text as follows:

Study Scenario 3 projects 2025 traffic levels taking into consideration improvements to the road system that are expected (i.e., planned and programmed) to be installed by 2025. This study scenario assumes that the General Plan would be implemented without the TGPA/ZOU amendments. One segment of Missouri Flat Road (ID 49) is identified in the General Plan as a roadway segment that is allowed to operate at LOS F (see Table 3.9-4). Here, one County-maintained roadway segment (ID 32) would change to an unacceptable LOS F. ~~One segment of Missouri Flat Road (ID 48) is identified in the General Plan as a roadway segment that is allowed to operate at LOS F (see Table 3.9-4).~~ The decrease in LOS on this roadway segment would be a significant impact.

Page 3.9-42, revise Table 3.9-10 as follows:

Table 3.9-10. Study Scenario 4 (Project 2025 Impact)—2010 Road Network + Project (TGPA/ZOU Buildout Assumption) With 2025 CIP/RTP/MTP Improvements

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class ^a Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Minimum LOS	Scenario 4				Impact? (Y/N)
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
14	U.S. Highway 50-WB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	D/E ^b	3,440	3,240	D	D	N
32	Cameron Park Dr.	200 ft N of Oxford Rd	2A	E	1,300	1,650	D	F	Y
47	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of China Garden Rd	2A	E	1,290	1,440	D	D	N
49	Missouri Flat Rd	400 yds N of Forni Rd	4AD	F ^c	2,400	3,120	D	D	N ^c

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2014.

^a Roadway Classification - See Table 3.9-3 for additional detail.

2R, W20, W18 = Minor Two-Lane Highway

2U = Major Two-Lane Highway

2A = Two-Lane Arterial

4AU = Four-Lane Arterial, Undivided

4AD = Four-Lane Arterial, Divided

6AD = Six-Lane Arterial, Divided

2F = Two Freeway Lanes (3)

2FA = Two Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)

3F = Three Freeway Lanes (3)

3FA = Three Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)

4F = Four Freeway Lanes (3)

^b These minimum LOS values represent the ~~20-year concept/ultimate~~ Concept LOS from the Caltrans 2014 TCR/~~CSM~~SCP because the model includes the 20-year concept facility improvements shown in Table 3.9-1.

^c This roadway segment is included in the list of roadway segments allowed to operate at LOS F as shown in Table 3.9-4.

Note: "GP" stands for General Purpose Lanes (includes auxiliary lanes)

Page 3.9-43, revise Table 3.9-11 as follows:

Table 3.9-11. Study Scenario 5 (2035 Baseline)—2010 Road Network with 2035 Land Use Buildout Outside of El Dorado County with 2010 CIP/RTP/MTP Improvements

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class ^a – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Minimum LOS	Scenario 5				Impact? (Y/N)
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
44	Green Valley Rd ^b	<u>100 ft W of El Dorado Hills Boulevard</u> approx. 100 ft E of County Line	2A	E	1,130	1,790	D	F	Y
47	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of China Garden Rd	2A	E	1,260	1,610	D	E	N
151	Green Valley Rd ^b	<u>200 ft E of County line</u> Approx. 200 ft W of El Dorado Hills Boulevard	2A	E	2,030 <u>1,840</u>	2,620 <u>2,080</u>	F	F	Y
226	White Rock Rd	At County Line	2A	E	900	1,810	D	F	Y

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2014

^a Roadway Classification - See Table 3.9-3 for additional detail.

^b Traffic Volumes for this roadway are estimates based on adjacent roadway volumes

2R, W20, W18 = Minor Two-Lane Highway

2U = Major Two-Lane Highway

2A = Two-Lane Arterial

4AU = Four-Lane Arterial, Undivided

4AD = Four-Lane Arterial, Divided

6AD = Six-Lane Arterial, Divided

2F = Two Freeway Lanes (3)

2FA = Two Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)

3F = Three Freeway Lanes (3)

3FA = Three Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)

4F = Four Freeway Lanes (3)

Page 3.9-44, revise Table 3.9-12 as follows:

Table 3.9-12. Study Scenario 6 (Cumulative Conditions in 2035)—2035 Road Network + Project (TGPA/ZOU Buildout Assumption) with 2035 CIP/RTP/ATP Improvements

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class ^a – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Minimum LOS	Scenario 6				Impact? (Y/N)
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
5	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Bass Lake	2FA	D /E/E ^b	2,530	4,700	B	E	Y
9	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Cameron Park	2F	D /E ^{bc}	2,280	3,600	C	E	N
13	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	D /E ^{bc}	2,660	3,810	C	E	N
14	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	D /E ^{bc}	3,900	3,500	E	D	N Y
32	Cameron Park Dr	200 ft N of Oxford Rd	2A	E	1,500	1,840	D	F	Y
38	El Dorado Hills Bl	300 ft S of Francisco Dr	2A	E	1,230	1,540	D	E	N
47	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of China Garden Rd	2A	E	1,240	1,450	D	D	N
49	Missouri Flat Rd	400 yds N of Forni Rd	4AD	F ^{de}	2,510	3,310	D	F	N ^{de}
56	Cameron Park Dr	100 ft N of Robin Ln	2A	F ^{de}	1,170	1,730	D	F	N ^d
196	Pleasant Valley Rd	200 yds E of SR 49 (E)	2A	E	1,300	1,560	D	E	N

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2014.

^a Roadway Classification - See Table 3.9-3 for details.

2R, W20, W18 = Minor Two-Lane Highway

2U = Major Two-Lane Highway

2A = Two-Lane Arterial

4AU = Four-Lane Arterial, Undivided

4AD = Four-Lane Arterial, Divided

6AD = Six-Lane Arterial, Divided

2F = Two Freeway Lanes (3)

2FA = Two Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)

3F= Three Freeway Lanes (3)

3FA= Three Freeway Lanes + Auxiliary Lane (3)

4F= Four Freeway Lanes (3)

^b The minimum acceptable operations is LOS D on this segment of US Highway 50 according to County standards. The Caltrans Concept LOS is LOS E. Impacts are identified based on the most stringent threshold (LOS D).

^{cb} These minimum LOS values represent the 20-year concept/ultimate e-Concept LOS from the Caltrans 2014 TCR/CMSMCP because the model includes the 20-year concept facility improvements shown in Table 3.9-1.

^{de} Not considered an impact because this roadway segment is included in the list of roadway segments allowed to operate at LOS F as shown in Table 3.9-4.

Note: "GP" stands for General Purpose Lanes (includes auxiliary lanes)

Page 3.9-45, revise text as follows:

Study Scenario 6 presents traffic conditions in 2035 assuming that planned CIP/RTP/MTP improvements have been installed and the TGPA/ZOU amendments have been approved. Two roadway segments (IDs ~~514~~ and 32) would exceed the minimum LOS. This includes one-segment of U.S. Highway 50 (ID ~~445~~) that would operate at LOS E. LOS E would exceed the County's LOS standards for Rural Regions, although it does not exceed Caltrans' 20-year Concept LOS, (although it does not exceed the ultimate concept LOS. The decrease to LOS E on this segment of U.S. Highway 50 for the 2035 planning period would be a significant impact. The decrease in service to LOS F on Cameron Park Drive (ID 32) would be a significant impact. Missouri Flat Road (ID 49) and Cameron Park Road (ID 56) however, are allowed to operate at LOS F per General Plan Policy TC-Xa and there would be no significant impact on those segments. The General Plan sets the maximum V/C ratio of Missouri Flat Road from Highway 50 to Mother Lode Drive at 1.12 and from Mother Load Drive to China Garden Road at 1.20. This encompasses segments 48 and 49 of Missouri Flat Road. Neither of these segments would exceed a maximum V/C of 1.01 in the PM peak hour.

Page 3.9-58, revise Table 3.9-13 as follows:

Table 3.9-13. Level of Service Summary Table

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Class – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Existing Conditions (2010)				Scenario 2				Scenario 3				Scenario 4				Scenario 5				Scenario 6			
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
1	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Latrobe	2FA	2FA	1,090 1,720	2,760 3,560	B	C	1,750 2,490	3,970 4,920	B	DE	1,240 1,980	2,580 3,430	B	BC	1,200 1,950	2,600 3,450	B	BC	1,330 1,980	3,500 4,300	B	CD	1,560 2,360	2,860 3,830	B	CD
2	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Latrobe	2F	2FA	2,240 2,955	1,340 2,140	CD	BC	3,110 4,000	2,950 2,960	DE	D	2,350 3,130	1,450 2,480	BC	B	2,280 3,090	1,410 2,450	BC	B	2,920 3,580	1,610 2,400	D	BC	2,450 3,450	1,690 2,840	BC	BC
3	U.S. Highway 50–EB HOV	W of Latrobe			620	800	-	-	-	-	-	-	740	850	-	-	750	850	-	-	-	-	-	-	800	970	-	-
4	U.S. Highway 50–WB HOV	W of Latrobe			620	800	-	-	-	-	-	-	690	1,030	-	-	720	1,040	-	-	-	-	-	-	900	1,150	-	-
	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Silva Valley Pkwy	2FA	2FA	1,450	3,630	B	C	2,300	5,010	B	E	2,180	3,920	B	D	2,150	3,930	B	D	1,850	4,000	B	D	2,540	4,320	B	D
	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Silva Valley Pkwy	2F	2FA	2,900	2,110	D	C	3,750	3,040	E	D	3,320	2,670	C	C	3,290	2,660	C	C	2,990	2,290	D	C	3,610	3,070	C	C
	U.S. Highway 50–EB HOV (future)	W of Silva Valley Pkwy			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	330	630	-	-	340	630	-	-	-	-	-	-	380	760	-	-
	U.S. Highway 50–WB HOV (future)	W of Silva Valley Pkwy			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	530	480	-	-	550	490	-	-	-	-	-	-	700	560	-	-
5	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Bass Lake	2FA	2FA	1,450	3,630	B	C	2,300	5,010	B	E	2,200	4,230	B	D	2,180	4,210	B	D	1,850	4,000	B	D	2,530	4,700	B	E
6	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Bass Lake	2F	2FA	2,900	2,110	D	C	3,750	3,040	E	D	3,250	2,590	C	B	3,220	2,570	C	B	2,990	2,290	D	C	3,000	2,360	C	B
7	U.S. Highway 50–EB HOV (future)	W of Bass Lake			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	310	600	-	-	320	610	-	-	-	-	-	-	360	740	-	-
8	U.S. Highway 50–WB HOV (future)	W of Bass Lake			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	370	460	-	-	390	460	-	-	-	-	-	-	490	530	-	-
	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Cambridge Rd	2F	2F	1,540	3,530	B	D	2,100	3,670	C	E	1,700	3,540	B	D	1,680	3,530	B	D	1,800	3,260	B	D	1,980	3,930	B	E
	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Cambridge Rd	2F	2F	3,070	2,120	D	C	3,210	2,890	D	D	2,260	2,240	C	C	2,240	2,220	C	C	2,960	2,310	D	C	2,500	2,560	C	C
	U.S. Highway 50–EB HOV (future)	W of Cambridge Rd			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200	440	-	-	210	450	-	-	-	-	-	-	240	560	-	-
	U.S. Highway 50–WB HOV (future)	W of Cambridge Rd			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	230	340	-	-	240	340	-	-	-	-	-	-	310	390	-	-
9	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Cameron Park	2F	2F	1,610	3,170	B	D	2,140	3,680	C	E	2,060	3,420	B	D	2,040	3,420	B	D	1,800	3,260	B	D	2,280	3,600	C	E
10	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Cameron Park	2F	2F	2,910	2,120	D	C	3,470	2,890	D	D	3,260	2,940	D	D	3,250	2,520	D	C	2,960	2,310	D	C	3,490	2,850	D	C
11	U.S. Highway 50–EB HOV (future)	W of Cameron Park			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	250	490	-	-	260	490	-	-	-	-	-	-	290	610	-	-
12	U.S. Highway 50–WB HOV (future)	W of Cameron Park			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	360	400	-	-	380	400	-	-	-	-	-	-	490	460	-	-
13	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	2F	2,020	2,930	B	D	2,410	3,660	C	E	2,520	3,410	C	D	2,510	3,410	C	D	2,170	3,030	C	D	2,660	3,810	C	E
14	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Ponderosa	2F	2F	2,970	2,700	D	C	3,610	3,230	E	D	3,440	3,260	D	D	3,440	3,240	D	D	3,010	2,830	D	C	3,900	3,500	E	D
17	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Shingle Springs	2F	2F	1,570	2,330	B	C	1,880	3,050	B	D	1,960	2,750	B	C	1,950	2,750	B	C	1,680	2,410	B	C	2,080	3,140	C	D
18	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Shingle Springs	2F7	2F	1,870	1,850	B	B	2,610	2,340	C	C	2,310	2,340	C	C	2,300	2,330	C	C	1,910	1,960	B	B	2,760	2,540	C	C
21	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Greenstone	2F	2F	1,440	2,220	B	C	1,700	2,800	B	C	1,760	2,600	B	C	1,750	2,600	B	C	1,540	2,290	B	C	1,870	2,920	B	D
22	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Greenstone	2F	2F	1,850	1,710	B	B	2,550	2,140	C	C	2,260	2,140	C	C	2,260	2,130	C	C	1,880	1,810	B	B	2,680	2,310	C	C
25	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	Greenstone	2F	2F	1,480	2,160	B	C	1,750	2,740	B	C	1,790	2,530	B	C	1,780	2,530	B	C	1,580	2,230	B	C	1,900	2,820	B	C
26	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	Greenstone	2F	2F	1,740	1,700	B	B	2,320	2,040	C	B	2,060	2,040	B	B	2,060	2,030	B	B	1,760	1,800	B	B	2,440	2,180	C	C
27	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	Missouri Flat	2F	2F	1,430	2,040	B	B	1,700	2,600	B	C	1,710	2,350	B	C	1,710	2,350	B	C	1,530	2,110	B	C	1,820	2,630	B	C
28	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	Missouri Flat	2F	2F	1,650	1,650	B	B	2,240	1,990	C	B	1,950	2,000	B	B	1,950	2,000	B	B	1,680	1,730	B	B	2,310	2,110	C	C
29	U.S. Highway 50–EB GP	W of Placerville	2F	2F	1,110	1,660	B	B	1,249	2,161	B	C	1,200	1,900	B	B	1,200	1,880	B	B	1,175	1,718	B	B	1,260	2,150	B	C
30	U.S. Highway 50–WB GP	W of Placerville	2F	2F	1,510	1,440	B	B	1,895	1,661	B	B	1,410	1,400	B	B	1,400	1,400	B	B	1,510	1,486	B	B	1,660	1,510	B	B
31	Cameron Park Dr	300 yds S of Hacienda Dr	2A	4AD	1,030	1,210	D	D	1,280	1,440	D	D	1,420	1,630	C	C	1,410	1,630	C	C	1,100	1,210	D	D	1,570	1,830	C	C
32	Cameron Park Dr	200 ft N of Oxford Rd	2A	2A	1,080	1,370	D	D	1,420	1,710	D	F	1,310	1,660	D	F	1,300	1,650	D	F	1,150	1,390	D	D	1,500	1,840	D	F
33	El Dorado Hills Bl	200 ft S of Saratoga Wy	6AD	6AD	2,090	2,530	C	C	2,740	3,020	C	D	2,010	2,270	C	C	2,040	2,330	C	C	2,290	2,680	C	C	2,260	2,650	C	C
34	El Dorado Hills Bl	100 ft S of Wilson Bl	4AD	4AD	1,860	1,800	D	C	2,350	2,170	D	D	2,420	2,220	D	D	2,420	2,220	D	D	2,010	1,910	D	D	2,650	2,410	D	D
35	El Dorado Hills Bl	100 ft S of Olson Ln	4AD	4AD	1,830	1,780	C	C	2,270	2,090	D	D	2,180	2,060	D	D	2,180	2,060	D	D	1,970	1,910	D	D	2,340	2,160	D	D
36	El Dorado Hills Bl	10 ft N of Olson Ln	4AD	4AD	1,790	1,590	C	C	2,220	1,900	D	D	2,130	1,870	D	D	2,130	1,870	D	D	1,920	1,720	D	C	2,290	1,970	D	D
37	El Dorado Hills Bl	100 ft N of Harvard Wy	4AD	4AD	1,060	1,480	C	C	1,530	1,850	C	C	1,290	1,720	C	C	1,290	1,720	C	C	1,270	1,660	C	C	1,380	1,800	C	C
38	El Dorado Hills Bl	300 ft S of Francisco Dr	2A	2A	990	1,340	D	D	1,390	1,620	D	E	1,160	1,510	D	D	1,160	1,510	D	D	1,190	1,480	D	D	1,230	1,540	D	E
39	El Dorado Hills Bl	100 ft S of Green Vly Rd	2A	2A	320	440	C	C	460	440	C	C	480	550	C	C	500	560	C	C	290	350	C	C	570	630	C	C
40	Francisco Dr	200 ft S of Green Valley Rd	2A	2A	950	1,130	D	D	1,250	1,440	D	D	930	1,190	D	D	900	1,190	D	D	1,180	1,390	D	D	900	1,150	D	D
41	Green Valley Rd	200 ft W of Mormon Island Dr	4AD	4AD	1,870	2,460	D	D	2,430	3,020	D	D	1,520	2,270	C	D	1,520	2,270	C	D	2,180	2,730	D	D	1,670	2,480	C	D
42	Green Valley Rd	200 ft E of Mormon Island Dr	4AD	4AD	1,860	2,430	D	D	2,420	2,980	D	D	1,510	2,230	C	D	1,510	2,240	C	D	2,170	2,690	D	D	1,660	2,440	C	D
43	Green Valley Rd	200 ft E of Francisco Dr	4AD	4AD	1,060	1,650	C	C	1,370	2,050	C	D	970	1,740	C	C	950	1,730	C	C	1,130	1,790	C	C	1,090	1,850	C	C
44	Green Valley Rd	100 ft W of El Dorado Hills Blvd	2A	4AU	1,060	1,650	D	F	1,370	2,050	D	F	970	1,740	C	C	950	1,730	C	C	1,130	1						

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Class – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Existing Conditions (2010)				Scenario 2				Scenario 3				Scenario 4				Scenario 5				Scenario 6			
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
45	Latrobe Rd	300 ft N of White Rock Rd	6AD	6AD	2,000	2,120	C	C	3,730	3,870	D	D	2,020	1,860	C	C	2,030	1,860	C	C	2,780	2,890	D	D	2,300	2,200	C	C
46	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft N of SR 49	2A	2A	1,050	1,220	D	D	1,130	1,200	D	D	950	960	D	D	940	960	D	D	1,060	1,240	D	D	890	940	D	D
47	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of China Garden Rd	2A	2A	1,250	1,580	D	E	1,350	1,600	D	E	1,300	1,470	D	D	1,290	1,440	D	D	1,260	1,610	D	E	1,240	1,450	D	D
48	Missouri Flat Rd	S of Forni Rd	4AD	4AD	1,470	1,850	C	C	1,660	2,100	C	D	1,800	2,250	C	D	1,810	2,270	C	D	1,450	1,830	C	C	1,950	2,440	D	D
49	Missouri Flat Rd	400 yds N of Forni Rd	4AD	4AD	2,040	2,650	D	D	2,250	2,910	D	D	2,390	3,120	D	D	2,400	3,120	D	D	2,020	2,640	D	D	2,510	3,310	D	F
50	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of Plaza Dr	4AD	4AD	1,340	1,930	C	D	1,520	2,130	C	D	1,490	2,130	C	D	1,480	2,130	C	D	1,350	1,910	C	D	1,560	2,240	C	D
51	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft N of Plaza Dr	4AD	4AD	590	650	C	C	760	850	C	C	730	850	C	C	730	850	C	C	590	650	C	C	800	960	C	C
52	Missouri Flat Rd	300 ft S of El Dorado Rd	2A	2A	640	790	C	C	740	990	C	D	620	740	C	C	620	730	C	C	640	800	C	C	660	860	C	D
53	North Shingle Rd	400 yds E of Ponderosa Rd	2A	2A	510	650	C	C	820	1,060	C	D	750	930	C	D	760	930	C	D	490	630	C	C	920	1,120	D	D
54	North Shingle Rd	100 ft S of Green Valley Rd	W22	W22	380	500	C	C	580	760	C	C	550	690	C	C	550	690	C	C	370	480	B	C	660	810	C	D
55	South Shingle Rd	100 ft S of Mother Lode Dr	2A	2A	720	1,030	C	D	1,230	1,590	D	E	960	1,300	D	D	960	1,290	D	D	770	1,070	C	D	1,110	1,530	D	D
56	Cameron Park Dr	100 ft N of Robin Ln	2A	2A	520	820	C	C	1,060	1,610	D	E	930	1,430	D	D	930	1,420	D	D	540	860	C	D	1,170	1,730	D	F
57	Cameron Park Dr	100 ft N of Coach Ln	4AD	4AD	1,370	2,100	C	D	2,180	2,950	D	D	1,960	2,860	D	D	1,970	2,860	D	D	1,400	2,130	C	D	2,250	3,050	D	D
58	Cameron Park Dr	200 yds N of Mira Loma Dr	2A	2A	920	1,240	D	D	1,150	1,450	D	D	1,090	1,420	D	D	1,080	1,420	D	D	990	1,270	D	D	1,170	1,480	D	D
59	Cameron Park Dr	200 yds S of Green Valley Rd	2A	2A	680	810	C	C	860	960	D	D	800	930	C	D	800	930	C	D	710	830	C	C	860	950	D	D
60	Country Club Dr	0.1 mi E of Merrychase Dr	2A	2A	350	230	C	C	570	460	C	C	520	310	C	C	520	310	C	C	350	230	C	C	650	510	C	C
61	Durock Rd	50 ft S of Robin Ln	2A	2A	380	580	C	C	740	1,030	C	D	640	940	C	D	640	930	C	D	390	600	C	C	810	1,110	C	D
62	Latrobe Rd Connection	South of White Rock Road		4AD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,340	1,460	C	C	1,320	1,440	C	C	-	-	-	-	1,790	1,890	C	D
62	Palmer Dr	100 ft E of Cameron Park Dr	2A	2A	570	820	C	C	800	1,130	C	D	730	1,030	C	D	730	1,030	C	D	570	820	C	C	820	1,150	C	D
63	Saratoga Way	West of El Dorado Hills Blvd		4AD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,240	2,360	D	D	2,220	2,370	D	D	-	-	-	-	2,470	2,580	D	D
63	Serrano Pkwy	450 ft E of Silva Valley Pkwy	4AD	4AD	1,080	930	C	C	1,460	1,170	C	C	1,130	1,020	C	C	1,130	1,020	C	C	1,040	970	C	C	1,290	1,210	C	C
64	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft S of Serrano Pkwy	4AD	4AD	850	640	C	C	1,370	1,220	C	C	1,620	1,360	C	C	1,620	1,360	C	C	890	800	C	C	1,760	1,550	C	C
65	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft N of Serrano Pkwy	4AD	4AD	1,270	900	C	C	1,640	1,250	C	C	1,600	1,180	C	C	1,590	1,170	C	C	1,340	1,000	C	C	1,720	1,310	C	C
66	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft S of Harvard Wy	4AD	4AD	1,050	860	C	C	1,340	1,170	C	C	1,280	1,050	C	C	1,270	1,040	C	C	1,110	970	C	C	1,350	1,140	C	C
67	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft N of Harvard Wy	2A	2A	790	630	C	C	940	820	D	C	1,000	720	D	C	990	710	D	C	760	670	C	C	1,070	790	D	C
68	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft S of Green Valley Rd	2A	2A	590	530	C	C	770	760	C	C	720	570	C	C	720	560	C	C	610	620	C	C	800	630	C	C
69	Sophia Pkwy	200 ft S of Green Valley Rd	2A	2A	450	590	C	C	710	870	C	D	320	530	C	C	320	530	C	C	640	750	C	C	380	650	C	C
70	White Rock Rd	100 ft E of Latrobe Rd	4AD	6AD	760	1,380	C	C	1,090	1,900	C	D	1,110	1,940	C	C	1,090	1,900	C	C	740	1,600	C	C	1,520	2,300	C	C
71	Barkley Rd	50 ft N of Carson Rd	2A	2A	70	80	C	C	80	90	C	C	80	90	C	C	80	90	C	C	70	80	C	C	80	100	C	C
72	Bedford Av	At City Limits	2A	2A	30	40	C	C	40	50	C	C	40	50	C	C	40	50	C	C	30	40	C	C	40	50	C	C
73	Big Cut Rd	100 ft N of Pleasant Vly Rd	W18	W18	70	90	B	B	210	260	B	B	160	200	B	B	160	200	B	B	80	90	B	B	240	260	B	B
74	Bucks Bar Rd	50 ft S of Pleasant Vly Rd	W20	W20	380	390	C	C	470	510	C	C	450	470	C	C	450	470	C	C	360	360	B	B	500	530	C	C
75	Bucks Bar Rd	300 ft N of Mt Aukum Rd	W18	W18	300	290	B	B	380	400	C	C	360	370	B	C	360	380	B	C	270	270	B	B	410	430	C	C
76	China Garden Rd	150 ft N of SR 49	2A	2A	80	80	C	C	90	80	C	C	90	80	C	C	90	80	C	C	80	80	C	C	90	90	C	C
77	China Garden Rd	200 yds E of Missouri Flat Rd	2A	2A	240	330	C	C	410	610	C	C	90	150	C	C	90	260	C	C	220	300	C	C	170	300	C	C
78	El Dorado Rd	200 yds N of Pleasant Vly Rd	W22	W22	210	250	B	B	390	440	C	C	330	390	B	C	340	390	B	C	220	250	B	B	370	440	B	C
79	Enterprise Dr	100 ft E of Forni Rd	2A	2A	220	320	C	C	240	360	C	C	220	320	C	C	210	320	C	C	220	320	C	C	220	330	C	C
80	Fairplay Rd	100 ft S of Mt Aukum Rd	W20	W20	150	170	B	B	180	200	B	B	170	190	B	B	170	190	B	B	140	160	B	B	190	220	B	B
81	Forebay Rd	100 ft N of Pony Express Tr	2A	2A	120	170	C	C	150	210	C	C	140	190	C	C	140	190	C	C	120	170	C	C	160	210	C	C
82	Forni Rd	200 ft N of SR 49	2A	2A	340	330	C	C	350	350	C	C	350	350	C	C	350	350	C	C	320	320	C	C	350	360	C	C
83	Forni Rd	300 ft W of Missouri Flat Rd	2A	2A	500	820	C	C	520	840	C	C	420	720	C	C	420	710	C	C	510	820	C	C	420	720	C	C
84	Forni Rd	30 ft W of Arroyo Vista Wy	2A	2A	100	150	C	C	110	160	C	C	110	170	C	C	110	170	C	C	100	150	C	C	110	170	C	C
85	Forni Rd	W of Placerville Dr at City Limits	W20	W20	70	120	B	B	240	190	B	B	-	-	B	B	-	-	B	B	70	110	B	B	20	-	B	B
86	French Creek Rd	300 ft S of Mother Lode Dr	2A	2A	200	240	C	C	250	280	C	C	220	230	C	C	220	230	C	C	200	240	C	C	260	260	C	C
87	Garden Valley Rd	300 ft N of SR 193	W20	W20	40	40	B	B	50	60	B	B	50	50	B	B	50	50	B	B	40	40	B	B	50	60	B	B
88	Garden Valley Rd	0.45 mi S of Marshall Rd	W20	W20	140	120	B	B	150	130	B	B	150	120	B	B	150	120	B	B	140	120	B	B	150	130	B	B
89	Greenwood Rd	100 ft W of Marshall Rd	2A	2A	80	110	C	C	170	200	C	C	130	160	C	C	130	160	C	C	70	110	C	C	170	210	C	C
90	Greenwood Rd	0.03 mi S of SR 193	2A	2A	60	90	C	C	60	90	C	C	60	90	C	C	60	90	C	C	60	80	C	C	60	90	C	C
91	Harvard Wy	0.15 mi E of El Dorado Hills Bl	4AU	4AU	930	730	C	C	1,220	890	C	C	1,010	840	C	C	1,010	840	C	C	960	760	C	C	1,120	890	C	C
92	Harvard Wy	200 ft W of Silva Valley Pkwy	4AU	4AU	820	560	C	C	1,080	740	C	C	890	590	C	C	880	590	C	C	870	600	C	C	950	640	C	C
93	Icehouse Rd	300 ft N of US 50	2A	2A	80	130	C	C	70	110	C	C	80	120	C	C	80	120	C	C	60	100	C	C	80	120	C	C
94	Lime Kiln Rd	100 ft E of China Garden Rd	2A	2A	130	230	C	C	290	550	C	C	30	70	C	C	30	150	C	C	110	200	C	C	70	180	C	C
95	Meder Rd	300 ft E of Cameron Park Dr	W22	W22	590	580	C	C	840	950	D	D	670	760	C	C	670	760	C	C	600	590	C	C	860	1,010	D	D

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Class – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Existing Conditions (2010)				Scenario 2				Scenario 3				Scenario 4				Scenario 5				Scenario 6			
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
96	Meder Rd	200 yds W of Ponderosa Rd	W22	W22	490	510	C	C	570	660	C	C	520	540	C	C	520	540	C	C	490	510	C	C	550	600	C	C
97	Mosquito Rd	300 ft S of Union Ridge Rd	2A	2A	150	150	C	C	330	350	C	C	270	280	C	C	270	280	C	C	140	140	C	C	350	360	C	C
98	Mosquito Rd	At American River Br	W18	W18	100	100	B	B	160	170	B	B	140	140	B	B	140	140	B	B	80	90	B	B	180	180	B	B
99	Newtown Rd	200 yds N of Pleasant Vly Rd	2A	2A	250	240	C	C	370	360	C	C	310	320	C	C	310	310	C	C	230	240	C	C	380	360	C	C
100	Oak Hill Rd	300 ft S of Pleasant Vly Rd	2A	2A	130	170	C	C	130	170	C	C	140	170	C	C	140	170	C	C	130	160	C	C	140	170	C	C
101	Patterson Dr	200 ft S of Pleasant Vly Rd	2A	2A	270	370	C	C	350	460	C	C	300	410	C	C	320	430	C	C	270	370	C	C	350	470	C	C
102	Ponderosa Rd	100 ft N of Meder Rd	W20	W20	130	130	B	B	140	130	B	B	140	140	B	B	140	140	B	B	130	130	B	B	150	140	B	B
103	Ponderosa Rd	100 ft S of Green Valley Rd	W20	W20	110	100	B	B	110	110	B	B	110	100	B	B	110	100	B	B	100	100	B	B	110	110	B	B
104	Rock Creek Rd	100 ft E of SR 193	2A	2A	20	20	C	C	20	20	C	C	20	20	C	C	20	20	C	C	20	20	C	C	20	20	C	C
105	Sand Ridge Rd	100 ft W of Bucks Bar Rd	2A	2A	100	100	C	C	120	130	C	C	130	130	C	C	130	130	C	C	100	100	C	C	120	130	C	C
106	Serrano Pkwy	250 ft W of Silva Valley Pkwy	4AD	4AD	770	590	C	C	860	690	C	C	550	370	C	C	550	370	C	C	780	610	C	C	660	470	C	C
107	Sliger Mine Rd	50 ft N of SR 193	2A	2A	50	70	C	C	60	80	C	C	60	80	C	C	60	80	C	C	40	60	C	C	70	90	C	C
108	Snows Rd	400 ft N of Newtown Rd	2A	2A	80	90	C	C	100	120	C	C	90	110	C	C	90	110	C	C	70	90	C	C	100	120	C	C
109	Snows Rd	200 ft S of Carson Rd	2A	2A	280	240	C	C	310	270	C	C	300	260	C	C	300	260	C	C	280	240	C	C	310	270	C	C
110	South Shingle Rd	0.5 mi E of Latrobe Rd	W18	W18	130	70	B	B	340	290	B	B	150	120	B	B	150	120	B	B	140	100	B	B	180	160	B	B
111	South Shingle Rd	100 ft N of Barnett Ranch Rd	W20	W20	190	230	B	B	400	430	C	C	200	260	B	B	200	260	B	B	230	260	B	B	230	290	B	B
112	Starbuck Rd	110 ft N of Green Valley Rd	2A	2A	100	150	C	C	150	200	C	C	150	200	C	C	150	200	C	C	100	150	C	C	160	210	C	C
113	Union Ridge Rd	100 ft W of Hassler Rd	2A	2A	40	50	C	C	70	80	C	C	60	70	C	C	60	70	C	C	40	50	C	C	80	90	C	C
114	Wentworth Springs Rd	100 ft W of Quintette Rd	2A	2A	40	60	C	C	40	70	C	C	40	70	C	C	40	70	C	C	40	60	C	C	50	70	C	C
115	White Rock Rd	100 ft S of Silva Valley Pkwy	2A	6AD	690	900	C	D	1,190	1,460	D	D	1,230	1,490	C	C	1,210	1,450	C	C	670	1,050	C	D	1,710	1,910	C	C
116	Bass Lake Rd	400 yd N of Country Club Dr	2A	2A	930	880	D	D	1,370	1,340	D	D	1,070	1,050	D	D	1,070	1,040	D	D	990	840	D	C	1,260	1,230	D	D
117	Bass Lake Rd	100 yd S of Green Vly Rd	W22	2A	510	450	C	C	790	670	C	C	570	480	C	C	570	480	C	C	520	460	C	C	670	570	C	C
118	Bassi Rd	200 ft W of Lotus Rd	2A	2A	80	100	C	C	100	120	C	C	90	110	C	C	90	110	C	C	80	100	C	C	100	120	C	C
119	Broadway	At City Limits	2A	2A	350	350	C	C	530	550	C	C	440	460	C	C	450	460	C	C	330	330	C	C	540	560	C	C
120	Cambridge Rd	At U.S. Highway 50 OC	2A	2A	620	860	C	D	840	1,060	C	D	770	980	C	D	770	960	C	D	640	840	C	C	910	1,010	D	D
121	Cambridge Rd	300 ft S of Country Club Dr.	2A	2A	580	750	C	C	740	980	C	D	600	880	C	D	590	860	C	D	590	760	C	C	660	910	C	D
122	Cambridge Rd	100 ft N of Country Club Dr	2A	2A	520	740	C	C	800	1,100	C	D	580	870	C	D	570	850	C	D	530	750	C	C	710	990	C	D
123	Cambridge Rd	300 yds N of Oxford Rd	2A	2A	330	480	C	C	520	700	C	C	370	570	C	C	380	560	C	C	360	480	C	C	440	670	C	C
124	Cambridge Rd	300 ft S of Green Valley Rd	2A	2A	350	410	C	C	710	720	C	C	440	570	C	C	440	570	C	C	370	430	C	C	590	730	C	C
125	Carson Rd	0.6 mi E of City Limits	2A	2A	120	170	C	C	130	180	C	C	120	180	C	C	130	180	C	C	120	170	C	C	130	180	C	C
126	Carson Rd	300 yds E of Gatlin Rd	2A	2A	80	140	C	C	110	160	C	C	100	150	C	C	100	150	C	C	70	110	C	C	110	160	C	C
127	Carson Rd	At Carson Ct	2A	2A	110	180	C	C	110	200	C	C	110	190	C	C	110	190	C	C	100	170	C	C	110	200	C	C
128	Carson Rd	100 ft W of Barkley Rd	2A	2A	210	280	C	C	280	360	C	C	260	330	C	C	260	330	C	C	210	280	C	C	290	360	C	C
129	Carson Rd	100 ft E of Ponderosa Wy	2A	2A	170	220	C	C	180	230	C	C	180	230	C	C	180	230	C	C	170	220	C	C	180	240	C	C
130	Cedar Ravine Rd	0.1 mi N of Pleasant Vly Rd	W20	2A	170	170	B	B	330	340	B	B	250	270	C	C	250	270	C	C	160	160	B	B	340	340	C	C
131	Cedar Ravine Rd	0.25 mi S of Country Club Dr	2A	2A	220	220	C	C	340	350	C	C	290	300	C	C	290	300	C	C	210	210	C	C	330	340	C	C
132	Cold Springs Rd	At City Limits	2A	2A	270	300	C	C	430	480	C	C	360	400	C	C	360	400	C	C	260	300	C	C	430	470	C	C
133	Cold Springs Rd	300 yds S of Gold Hill Rd	2A	2A	190	280	C	C	270	370	C	C	230	330	C	C	230	330	C	C	180	270	C	C	270	360	C	C
134	Cold Springs Rd	100 ft S of SR 153	W22	2A	120	180	B	B	190	260	B	B	150	220	C	C	150	210	C	C	120	180	B	B	190	250	C	C
135	Country Club Dr	West of Bass Lake Road	-	2A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	330	110	C	C	330	110	C	C	-	-	-	-	500	230	C	C
136	Country Club Dr	0.4 mi E of Bass Lake Rd	2A	2A	440	350	C	C	820	720	C	C	740	540	C	C	730	540	C	C	470	370	C	C	930	810	D	C
137	Country Club Dr	0.15 mi W of Knollwood Dr	2A	2A	480	310	C	C	760	620	C	C	710	420	C	C	690	410	C	C	480	310	C	C	890	630	D	C
138	Country Club Dr	300 yds E of Cambridge Rd	2A	2A	240	270	C	C	710	870	C	D	520	590	C	C	510	590	C	C	240	300	C	C	750	790	C	C
139	Country Club Dr	0.2 mi W of Cameron Park Dr	2A	2A	230	370	C	C	500	680	C	C	380	550	C	C	370	550	C	C	230	390	C	C	520	620	C	C
140	Durock Rd	50 ft W of S Shingle Rd	2A	2A	360	560	C	C	730	950	C	D	600	790	C	C	600	780	C	C	370	550	C	C	720	940	C	D
141	El Dorado Rd	0.2 mi S of US 50	W22	2A	440	500	C	C	600	710	C	C	570	670	C	C	580	680	C	C	450	500	C	C	630	750	C	C
142	El Dorado Rd	0.11 mi N of U.S. Highway 50	W22	2A	160	200	B	B	270	390	B	B	280	350	C	C	280	350	C	C	150	210	B	B	340	450	C	C
143	El Dorado Rd	50 ft N of Missouri Flat Rd	W22	2A	150	260	B	B	160	320	B	B	130	220	C	C	130	220	C	C	150	260	B	B	140	260	C	C
144	Francisco Dr	200 ft N of Green Valley Rd	4AD	4AD	900	1,210	C	C	940	1,220	C	C	930	1,240	C	C	930	1,240	C	C	900	1,200	C	C	970	1,270	C	C
145	Francisco Dr	100 ft S of Sheffield Dr	2A	2A	160	200	C	C	180	210	C	C	170	190	C	C	170	190	C	C	170	200	C	C	180	210	C	C
146	Francisco Dr	300 yds N of Sheffield Dr	2A	2A	60	80	C	C	70	90	C	C	70	70	C	C	60	70	C	C	60	80	C	C	70	90	C	C
147	Gold Hill Rd	100 ft E of Lotus Rd	W22	2A	230	140	B	B	290	190	B	B	270	180	C	C	270	180	C	C	230	140	B	B	290	200	C	C
147	Gold Hill Rd	200 ft W of Cold Springs Rd	W22	2A	220	150	B	B	280	200	B	B	260	180	C	C	260	180	C	C	220	150	B	B	280	200	C	C

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Class – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Existing Conditions (2010)				Scenario 2				Scenario 3				Scenario 4				Scenario 5				Scenario 6			
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
148	Gold Hill Rd	100 yds E of Cold Springs Rd	W22	2A	50	40	B	B	80	60	B	B	70	50	C	C	70	50	C	C	60	40	B	B	80	60	C	C
149	Green Valley Rd	200 ft W of Sophia Pkwy	4AU	4AU	1,730	2,050	C	D	2,000	2,230	D	D	1,650	2,050	C	D	1,640	2,050	C	D	1,840	2,080	D	D	1,690	2,090	C	D
150	Green Valley Rd	200 ft E of Sophia Pkwy	4AU	4AU	1,730	2,350	C	D	2,270	2,900	D	D	1,420	2,200	C	D	1,420	2,200	C	D	2,030	2,620	D	D	1,560	2,390	C	D
151	Green Valley Rd	200 ft E of County Line	2A	4AU	1,730	2,050	F	F	2,000	2,230	F	F	1,650	2,050	C	D	1,640	2,050	C	D	1,840	2,080	F	F	1,690	2,090	C	D
152	Green Valley Rd	300 ft W of Silva Valley Pkwy	2A	4AU	970	1,120	D	D	1,120	1,360	D	D	1,100	1,330	C	C	1,090	1,320	C	C	1,000	1,250	D	D	1,280	1,440	C	C
153	Green Valley Rd	200 ft W of Bass Lake Rd	2A	2A	1,200	980	D	D	1,400	1,240	D	D	1,120	1,020	D	D	1,130	1,010	D	D	1,240	1,040	D	D	1,230	1,090	D	D
154	Green Valley Rd	300 ft W of Cameron Park Dr	2A	2A	930	940	D	D	1,340	1,340	D	D	1,040	1,120	D	D	1,040	1,110	D	D	970	990	D	D	1,230	1,270	D	D
155	Green Valley Rd	300 ft E of La Crescenta Dr	W22	2A	610	630	C	C	930	980	D	D	710	730	C	C	700	730	C	C	630	640	C	C	800	820	C	C
156	Green Valley Rd	500 ft E of Deer Valley Rd (E)	W18	2A	360	420	B	C	580	670	C	C	340	400	C	C	340	400	C	C	370	430	C	C	420	480	C	C
157	Green Valley Rd	300 ft W of Lotus Rd	W18	2A	570	650	C	C	990	1,170	D	D	760	870	C	D	760	870	C	D	560	650	C	C	940	1,070	D	D
158	Green Valley Rd	100 ft W of Greenstone Rd	W20	2A	300	360	B	B	470	590	C	C	390	460	C	C	390	460	C	C	310	360	B	B	430	520	C	C
159	Green Valley Rd	400 ft W of Campus Dr	W20	2A	370	420	B	C	450	540	C	C	420	480	C	C	420	480	C	C	380	430	C	C	430	540	C	C
160	Green Valley Rd	200 ft W of Missouri Flat Rd	W20	2A	710	760	C	C	800	880	D	D	770	820	C	C	760	820	C	C	720	770	C	C	780	880	C	D
161	Green Valley Rd	100 ft W of Weber Creek Br	W18	2A	230	310	B	B	300	410	B	C	290	330	C	C	290	330	C	C	230	320	B	B	310	390	C	C
162	Greenstone Rd	300 ft N of Mother Lode Dr	W18	2A	80	110	B	B	120	160	B	B	110	130	C	C	110	130	C	C	80	110	B	B	120	160	C	C
163	Greenstone Rd	0.20 mi N of US 50	2A	2A	210	220	C	C	350	400	C	C	320	340	C	C	320	340	C	C	210	220	C	C	360	360	C	C
164	Grizzly Flat Rd	200 yds E of Mt Aukum Rd	2A	2A	160	190	C	C	230	260	C	C	210	240	C	C	210	240	C	C	150	170	C	C	240	270	C	C
165	Lake Hills Dr	100 ft N of Salmon Falls Rd	2A	2A	250	260	C	C	260	270	C	C	260	280	C	C	260	280	C	C	240	260	C	C	260	270	C	C
166	Latrobe Rd	250 ft N of County Line	2A	2A	240	300	C	C	540	650	C	C	260	300	C	C	260	300	C	C	450	480	C	C	380	400	C	C
167	Latrobe Rd	1.5 mi N of S Shingle Rd	2A	2A	250	310	C	C	620	710	C	C	300	340	C	C	290	340	C	C	490	550	C	C	430	440	C	C
168	Latrobe Rd	At Deer Creek Bridge	2A	2A	330	390	C	C	640	730	C	C	360	390	C	C	350	390	C	C	540	570	C	C	480	490	C	C
169	Latrobe Rd	100 ft S of Investment Bl	2A	2A	380	420	C	C	780	870	C	D	470	490	C	C	460	490	C	C	620	660	C	C	620	620	C	C
170	Latrobe Rd	100 ft N of Investment Bl	2A	2A	650	710	C	C	970	1,080	D	D	730	770	C	C	720	770	C	C	890	960	D	D	870	880	D	D
171	Latrobe Rd	100 ft N of Golden Foothill Pw	4AD	4AD	1,750	1,740	C	C	2,570	2,610	D	D	1,320	1,280	C	C	1,320	1,280	C	C	1,970	1,950	D	D	1,490	1,440	C	C
172	Lotus Rd	300 ft N of Green Valley Rd	2A	2A	470	570	C	C	1,010	1,220	D	D	770	930	C	D	770	930	C	D	450	560	C	C	1,010	1,190	D	D
173	Lotus Rd	300 ft S of Thompson Hill Rd	2A	2A	310	430	C	C	530	680	C	C	390	540	C	C	390	540	C	C	290	410	C	C	530	670	C	C
174	Lotus Rd	0.25 mi S of SR 49	2A	2A	260	460	C	C	480	710	C	C	350	570	C	C	350	570	C	C	250	440	C	C	490	700	C	C
175	Luneman Rd	100 ft W of Lotus Rd	2A	2A	270	180	C	C	330	260	C	C	310	230	C	C	310	230	C	C	270	180	C	C	330	260	C	C
176	Marshall Rd	200 yds E of SR 49	2A	2A	260	300	C	C	370	410	C	C	310	350	C	C	310	350	C	C	250	290	C	C	380	410	C	C
177	Marshall Rd	300 ft E of Garden Valley Rd	2A	2A	430	370	C	C	560	500	C	C	490	440	C	C	490	440	C	C	410	360	C	C	580	510	C	C
178	Marshall Rd	300 yds S of Lower Main St	2A	2A	40	50	C	C	90	100	C	C	60	70	C	C	60	70	C	C	40	50	C	C	110	110	C	C
179	Missouri Flat Rd	300 ft N of El Dorado Rd	2A	2A	650	620	C	C	730	740	C	C	690	680	C	C	690	680	C	C	650	630	C	C	720	750	C	C
180	Mormon Emigrant Tr	100 ft E of Sly Park Rd	2A	2A	60	90	C	C	110	150	C	C	100	140	C	C	100	140	C	C	60	90	C	C	140	180	C	C
181	Mosquito Rd	At City Limits	2A	2A	270	310	C	C	490	550	C	C	410	460	C	C	410	460	C	C	260	300	C	C	510	570	C	C
182	Mother Lode Dr	200 ft W of Sunset Ln	2A	2A	910	1,100	D	D	1,140	1,330	D	D	1,050	1,260	D	D	1,060	1,260	D	D	940	1,130	D	D	1,130	1,320	D	D
183	Mother Lode Dr	400 yds W of Pleasant Valley Rd	2A	2A	570	740	C	C	910	1,120	D	D	730	910	C	D	750	920	C	D	590	750	C	C	870	1,060	D	D
184	Mother Lode Dr	0.43 mi E of Pleasant Valley Rd	2A	2A	240	320	C	C	280	360	C	C	260	350	C	C	260	350	C	C	240	330	C	C	280	370	C	C
185	Mt Aukum Rd	0.25 mi N of County Line	2A	2A	120	160	C	C	130	160	C	C	150	190	C	C	150	190	C	C	120	150	C	C	150	190	C	C
186	Mt Aukum Rd	300 ft S of Bucks Bar Rd	2A	2A	300	290	C	C	370	380	C	C	350	360	C	C	350	360	C	C	280	280	C	C	400	410	C	C
187	Mt Aukum Rd	300 ft S of Pleasant Vly Rd	2A	2A	200	270	C	C	290	340	C	C	260	330	C	C	260	330	C	C	190	270	C	C	300	370	C	C
188	Mt Murphy Rd	50 ft S of Marshall Rd	2A	2A	90	100	C	C	140	160	C	C	110	130	C	C	110	130	C	C	80	90	C	C	140	160	C	C
189	Mt Murphy Rd	200 yds N of SR 49	2A	2A	20	30	C	C	110	130	C	C	60	80	C	C	60	80	C	C	20	30	C	C	110	130	C	C
190	Newtown Rd	200 yds N of Pioneer Hill Rd	2A	2A	200	220	C	C	330	350	C	C	260	280	C	C	260	280	C	C	180	210	C	C	340	350	C	C
191	Newtown Rd	100 ft E of Broadway	2A	2A	280	320	C	C	410	450	C	C	340	380	C	C	340	380	C	C	260	310	C	C	420	450	C	C
192	Old Frenchtown Rd	400 yds S of Mother Lode Dr	2A	2A	90	100	C	C	130	150	C	C	110	130	C	C	110	130	C	C	90	110	C	C	130	150	C	C
193	Omo Ranch Rd	100 ft E of Mt Aukum Rd	2A	2A	60	80	C	C	70	80	C	C	70	90	C	C	70	90	C	C	60	70	C	C	70	90	C	C
194	Oxford Rd	50 ft E of Salida Wy	2A	2A	290	420	C	C	710	850	C	D	390	640	C	C	390	630	C	C	290	440	C	C	620	850	C	D
195	Pleasant Valley Rd	200 yds E of Mother Lode Dr	2A	2A	440	560	C	C	740	900	C	D	580	710	C	C	600	720	C	C	450	570	C	C	700	830	C	C
196	Pleasant Valley Rd	200 yds E of SR 49 (E)	2A	2A	1,030	1,230	D	D	1,240	1,500	D	D	1,200	1,440	D	D	1,200	1,430	D	D	1,010	1,210	D	D	1,300	1,560	D	E
197	Pleasant Valley Rd	300 ft W of Oak Hill Rd	2A	2A	860	980	D	D	940	1,090	D	D	930	1,060	D	D	930	1,060	D	D	830	950	C	D	970	1,130	D	D
198	Pleasant Valley Rd	100 ft E of Cedar Ravine Rd	2A	2A	800	830	C	C	1,020	1,080	D	D	950	990	D	D	940	990	D	D	780	800	C	C	1,060	1,120	D	D
199	Pleasant Valley Rd	0.10 mi E of Bucks Bar Rd	2A	2A	530	450	C	C	670	580	C	C	600	530	C	C	610	530	C	C	540	450	C	C	670	600	C	C
200	Pleasant Valley Rd	0.40 mi E of Newtown Rd	2A	2A	410	450	C	C	550	580	C	C	500	530	C	C	500	530	C	C	400	440	C	C	570	600	C	C

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class – Scenario Exist, 2, and 5	Class – Scenario 3, 4, and 6	Existing Conditions (2010)				Scenario 2				Scenario 3				Scenario 4				Scenario 5				Scenario 6			
					Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
					AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
201	Ponderosa Rd	300 ft N of Wild Chaparral Dr	2A	2A	680	600	C	C	860	760	D	C	810	660	C	C	810	660	C	C	690	600	C	C	860	720	D	C
202	Pony Express Tr	200 yds E of Carson Rd	2A	2A	180	240	C	C	200	270	C	C	200	260	C	C	200	260	C	C	170	240	C	C	200	270	C	C
203	Pony Express Tr	300 ft E of Gilmore Rd	2A	2A	280	420	C	C	350	500	C	C	330	480	C	C	330	480	C	C	270	420	C	C	360	510	C	C
204	Pony Express Tr	300 ft W of Forebay Rd	2A	2A	350	510	C	C	370	530	C	C	370	530	C	C	370	530	C	C	350	520	C	C	370	540	C	C
205	Salmon Falls Rd	50 ft S of Malcolm-Dixon Rd	2A	2A	560	620	C	C	860	790	D	C	770	810	C	C	770	810	C	C	650	620	C	C	920	940	D	D
206	Salmon Falls Rd	At New York Creek Bridge	2A	2A	200	220	C	C	430	410	C	C	280	300	C	C	280	300	C	C	190	210	C	C	440	420	C	C
207	Salmon Falls Rd	400 yds S of Pedro Hill Rd	2A	2A	120	170	C	C	290	310	C	C	180	230	C	C	180	230	C	C	110	160	C	C	300	320	C	C
208	Salmon Falls Rd	200 yds S of Rattlesnake Bar Rd	2A	2A	30	50	C	C	210	190	C	C	100	100	C	C	100	100	C	C	30	40	C	C	210	200	C	C
209	Sand Ridge Rd	300 ft E of SR 49	2A	2A	50	50	C	C	130	120	C	C	90	90	C	C	90	90	C	C	50	50	C	C	140	130	C	C
210	Serrano Pkwy	300 ft W of Bass Lake Rd	4AD	4AD	370	380	C	C	870	760	C	C	410	470	C	C	410	480	C	C	400	430	C	C	580	690	C	C
211	Shingle Springs Dr	0.20 mi S of U.S. Highway 50	2A	2A	420	400	C	C	650	780	C	C	560	570	C	C	560	570	C	C	400	390	C	C	670	760	C	C
212	Sly Park Rd	0.35 mi E of Mt Aukum Rd	2A	2A	240	290	C	C	310	360	C	C	280	330	C	C	280	330	C	C	240	280	C	C	310	360	C	C
213	Sly Park Rd	1.62 mi W of Mormon Emigrant Tr	W18	W18	150	190	B	B	190	240	B	B	170	220	B	B	170	220	B	B	150	190	B	B	200	250	B	B
214	Sly Park Rd	0.35 mi E of Mormon Emigrant Tr	2A	2A	260	330	C	C	350	430	C	C	320	400	C	C	320	400	C	C	250	320	C	C	380	460	C	C
215	Sly Park Rd	100 ft S of Gold Ridge Tr (N)	2A	2A	310	310	C	C	430	450	C	C	370	380	C	C	370	380	C	C	300	310	C	C	470	480	C	C
216	Sly Park Rd	100 ft S of Pony Express Tr	2A	2A	590	710	C	C	640	770	C	C	630	750	C	C	630	750	C	C	590	710	C	C	650	770	C	C
217	South Shingle Rd	100 ft S of Sunset Ln	W20	W20	420	530	C	C	720	870	C	D	450	610	C	C	450	610	C	C	460	570	C	C	580	760	C	C
218	SR49	North of China Hill	2A	2A	480	510	C	C	590	650	C	C	540	570	C	C	540	570	C	C	450	480	C	C	580	630	C	C
219	SR49	West of Missouri Flat Rd	2A	2A	980	950	D	D	1,240	1,280	D	D	1,090	1,080	D	D	1,110	1,100	D	D	960	940	D	D	1,160	1,150	D	D
220	SR49	West of Hastings Creed Rd	2A	2A	260	310	C	C	410	500	C	C	360	440	C	C	360	430	C	C	250	290	C	C	410	510	C	C
221	SR49	At the Placer County Line	2A	2A	640	750	C	C	810	940	C	D	750	870	C	D	750	870	C	D	620	730	C	C	820	950	C	D
222	SR 193	West of American River Road	2A	2A	470	580	C	C	590	710	C	C	540	650	C	C	540	650	C	C	460	560	C	C	600	710	C	C
223	SR 193	North of SR 49 in Placerville	2A	2A	180	190	C	C	210	230	C	C	200	210	C	C	200	210	C	C	170	180	C	C	210	230	C	C
224	Union Mine Rd	200 yds S of SR 49	2A	2A	290	140	C	C	300	160	C	C	290	150	C	C	290	150	C	C	280	140	C	C	300	160	C	C
225	Wentworth Springs Rd	0.7 mi E of Main St	2A	2A	170	220	C	C	190	250	C	C	180	240	C	C	180	240	C	C	160	210	C	C	200	260	C	C
226	White Rock Rd	At County Line	2A	4AD	530	1,070	C	D	1,060	1,910	D	F	660	1,330	C	C	660	1,280	C	C	900	1,810	D	F	1,020	1,740	C	C
227	White Rock Rd	100 ft W of Latrobe Rd	4AD	4AD	710	1,150	C	C	1,340	2,220	C	D	740	1,330	C	C	740	1,270	C	C	1,180	2,070	C	D	1,050	1,650	C	C

Section 3.10, Water Supply (Recirculated Partial DEIR)

Page 3.10-7, Add the following heading above the fifth paragraph:

El Dorado County Water Agency

Page 3.10-7, revise the following paragraph (fifth paragraph) as follows:

The El Dorado County Water Agency (EDCWA) is a long-term water planning organization that leads, assists, and participates in projects such as securing water rights for El Dorado County and promoting water conservation. Although it works in concert with the county water districts, EDCWA does not supply water to individual users, nor does it maintain water storage or transmission facilities. It is not a water supply ~~agency purveyor~~ like EID, GDPUD, and GFCSD, nor does it exert any regulatory power over the water supply agencies.

Page 3.10-7, add the following paragraph under the fifth paragraph:

EDCWA adopted its *Water Resources Development and Management Plan (WRDMP)* in 2007 in response to the adoption of the 2004 County General Plan. The express goal of the WRDMP “is to coordinate water planning activities within the West Slope and to provide a blueprint for actions and facilities that could be needed to meet those projected future water needs.” (El Dorado County Water Agency 2014) The 2007 WRDMP examined the adequacy of existing and future public water supplies to meet projected future demand, based on the land use densities reflected in the 2004 General Plan. In late 2014, the EDCWA adopted an update to the WRDMP.

Page 3.10-7, revise the paragraph as follows:

The 2014 *West Slope Update* of EDCWA’s *Water Resources Development and Management Plan (2014 Update)* reflects the Agency EDCWA’s long-term view of water supply and demand in El Dorado County in light of the Agency’s revised assumptions regarding land use, future water supply availability, and drought conditions. It forecasts that, although water supply will meet demand in EID’s service area to 2035, after 2035 EID will face substantial supply shortages. As discussed in *Impact WS-1: Create a need for new or expanded entitlements or resources for sufficient water supply*, the 2014 Update employs different planning assumptions than does the west county’s major water purveyor, the El Dorado Irrigation District.

Page 3.10-8, insert the following after the second paragraph under Service Area:

EID’s service area also includes a portion of the Folsom Specific Plan Area south of U.S. Highway 50. EID’s planning documents take that service into account as part of future demand projections.

Page 3.10-9, revise the first paragraph as follows:

In the future, EID plans to purchase 7,500 acre-feet per year (AFY) of water wholesale from EDCWA through a USBR contract under Public Law 101-514 (i.e., “Fazio” water). This water would otherwise be destined for Folsom Lake. ~~The Fazio water is expected to begin delivery in 2015.~~ EID is also pursuing through ~~EDCWA~~ the El Dorado Water and Power Authority (EDWPA) water rights for another 30,000 AFY (EDWPA supplemental water rights project) under the “El Dorado–SMUD Cooperation Agreement.” This supply would be available to EID beginning in 2025. By 2025, EID would thereby increase its current supply by 37,500 AFY in normal years; this would be reduced to an increase of 10,625 AFY in dry years (El Dorado Irrigation District 2013a).

Page 3.10-9, revise the fourth paragraph as follows:

Section 5.3.1, Concept 1B, of the IWRMP describes the EDWPA El Dorado-SMUD Cooperation Agreement as the “supplemental water rights project,” as follows.

Page 3.10-9, add the following paragraph and bullets after the fourth paragraph and above the Heading, “Infrastructure”.

Water available through the EDWPA supplemental water rights project would be taken from the UARP in a manner consistent with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) licensing requirements for the UARP. The UARP is operated as a hydroelectric project, so the supplemental water would be from a combination of the following sources:

- l water that does not originate from storage, and is used for FERC licensing flow requirements below Slab Creek Reservoir;
- l water that does not originate from storage, and is directly diverted for power production in UARP facilities and to meet EDWPA water delivery requirements;
- l water released from Loon Lake, Ice House, and Union Valley Reservoirs for power production, instream flows, or to meet EDWPA delivery requirements. (El Dorado Irrigation District 2013a).

Page 3.10-11, revise the third paragraph under Conservation Measures as follows:

EID has adopted demand management measures that conserve water during both normal and dry years. These include measures such as water audits for residential customers, high-efficiency clothes washer rebates, and an Irrigation Management Service that provides irrigation scheduling for commercial agriculture customers. Under its *2008 Drought Preparedness Plan* and the *2014 Update to its 2012 Drought Action Plan*, EID has established a four-stage water conservation program for additional savings during water supply shortages. The drought preparedness plan is not invoked when there is a single dry year. Stage 1 is typically declared in the second dry year and sets a voluntary 15% conservation goal. Stage 2 is typically declared in the third dry year and implements water use reduction measures to decrease normal demand by up to 30% through voluntary and mandatory measures. Drought Stage 3 establishes mandatory measures to reduce EID-wide water demand by up to 50%. Stage 4 imposes a mandatory conservation requirement of greater than 50% through mandatory measures such as water rationing (Brown and Caldwell 2008; El Dorado Irrigation District ~~2012~~2014). The Drought Action Plan describes the actions EID will take during each respective stage, including convening a Drought Response Team to coordinate the responses of EID’s various departments, reaching out to the community with information about water conservation, undertaking changes in operations to conserve water supplies, and determining when to increase or reduce the stage. The Drought Action Plan process is summarized in Table 3.10-1.

Page 3.10-19, revise the second paragraph after New land uses under the ZOU as follows:

These uses would be allowed only upon prior approval of a discretionary permit after a public hearing. ~~As a result, they~~ Permit applications will be subject to their own site-specific and project-specific CEQA analyses, based on project-specific information that is not available now at the program level. Potential water demand and available supply would be considered at that time and feasible mitigation measures necessary to avoid the impacts of the proposed use would be made conditions of approval. The County is not required to approve discretionary permits and, alternatively, could choose to deny such permits on the basis of inadequate water supply.

Page 3.10-19, add the following discussion before El Dorado Irrigation District:**Proposed Landscaping and Irrigation Standards**

The proposed Landscaping and Irrigation Standards are based on the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance promulgated by the Department of Water Resources for the express purpose of reducing landscaping water use in California (Department of Water Resources 2010). The proposed standards would require the use of drought-tolerant plant species and water efficient irrigation and landscaping practices for the following development types:

1. New construction and rehabilitated landscapes requiring a permit with a landscape area equal to or greater than 2,500 square feet for industrial, research and development, commercial, civic, or utility uses, and developer-installed landscaping in single- and multi-unit residential development.
2. New construction landscapes that are homeowner-provided and/or homeowner-hired in single- and multi-unit residential projects, with a total landscape area equal to or greater than 5,000 square feet and only when a building or grading permit is required for said landscaping installation.

Adoption of the proposed Landscaping and Irrigation Standards would reduce the water demand related to landscaping for future development in areas served by the water districts and in areas dependent upon groundwater. The reduction in projected demand in comparison to demand under existing development standards is unknown because it is dependent upon the design of future qualifying development projects and whether they meet the minimum requirements or exceed such requirements. In any case, application of the proposed standards will reduce projected demand somewhat. It is unlikely to be a sufficient reduction to avoid a significant effect on water supply as a result of future development from implementation of the General Plan.

Page 3.10-19, revise the following paragraph as follows:

Future demand is based on the 2004 General Plan land use assumptions, using EID's own assumptions for the future rate of growth. The County's most recent study indicates that the growth rate under the General Plan is just over 1%. (BAE Urban Economics 2013) EID uses slightly higher growth rates than does the County for its El Dorado Hills, Western, and Eastern Regions, for three time periods, with those rates increasing in the future. EID has projected supply and demand to the year 2035, based on securing the Fazio water and the EDWPA supplemental water rights project El Dorado SMUD Cooperation Agreement supply (El Dorado Irrigation District 2013b).

Page 3.10-20, revise the following paragraph as follows:

EID's projected increased water supply avoids the impact identified in the 2004 General Plan EIR. The project's impact on water supply within EID is less than significant, based on EID's projections.

Page 3.10-25, revise the following paragraph as follows:

The TGPA/ZOU EIR concludes that EID will have sufficient water to meet estimated water demands in 2035, based on EID's UWMP and IWRMP. On the surface, that conclusion would appear to conflict with the findings of the EDCWA's 2014 Update. As explained below, even though these supply analyses have been prepared for different purposes, they actually reach similar conclusions regarding the availability of adequate supply to 2035. After 2035, the 2014 Update indicates that EID's water supply will fall short.

Page 3.10-26, revise the following paragraphs as follows:

~~As a result, The differences between the EID and EDCWA projections lie in the many assumptions and characterizations can and do that~~ differ between the 2014 Update and EID's plans—with both agencies appropriately developing conclusions based upon those differing conditions and their differing responsibilities.

A key difference that manifests in the 2014 Update conclusions is the representation of “planned supplies.” In the IWRMP, the Central Valley Project Fazio water entitlement (PL 101-514 [1990] Fazio) is reflected as one of the water assets EID views as part of their water rights and entitlement portfolio. Also included is the partial assignment detailed in the EDWPA supplemental water rights project El Dorado SMUD Cooperative Agreement. A full description of these water supplies is included in the IWRMP. In contrast, the 2014 Update does not include either supply as part of EID's available supply portfolio. The result is a stated shortfall in the 2014 Update for the EID service area. Though the 2014 Update does discuss these as water supplies that EID recognizes and supplies that could be used to offset the stated shortfall (see 2014 Update, p. 109), they are not included in the 2014 Update's calculations and resulting tables.

The analysis of EID's supply in the TGPA/ZOU EIR appropriately considers these supplies as part of the total projected water supplies available to EID. This reliance on EID's forecasts is consistent with General Plan Objective 5.1.2: Concurrency. In the context of Water Code Section 10910, which describes the analysis that is to be undertaken in a formal water supply assessment, projected water supplies identified in a UWMP are to be considered by the lead agency. Although the TGPA/ZOU project is not subject to Section 10910, that section provides useful guidance in how to analyze the availability of water supplies for a general plan update.

The 2014 Update also assumes that there will be significant annexations into the EID service area in the future. EID's UWMP and IWRMP do not contemplate major annexations and therefore assume that EID's service area will not substantially increase in the future.

In addition to different future horizons (2035 versus build-out), future service area, and different assumptions of available water supply, there is another key assumption that explains the differences in these two documents. The 2014 Update forecasts a substantial net increase (approximately 29,800 acre-feet) in agricultural water use between the baseline year of 2000 and the buildout year beyond 2035. This increase in demand is based on the assumptions that substantial additional agricultural land will be planted in irrigated crops and that the buildout crop mix will be 50% wine grapes (which use 1.3 acre-feet/acre) and 50% tree crops (which use 2.8 acre-feet/acre). However, this assumption is not substantiated by past experience and likely overestimates the increase in agricultural water demand.

Page 3.10-27, revise the following paragraph as follows:

This is not to suggest that there will not be growth in agricultural water demand. The steady increase in agricultural production that is discussed in Section 3.2, *Agricultural Resources*, indicates that more land will be brought into irrigated crop production in the future, thereby increasing water demand over the baseline. However, it does indicate that the 2014 Update agricultural demand projections may be overstated.

Page 3.10-29, revise the following paragraph as follows:

There are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The following ~~two~~^{three} potential measures are not feasible for the reasons described below.

Page 3.10-30, add the following paragraphs after the last paragraph:

Adopt a Groundwater Management Plan: The County has adopted a number of groundwater related policies as part of its General Plan (see the Public Services and Utilities Element) that will be implemented as budget allows. The following groundwater objective and policies demonstrate the importance of groundwater supplies to the County.

Objective 5.2.3: Groundwater Systems. **Demonstrate that water supply is available for proposed groundwater dependent development and protect against degradation of well water supplies for existing residents.**

The General Plan's policies 5.3.3.1 through 5.3.3.7 provide for overview of individual development proposals to ensure that there is sufficient groundwater, if the project is to depend on groundwater.

Separately, the County Environmental Management Department has developed and made available, *A Guide for the Private Well Owner*, as well as an informational page on *Typical Water Demands For Rural Residential Parcels* (http://www.edcgov.us/Water_Well_Program.aspx). In addition, each new well that is drilled within the County needs to be approved via issuance of a well permit. In order to obtain a building permit, proof of an adequate water supply must be provided to the Division of Environmental Management as part of the application (County Policy #800-02).

Although these examples do not comprise a County groundwater management plan, they do represent the County's efforts to monitor and manage groundwater resources within the County. With consideration of the County's budgetary constraints, these efforts are effective at managing groundwater use and supply within the County.

Adoption of a groundwater management plan would be infeasible within a reasonable period of time due to the current lack of the baseline data necessary to develop such a plan. Necessary baseline data would include multi-year sampling of water levels in groundwater wells on a countywide basis in sufficient sample numbers (i.e., data points) to be able to describe the outlines of the county's numerous fractured, non-contiguous aquifers, understand the variations in groundwater supply during wet and dry years within those aquifers, and project the aquifers' safe yield rates.

The County's GOTNET data of well depths and production rates in gallons per minute (gpm) is not comprehensive, long-term data. In fact, it represents only instantaneous measurements, as opposed to long-term monitoring, and because of the variable nature and undefined boundaries of the fractured aquifers, instantaneous measurements are insufficient to characterize changes that may be occurring within any given aquifer and the available water supply within the aquifer. The State Water Resources Control Board's GAMA data used for the Voluntary Domestic Well Assessment Project El Dorado County Data Summary Report (SWRCB 2005) was developed to characterize groundwater quality and presents median depths of wells surveyed in 1978 (Carla Calkins, Water Well Survey Report, June 1978). This is historical data, over 35 years old, and is not linked to any data points since that time. It is of limited use in characterizing existing conditions.

Therefore, although there is well information available, it is not sufficient to provide the detailed analysis needed to adequately characterize groundwater conditions in the western portion of the County. The data that is available (i.e., GOTONET, State Water Board, and DWR) is not comprehensive, it consists of one-time observations or at too few well locations to (1) map/identify the boundaries of the groundwater aquifers or the sources of supply; (2) accurately characterize groundwater supplies within the fractured aquifers; (3) identify specific aquifers where wells are non-productive over the long term; (4) characterize the use/recovery rates within aquifers; or (5) provide other data points necessary to preparing a GWMP.

Section 3.11, Energy Resources (Recirculated Partial DEIR)

Page 3.11-2, a third paragraph is added to the section California Building Standards Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations), including Energy Code (Title 24, Part 6) and Green Building Standards Code (Title 24, Part 11) as follows:

The California Building Code applies to all new development, and there are no substantive waivers available that would exempt development from its energy efficiency requirements. The California Building Code is revised on a regular basis, with each revision increasing the required level of energy efficiency.

Page 3.11-4, add the following text and new Table 3.11-1 after the last paragraph:

Demand for electricity and natural gas in El Dorado County (including the cities of Placerville and South Lake Tahoe) has been relatively constant during the period of 2008-2013 while the county’s population has increased slightly, as shown in Table 3.11-1.

Table 3.11-1. El Dorado County Energy Demand 2008-2013

Year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
County Population (incl. Placerville)	177,897	179,150	180,682	180,483	179,695	181,658
Electricity Consumption (millions of kWh)	1298	1263	1252	1265	1257	1245
Natural Gas Consumption (millions of therms)	31	32	31	33	30	30
Sources: Department of Finance 2012; Department of Finance 2015; California Energy Commission 2015a; California Energy Commission 2015b						

Page 3.11-5, the first paragraph under Impact Mechanisms is revised as follows:

The impact mechanisms for energy resources are electrical and natural gas use by residences, businesses, and industry, and transportation-related fuel use as analyzed for generally the same as for air quality and GHGs (see Section 3.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases). ~~These include impacts derive from~~ the TGPA policies related to increased density in mixed use developments, specific uses

that may be authorized under the ZOU by discretionary permit, and adoption of the Landscaping and Irrigation Standards, Outdoor Lighting Standards, and Parking and Loading Standards, in addition to the overall increase in development that will be allowed under the General Plan as amended by the TGPA and as implemented by the Zoning Ordinance.

Page 3.11-5, the first paragraph under Methods of Analysis is revised as follows:

Impacts on energy resources are examined at a general and programmatic level. The analysis considers all potential energy uses associated with the project, including fossil fuel consumption during future construction, new building electricity and natural gas usage, and gasoline and diesel consumption from changes in vehicle traffic. Little information is available regarding energy use at the county level. Information from the greenhouse gas analysis prepared for this EIR was utilized as the basis for qualifying the use of energy in El Dorado County. California Energy Commission reports provided information on recent energy use in the electrical and natural gas sectors. The assessment focuses only on those impact mechanisms (see above) with the potential to result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary energy consumption.

Page 3.11-6, the following text is added after second paragraph:

Appendix F is directed at development projects for which an energy budget is reasonably feasible to prepare. The TGPA/ZOU is a larger scale project that does not include any discrete development projects and instead sets out general land use policies and regulations for future development. As a result, several of the potential energy impacts listed above are not relevant to analyzing the energy efficiency of the TGPA/ZOU. The following describes the relevancy of each of the impacts.

1. The TGPA/ZOU is not a development project for which there are stages such as construction, operation and maintenance. General information is known about future development under the TGPA/ZOU and the General Plan, but a specific estimate of amount and fuel type would be purely speculative without information about future individual development projects that is not available.
2. The general effects of the project on the ability of energy suppliers to provide energy in the future can be estimated and is discussed below.
3. The effects of the TGPA/ZOU on peak- and base-period energy demands cannot be known because there is no information on what peak- and base-period energy supplies may be available in 2035, the planning horizon for the TGPA/ZOU project.
4. Future development under the TGPA/ZOU and the General Plan will comply with California's energy-efficient building codes, as discussed below.
5. See item 3 above.
6. The general efficiency of future transportation is discussed below in the context of federal standards for fuel efficiency.

Page 3.11-6, the following text is added to end of the Thresholds of Significance section:

The Oxford Dictionaries Online defines wasteful as "using or expending something of value carelessly, extravagantly, or to no purpose" (Oxford Dictionaries 2015). Whether an action, such as residential and commercial development, or even expansion of agricultural use, is careless, extravagant, or to no purpose is a value judgment in the absence of objective standards. With the

adoption of the General Plan, the County has established as policy the pattern, density, and intensity of land use development. The goals and policies of the General Plan reflect the elected Board of Supervisors' considered judgment that development that is consistent with the General Plan is neither careless nor without purpose.

Efficiency is a relative term. Existing development is less efficient in its energy use than future development because it was built to a less efficient standard. Since adoption of the state's first energy efficiency codes in the late 1970s, energy efficiency standards have saved Californians more than \$74 billion in reduced electricity bills (California Energy Commission 2015a). The state energy efficiency requirements of the California Building Code will continue to be updated to improve energy efficiency (California Energy Commission 2015b). Similarly, vehicle fuel efficiency will improve in the future as the national Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards for automobiles and trucks take effect (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 2015a). This will include phasing in a fleet average of 54.5 miles per gallon for new cars by model year 2025 (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 2015b).

The Oxford Dictionaries Online defines unnecessary as "more than is needed; excessive." (Oxford Dictionaries 2015). With the adoption of the General Plan, the County has established as policy the pattern, density, and intensity of future development. The existing General Plan can accommodate an additional 17,500 new dwellings, more or less, before buildout; the TGPA would marginally increase that potential. The BAE Urban Economics projection of population growth to 2035 prepared for the TGPA indicates that the county's population will increase by approximately 40,913 persons within the West Slope area, minus the City of Placerville. This would require approximately 15,409 additional housing units. Population growth over the planning period will create a need for new housing that will likewise result in an increase in energy consumption.

Page 3.11-7, the first paragraph under Energy Use by Future Development is revised as follows:

Future development as envisioned in the General Plan, TGPA, and ZOU would result in the consumption of electricity and natural gas for power, water conveyance, heating, and cooking. All future development will conform to building code and other state energy conservation measures described in the Regulatory Setting. In general, future new development will be more energy efficient than existing development. Therefore, it will not result in the inefficient or wasteful consumption of energy. As noted above, the TGPA/ZOU does not propose adding substantially more development than allowed under the current General Plan. Accordingly, while overall energy use will increase over existing levels because of future development under the General Plan, implementation of the project is not anticipated to ~~substantially increase the rates of building~~ electricity, water, or natural gas consumption over ~~current currently projected~~ levels.

Page 3.11-7, the following text is added following the first paragraph on that page:

The California Independent System Operator (CAISO), in collaboration with the California Energy Commission and California Public Utilities Commission, is responsible for ensuring that California's power system reliably delivers power to meet the state's needs. CAISO manages the high voltage grid for 80% of California, including El Dorado County and Pacific Gas and Electric's (PG&E's) service area. This encompasses statewide approximately 26,000 miles of transmission lines and 740 power plants. CAISO is responsible for planning improvements to the grid necessary to reliability, conformity to state energy goals, and economic opportunity on a regular basis. The planning process includes forecasting reliability into the future on a 10-year horizon (to 2024), and approving the

transmission projects (e.g., new and expanded capacity transmission lines) necessary to ensure reliability. CAISO's 2014–2015 Transmission Plan, for example, approves seven reliability-driven transmission projects for the statewide grid, with a total cost of approximately \$352 million. (California Independent System Operator 2015).

The CAISO's 2015 Local Capacity Technical Analysis report indicates that sufficient electrical supply capacity exists to serve El Dorado County in the short term and to 2024 (the extent of current CAISO forecasts). This report identifies thermal overloads and loss of crucial facilities or transmission lines under theoretical contingency situations as concerns in the Sierra Division that includes western El Dorado County. However, it goes on to state that "previously approved projects within the area address the identified reliability concerns." (California Independent System Operator 2014)

The TGPA/ZOU does not represent a substantive increase in the development potential identified in the 2004 General Plan. Therefore, it would not substantially change the energy need forecasts used by CAISO, nor would it result in an inability to provide reliable electrical energy to El Dorado County in the future.

Page 3.11-8, the following modifications are made to the text in the last paragraph of the discussion of Impact NRG-1:

In light of reasonably foreseeable improvements in Federal- and State-mandated energy and fuel efficiency requirements, the County's adopted development policies expressed in the General Plan, and reasonable projections of population growth, new development will generally be neither wasteful nor inefficient, nor will it result in an unnecessary use of energy. Because the project is consistent with state and local energy policies, the project would not result in a wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary usage of energy. This impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Section 3.12, Community Design Standards and ZOU Additions (Recirculated Partial DEIR)

Page 3.12-2, revise the paragraph under Landscaping and Irrigation Standards as follows:

The Landscaping and Irrigation Standards will affect the types and amounts of landscaping required, including requiring the use of drought-tolerant species, water efficient irrigation, and water efficient landscaping practices. Under the standards, a water efficient landscape plan is required for the following:

1. New construction and rehabilitated landscapes requiring a permit with a landscape area equal to or greater than 2,500 square feet for industrial, research and development, commercial, civic, or utility uses, and developer-installed landscaping in single- and multi-unit residential development.
2. New construction landscapes that are homeowner-provided and/or homeowner-hired in single- and multi-unit residential projects, with a total landscape area equal to or greater than 5,000 square feet and only when a building or grading permit is required for said landscaping installation.
3. Areas of potential impacts: aesthetics, water supply.

Page 3.12-5, revise the first sentence of the discussion of Impact WS-1 as follows:

The Landscaping and Irrigation Standards will affect the types and amounts of landscaping required, including requiring the use of drought-tolerant species and water efficient irrigation and landscaping practices.

Chapter 4, Alternatives

Page 4-6, the last bullet on the page is revised as follows:

- l Expand allowed uses in the agricultural and rural land zones (including forest resource and TPZ) to provide opportunities for agricultural support, recreation, and rural commerce.

Page 4-8, the first paragraph under Reason for Rejection is revised as follows:

Amending the General Plan’s biological resources policies would meet the objective of revising existing General Plan policies and land use designations to provide clarity. It would not, however meet any of the other objectives of the TGPA. In addition, the County Board of Supervisors has chosen to consider these revisions separately from the TGPA. ~~The County has hired a consultant to continue work on the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan beginning in spring 2014. In March 2014, the Board approved a 3-year contract with the consulting firm Dudek to undertake an update of the General Plan’s biological resource policies, including an in-lieu fee option Oak Resources Management Plan. The biological resources policies update is currently in progress.~~

Page 4-13 [Recirculated Draft EIR], revise the last sentence under Agriculture and Forestry Resources as follows:

Conversion of small areas of grazing lands would not result in a significant impact related to farmland. The impact of Alternative 2 would be less than significant, ~~similar to the project.~~

Page 4-13 [Recirculated Draft EIR], revise the first sentence under Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases as follows:

Alternative 2 would have the same impact as the project (Air Quality: significant and unavoidable; Greenhouse Gases: less than significant) because it proposes the same land uses.

Page 4-16 [Recirculated Draft EIR], revise Table 4.2 as follows:

Table 4-2. Project Components with Significant Impacts

Project Component	Significant Impact Area	Mitigation Measure, if any, and Significance After Mitigation ^a
Development on slopes of 30% or more (Policy 7.1.2.1, Ordinance section 17.30.060)	Aesthetics	BIO-1a: Limit the relaxation of hillside development standards SU
	Biological Resources	BIO-1a: Limit the relaxation of hillside development standards SU
	Land Use	BIO-1a: Limit the relaxation of hillside development standards SU
Infill development (Policy 2.4.1.5)	Biological Resources	NONE SU

Project Component	Significant Impact Area	Mitigation Measure, if any, and Significance After Mitigation ^a
Certain ranch marketing activities (Ordinance section 17.40.260) ^b	Aesthetics	AES-4: Revise proposed Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.34 and Section 17.40.170 (light shielding) LTS
	Agricultural Resources	AG-1a: Amend the ZOU to limit the size of proposed Health Resort and Retreat Centers LTS
	Biological Resources	BIO-1c: Limit music festivals and concerts Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Return Event Site to Pre-Event Condition SU
	Land Use	LU-5 4b : Revise Section 17.40.260, Ranch Marketing, prior to adoption LTS
	<u>Groundwater</u>	<u>None</u> <u>SU</u>
Home Occupations (Ordinance section 17.40.160.F) ^c	Land Use	TRA-2: Reduce the Proposed Number of Employees Allowed by Right at Home Occupations (<u>Table 17.40.160.2</u>) LU-5: Revise the Home Occupancy Provisions To Restrict The Use Of Hazardous Materials SU
	Traffic	TRA-2: Reduce the Proposed Number of Employees Allowed by Right at Home Occupations (<u>Table 17.40.160.2</u>) SU
	<u>Groundwater</u>	<u>None</u> <u>SU</u>
Agricultural and timber lodging activities (Ordinance section 17.40.170)	Aesthetics	AES-4: Revise proposed Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.34 and Section 17.40.170 (light shielding) SU
	Agricultural Resources	AG-1a: Amend the ZOU to limit the size of proposed Health Resort and Retreat Centers LTS
	Biological Resources	AG-1a: Amend the ZOU to limit the size of proposed Health Resort and Retreat Centers SU
	Land Use	None LTS
	<u>Groundwater</u>	<u>None</u> <u>SU</u>
Public utility service facilities, intensive, in some zones	Agricultural Resources	AG-1b: Amend the ZOU to limit Public Utility Service Facilities to minor facilities in the PA, AG, and RL zones LTS
	Biological Resources	None SU
	Land Use	None SU

Project Component	Significant Impact Area	Mitigation Measure, if any, and Significance After Mitigation ^a
	<u>Groundwater</u>	<u>None</u> <u>SU</u>
Industrial, general, in some zones	Aesthetics	AG-4: Amend proposed Table 17.21.020 to restrict incompatible uses from being located in the TPZ zone SU
	Agricultural Resources	AG-4: Amend proposed Table 17.21.020 to restrict incompatible uses from being located in the TPZ zone LTS
	Land Use	None SU
	<u>Groundwater</u>	<u>None</u> <u>SU</u>
Recreational facilities (Chapter 17.25)	Aesthetics	None SU
	Land Use	None SU
	<u>Groundwater</u>	<u>None</u> <u>SU</u>
Ski area	Agricultural Resources	AG-4: Amend proposed Table 17.21.020 to restrict incompatible uses from being located in the TPZ zone LTS
	Land Use	None SU
	<u>Groundwater</u>	<u>None</u> <u>SU</u>

Note: LTS = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable

^a The significance level reflects the greatest significance for the given impact area.

^b ~~In order for this alternative to meet the project objectives, these~~ These activities would be those requiring a CUP or that are of large scale such as special events and music festivals.

^c These activities would be those requiring a CUP.

Page 4-18 [Recirculated Draft EIR], revise Table 4.3 as follows to match the text of Section 4.5:

Table 4-3. Impacts of Project Alternatives

	Impact Category and Significance ^a											
	Aesthetics	Agricultural and Forestry Resources	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases ²	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	<u>Energy</u>	Land Use and Planning	Noise	Population and Housing	Transportation and Traffic	Water Supply	Cumulative
Project	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	<u>LTS</u>	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU
Alternative												
1. No-Project	SU	SU	SU	SU	LTS	<u>LTS</u>	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU
2. Transit Connection	SU	LTS	<u>Air Quality:</u> SU <u>GHG: LTS</u>	SU	SU	<u>LTS</u>	SU	SU	LTS	SU ^b	SU	SU
3. Selective Approval of TGPA/ZOU Components	SU	LTS	SU	SU	LTS	<u>LTS</u>	SU	SU	LTS SU	SU	SU	SU

^a SU = significant and unavoidable; LTS = less than significant; — = not applicable

^b Alternative 2 will reduce this impact below the level of the project, but not to a less-than-significant level.

Chapter 5, Other CEQA Considerations (Recirculated Partial Draft EIR)

Page 5-3, revise the second paragraph under Project Impacts as follows:

New Policy 2.5.2.1 would result in an increase in allowable development intensity, causing a likely overall minor increase in the potential for visual impact in comparison to the current General Plan. In addition, the ZOU includes new provisions that could allow ranch marketing, agricultural and timber resource lodging, and health resort and retreat centers in agricultural and forestry zones—types of development located on rural agricultural and forestry lands of the county that can have adverse effects on the character of the surrounding area. Implementation of the project would allow residential development on slopes of 30% or more, which has the potential to increase visual impacts because it would allow development on slopes that are unavailable for development under the current General Plan. Although the Outdoor Lighting Standards will restrain light spillage from new development, the extent of development anticipated under the TGPA/ZOU would make this a significant impact. The home occupation ordinance revisions (Section 17.40.160) would increase the potential to degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings by introducing visually incompatible uses. Cumulative visual impacts would, therefore, be more intense under the project than the 2004 General Plan.

Pages 5-11 and 5-13, revise the second, third, and fourth paragraphs under Project Impacts as follows:

The Cumulative Projects represent a major increase in the level of development west of Placerville that would generate traffic on U.S. Highway 50, White Rock Road, and other roads serving the Cumulative Projects. Although the County is under no obligation to approve any of these projects, particularly if it finds that they would result in unmitigated LOS F conditions on segments of U.S. Highway 50, for purposes of this analysis they are assumed to be built, and this analysis assumes their presence in the future². This Cumulative growth within the county will result in a substantial increase in traffic on segments of U.S. Highway 50, Cameron Park Drive, Missouri Flat Road, and South Shingle Road and on connecting roads. Table 5-2 highlights the roads that will exceed LOS E and F standards under cumulative conditions.

New residential, commercial, recreation, and public-utility oriented uses would lead to new trips from a variety of areas, including regional trips from workers in Sacramento commuting to new homes in western El Dorado County and local trips of new residents commuting to nearby services within El Dorado County. The Folsom South of Highway 50 project would be expected to generate even greater volumes of traffic, increasing current traffic levels on U.S. Highway 50 and White Rock Road. The future Southeast Connector project, expanding White Rock Road to link Elk Grove and El Dorado Hills with an expressway and the associated Latrobe Road connector, will take some of this project's traffic off of U.S. Highway 50 when it is completed, as will the Easton Valley Parkway, which will provide east-west circulation within ~~this~~that project. Cumulative impacts will nonetheless be significant on a number of road segments within the county. Table 5-3 illustrates the forecasted LOS under cumulative conditions.

² As mentioned earlier, this is in keeping with CEQA's approach to cumulative impact analysis and does not presuppose the County's approval of any of the Cumulative Projects located within the County.

Nonetheless, the Cumulative Projects are projected to result in significant cumulative impacts on U.S. Highway 50 and several major county roads. Together, the Cumulative Projects would cause a cumulatively significant impact on several segments of U.S. Highway 50 between its Ponderosa Road interchange and the Sacramento County line, and other roads within the county. In addition, traffic volumes are projected to be cumulatively significant on segments of Cameron Park Drive, El Dorado Hills Boulevard, Green Valley Road, Missouri Flat Road, Pleasant Valley Road, and South Shingle Road. The roadway segments exceeding the thresholds of significance under cumulative conditions are shown in Table 5-2.

The severity of the cumulative impacts on U.S. Highway 50, Cameron Park Drive, Missouri Flat Road, and South Shingle Road ~~and the county roads~~ are sufficient that even small projects would result in cumulatively considerable contributions. The project would contribute to this cumulatively significant impact. Similar to the conclusion reached in the 2004 General Plan EIR analysis, while mitigation measures would reduce El Dorado County's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts, the project's contribution would be considerable and cumulative regional traffic impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table 5-3. Cumulative Traffic Impacts

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class - Super Cumulative	SuperCumulative No Project				SuperCumulative Plus Project			
				Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
				AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
1	US50 - EB GP	w/o latrobe	2FA 3F	2,780 3,580	4,440 5,680	C	D E	2,790 3,580	4,450 5,710	C	D E
2	US50 - WB GP	w/o latrobe	3FA	3,260 4,670	2,790 4,060	B C	B C	3,250 4,640	2,760 4,030	B C	B C
3	US50 - EB HOV	w/o latrobe		800	1,240			790	1,260		
4	US50 - WB HOV	w/o latrobe		1,320	1,260			1,290	1,270		
	US50 - EB GP	W. of Silva Valley Pkwy	3FA	2,780	4,850	B	C	2,780	4,810	B	C
	US50 - WB GP	W. of Silva Valley Pkwy	3FA	3,610	3,200	B	B	3,600	3,190	B	B
	US50 - EB HOV (future)	W. of Silva Valley Pkwy		430	1,020			430	1,030		
	US50 - WB HOV (future)	W. of Silva Valley Pkwy		990	750			970	750		
5	US50 - EB GP	W. of Bass Lake	2FA	3,090	5,860	C	F	3,090	5,850	C	F
6	US50 - WB GP	W. of Bass Lake	2FA	3,320	3,050	C	C	3,370	3,020	C	C
7	US50 - EB HOV (future)	W. of Bass Lake		520	1,060			510	1,070		
8	US50 - WB HOV (future)	W. of Bass Lake		760	780			750	780		
	US50 - EB GP	W. of Cambridge Rd	2FA	1,860	3,520	B	C	1,870	3,510	B	C
	US50 - WB GP	W. of Cambridge Rd	2FA	2,090	2,410	B	B	2,110	2,390	B	B
	US50 - EB HOV (future)	W. of Cambridge Rd									
	US50 - WB HOV (future)	W. of Cambridge Rd		470	610			470	610		
9	US50 - EB GP	W. of Cameron Park	2FA	2,920	4,650	C	E	2,910	4,640	C	E

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class - Super Cumulative	SuperCumulative No Project				SuperCumulative Plus Project			
				Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
				AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
10	US50 - WB GP	W. of Cameron Park	2F	3,920	3,800	E	E			E	E
11	US50 - EB HOV (future)	W. of Cameron Park									
12	US50 - WB HOV (future)	W. of Cameron Park		640	750	-	-	630	750	-	-
13	US50 - EB GP	W. of Ponderosa	2FA	2,760	3,750	C	D	2,760	3,740	C	D
14	US50 - WB GP	W. of Ponderosa	2F	3,660	3,750	E	E	3,670	3,740	E	E
15	US50 - EB HOV (future)	W. of Ponderosa		470	660	-	-	460	670	-	-
16	US50 - WB HOV (future)	W. of Ponderosa		570	710	-	-	560	710	-	-
17	US50 - EB GP	W. of ShingleSprings	2F	2,200	3,310	C	D	2,200	3,310	C	D
18	US50 - WB GP	W. of ShingleSprings	2F	2,600	2,780	C	C	2,630	2,770	C	C
19	US50 - EB HOV (future)	W. of ShingleSprings		320	510	-	-	310	510	-	-
20	US50 - WB HOV (future)	W. of ShingleSprings		380	470	-	-	370	470	-	-
21	US50 - EB GP	W. of Greenstone	2F	2,000	2,780	B	C	2,000	2,780	B	C
22	US50 - WB GP	W. of Greenstone	2F	2,300	2,480	C	C	2,320	2,480	C	C
23	US50 - EB HOV (future)	W. of Greenstone		280	450	-	-	280	450	-	-
24	US50 - WB HOV (future)	W. of Greenstone		340	410	-	-	340	410	-	-
25	US50 - EB GP	Greenstone	2F	2,370	3,180	C	D	2,360	3,180	C	D
26	US50 - WB GP	Greenstone	2F	2,440	2,780	C	C	2,450	2,770	C	C
27	US50 - EB GP	Missouri Flat	2F	2,170	2,840	C	C	2,160	2,840	C	C
28	US50 - WB GP	Missouri Flat	2F	2,290	2,590	C	C	2,300	2,590	C	C
29	US50 - EB GP	W of Placerville	2F	1,660	2,540	B	C	1,660	2,520	B	C

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class - Super Cumulative	SuperCumulative No Project				SuperCumulative Plus Project			
				Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
				AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
30	US50 - WB GP	W of Placerville	2F	1,790	2,050	B	B	1,790	2,040	B	B
31	Cameron Park Dr	300 yds S of Hacienda Dr	4AD	1,650	2,120	C	D	1,650	2,110	C	D
32	Cameron Park Dr	200 ft N of Oxford Rd	2A	1,600	2,070	E	F	1,590	2,060	E	F
33	El Dorado Hills Bl	200 ft S of Saratoga Wy	6AD	2,620	3,370	C	D	2,670	3,340	C	D
34	El Dorado Hills Bl	100 ft S of Wilson Bl	4AD	2,970	2,950	D	D	2,970	2,950	D	D
35	El Dorado Hills Bl	100 ft S of Olson Ln	4AD	2,680	2,600	D	D	2,680	2,600	D	D
36	El Dorado Hills Bl	10 ft N of Olson Ln	4AD	2,360	2,120	D	D	2,350	2,120	D	D
37	El Dorado Hills Bl	100 ft N of Harvard Wy	4AD	1,550	2,060	C	D	1,540	2,060	C	D
38	El Dorado Hills Bl	300 ft S of Francisco Dr	2A	1,250	1,610	D	E	1,250	1,610	D	E
39	El Dorado Hills Bl	100 ft S of Green Vly Rd	2A	610	620	C	C	610	620	C	C
40	Francisco Dr	200 ft S of Green Valley Rd	2A	1,100	1,460	D	D	1,100	1,470	D	D
41	Green Valley Rd	200 ft W of Mormon Island Dr	4AD	1,890	2,870	D	D	1,890	2,870	D	D
42	Green Valley Rd	200 ft E of Mormon Island Dr	4AD	1,880	2,840	D	D	1,880	2,840	D	D
43	Green Valley Rd	200 ft E of Francisco Dr	4AD	1,550	2,500	C	D	1,550	2,500	C	D
44	Green Valley Rd	100 ft W of El Dorado Hills Blvd	4AU	1,550	2,500	C	D	1,550	2,500	C	D
45	Latrobe Rd	300 ft N of White Rock Rd	6AD	3,320	3,250	D	D	3,260	3,240	D	D
46	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft N of SR 49	2A	770	1,020	C	D	760	1,010	C	D
47	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of China Garden Rd	2A	1,160	1,640	D	E	1,150	1,630	D	E
48	Missouri Flat Rd	S of Forni Rd	4AD	2,030	2,690	D	D	2,040	2,690	D	D
49	Missouri Flat Rd	400 yds N of Forni Rd	4AD	2,970	4,010	D	F	2,980	3,990	D	F
50	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft S of Plaza Dr	4AD	1,790	2,590	C	D	1,790	2,580	C	D
51	Missouri Flat Rd	100 ft N of Plaza Dr	4AD	1,030	1,310	C	C	1,030	1,300	C	C
52	Missouri Flat Rd	300 ft S of El Dorado Rd	2A	820	1,090	C	D	820	1,090	C	D

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class - Super Cumulative	SuperCumulative No Project				SuperCumulative Plus Project			
				Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
				AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
53	North Shingle Rd	400 yds E of Ponderosa Rd	2A	900	1,190	D	D	890	1,190	D	D
54	North Shingle Rd	100 ft S of Green Valley Rd	W22	620	820	C	D	620	830	C	D
55	South Shingle Rd	100 ft S of Mother Lode Dr	2A	1,240	1,870	D	F	1,260	1,870	D	F
56	Cameron Park Dr	100 ft N of Robin Ln	2A	640	870	C	D	650	870	C	D
57	Cameron Park Dr	100 ft N of Coach Ln	4AD	2,410	3,780	D	F	2,420	3,760	D	F
58	Cameron Park Dr	200 yds N of Mira Loma Dr	2A	1,240	1,640	D	E	1,230	1,640	D	E
59	Cameron Park Dr	200 yds S of Green Valley Rd	2A	900	1,080	D	D	890	1,080	D	D
60	Country Club Dr	0.1 mi E of Merrychase Dr	2A	600	570	C	C	630	560	C	C
61	Durock Rd	50 ft S of Robin Ln	2A	840	1,130	C	D	840	1,130	C	D
	Latrobe Rd Connection	South of White Rock Road	4AD	1,830	1,900	C	D	1,850	1,900	C	D
62	Palmer Dr	100 ft E of Cameron Park Dr	2A	860	1,300	D	D	860	1,300	D	D
	Saratoga Way	West of El Dorado Hills Blvd	4AD	1,410	1,790	C	C	1,430	1,790	C	C
63	Serrano Pkwy	450 ft E of Silva Valley Pkwy	4AD	1,390	1,310	C	C	1,400	1,290	C	C
64	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft S of Serrano Pkwy	4AD	2,090	2,060	D	D	2,110	2,050	D	D
65	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft N of Serrano Pkwy	4AD	2,340	2,250	D	D	2,350	2,260	D	D
66	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft S of Harvard Wy	4AD	1,830	1,900	C	D	1,840	1,910	C	D
67	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft N of Harvard Wy	2A	1,520	1,450	D	D	1,520	1,450	D	D
68	Silva Valley Pkwy	100 ft S of Green Valley Rd	2A	900	1,070	D	D	900	1,060	D	D
69	Sophia Pkwy	200 ft S of Green Valley Rd	2A	430	740	C	C	440	730	C	C
70	White Rock Rd	100 ft E of Latrobe Rd	6AD	1,250	2,420	C	C	1,330	2,420	C	C
71	Barkley Rd	50 ft N of Carson Rd	2A	90	130	C	C	90	130	C	C
72	Bedford Av	At City Limits	2A	50	60	C	C	50	60	C	C

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class - Super Cumulative	SuperCumulative No Project				SuperCumulative Plus Project			
				Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
				AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
73	Big Cut Rd	100 ft N of Pleasant Vly Rd	W18	230	310	B	B	230	310	B	B
74	Bucks Bar Rd	50 ft S of Pleasant Vly Rd	W20	480	530	C	C	480	530	C	C
75	Bucks Bar Rd	300 ft N of Mt Aukum Rd	W18	400	430	C	C	400	430	C	C
76	China Garden Rd	150 ft N of SR 49	2A	120	150	C	C	120	150	C	C
77	China Garden Rd	200 yds E of Missouri Flat Rd	2A	90	250	C	C	110	290	C	C
78	El Dorado Rd	200 yds N of Pleasant Vly Rd	W22	370	440	B	C	380	450	C	C
79	Enterprise Dr	100 ft E of Forni Rd	2A	260	370	C	C	260	370	C	C
80	Fairplay Rd	100 ft S of Mt Aukum Rd	W20	190	230	B	B	190	230	B	B
81	Forebay Rd	100 ft N of Pony Express Tr	2A	150	220	C	C	150	220	C	C
82	Forni Rd	200 ft N of SR 49	2A	580	690	C	C	580	690	C	C
83	Forni Rd	300 ft W of Missouri Flat Rd	2A	530	910	C	D	520	910	C	D
84	Forni Rd	30 ft W of Arroyo Vista Wy	2A	120	200	C	C	130	200	C	C
85	Forni Rd	W of P-ville Dr @ City Limits	W20	250	260	B	B	250	260	B	B
86	French Creek Rd	300 ft S of Mother Lode Dr	2A	230	230	C	C	220	230	C	C
87	Garden Valley Rd	300 ft N of SR 193	W20	60	60	B	B	60	60	B	B
88	Garden Valley Rd	0.45 mi S of Marshall Rd	W20	150	130	B	B	150	130	B	B
89	Greenwood Rd	100 ft W of Marshall Rd	2A	130	180	C	C	130	180	C	C
90	Greenwood Rd	0.03 mi S of SR 193	2A	60	90	C	C	60	90	C	C
91	Harvard Wy	0.15 mi E of El Dorado Hills Bl	4AU	1,240	1,230	C	C	1,240	1,220	C	C
92	Harvard Wy	200 ft W of Silva Valley Pkwy	4AU	1,250	1,100	C	C	1,250	1,100	C	C

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class - Super Cumulative	SuperCumulative No Project				SuperCumulative Plus Project			
				Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
				AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
93	Icehouse Rd	300 ft N of US 50	2A	80	130	C	C	80	130	C	C
94	Lime Kiln Rd	100 ft E of China Garden Rd	2A	30	140	C	C	40	170	C	C
95	Meder Rd	300 ft E of Cameron Park Dr	W22	940	1,140	D	D	940	1,140	D	D
96	Meder Rd	200 yds W of Ponderosa Rd	W22	610	690	C	C	610	690	C	C
97	Mosquito Rd	300 ft S of Union Ridge Rd	2A	340	390	C	C	340	390	C	C
98	Mosquito Rd	At American River Br	W18	150	170	B	B	150	170	B	B
99	Newtown Rd	200 yds N of Pleasant Vly Rd	2A	290	340	C	C	290	340	C	C
100	Oak Hill Rd	300 ft S of Pleasant Vly Rd	2A	150	190	C	C	150	190	C	C
101	Patterson Dr	200 ft S of Pleasant Vly Rd	2A	460	630	C	C	480	650	C	C
102	Ponderosa Rd	100 ft N of Meder Rd	W20	150	150	B	B	140	150	B	B
103	Ponderosa Rd	100 ft S of Green Valley Rd	W20	110	110	B	B	110	110	B	B
104	Rock Creek Rd	100 ft E of SR 193	2A	20	20	C	C	20	20	C	C
105	Sand Ridge Rd	100 ft W of Bucks Bar Rd	2A	120	130	C	C	120	130	C	C
106	Serrano Pkwy	250 ft W of Silva Valley Pkwy	4AD	520	410	C	C	520	420	C	C
107	Sliger Mine Rd	50 ft N of SR 193	2A	60	90	C	C	60	90	C	C
108	Snows Rd	400 ft N of Newtown Rd	2A	100	120	C	C	100	120	C	C
109	Snows Rd	200 ft S of Carson Rd	2A	330	310	C	C	330	310	C	C
110	South Shingle Rd	0.5 mi E of Latrobe Rd	W18	200	210	B	B	200	200	B	B
111	South Shingle Rd	100 ft N of Barnett Ranch Rd	W20	270	350	B	B	270	350	B	B
112	Starbuck Rd	110 ft N of Green Valley Rd	2A	160	220	C	C	150	210	C	C
113	Union Ridge Rd	100 ft W of Hassler Rd	2A	80	90	C	C	80	90	C	C

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class - Super Cumulative	SuperCumulative No Project				SuperCumulative Plus Project			
				Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
				AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
114	Wentworth Springs Rd	100 ft W of Quintette Rd	2A	50	70	C	C	50	70	C	C
115	White Rock Rd	100 ft S of Silva Valley Pkwy	6AD	1,900	2,460	C	C	1,960	2,460	C	C
116	Bass Lake Rd	400 yd N of Country Club Dr	4AD	2,020	2,350	D	D	2,020	2,350	D	D
117	Bass Lake Rd	100 yd S of Green Vly Rd	2A	710	720	C	C	720	710	C	C
118	Bassi Rd	200 ft W of Lotus Rd	2A	90	120	C	C	90	120	C	C
119	Broadway	At City Limits	2A	380	460	C	C	380	460	C	C
120	Cambridge Rd	At US 50 OC	4AD	1,780	2,270	C	D	1,790	2,270	C	D
121	Cambridge Rd	300 ft S of Country Club Dr.	2A	640	990	C	D	620	990	C	D
122	Cambridge Rd	100 ft N of Country Club Dr	2A	890	1,270	D	D	900	1,260	D	D
123	Cambridge Rd	300 yds N of Oxford Rd	2A	530	820	C	C	540	830	C	C
124	Cambridge Rd	300 ft S of Green Valley Rd	2A	720	930	C	D	730	930	C	D
125	Carson Rd	0.6 Mi E of City Limits	2A	200	290	C	C	210	300	C	C
126	Carson Rd	300 yds E of Gatlin Rd	2A	110	170	C	C	110	170	C	C
127	Carson Rd	At Carson Ct	2A	110	210	C	C	110	210	C	C
128	Carson Rd	100 ft W of Barkley Rd	2A	310	440	C	C	310	440	C	C
129	Carson Rd	100 ft E of Ponderosa Wy	2A	180	230	C	C	180	230	C	C
130	Cedar Ravine Rd	0.1 Mi N of Pleasant Vly Rd	2A	340	400	C	C	340	400	C	C
131	Cedar Ravine Rd	0.25 Mi S of Country Club Dr	2A	360	400	C	C	360	400	C	C
132	Cold Springs Rd	At City Limits	2A	410	510	C	C	410	510	C	C
133	Cold Springs Rd	300 yds S of Gold Hill Rd	2A	250	380	C	C	250	370	C	C
134	Cold Springs Rd	100 ft S of SR 153	2A	180	270	C	C	180	260	C	C

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class - Super Cumulative	SuperCumulative No Project				SuperCumulative Plus Project			
				Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
				AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	Country Club Dr	West of Bass Lake Road	2A	970	980	D	D	950	970	D	D
135	Country Club Dr	0.4 mi E of Bass Lake Rd	2A	890	950	D	D	900	940	D	D
136	Country Club Dr	0.15 mi W of Knollwood Dr	2A	970	820	D	C	1,010	810	D	C
137	Country Club Dr	300 yds E of Cambridge Rd	2A	210	290	C	C	220	280	C	C
138	Country Club Dr	0.2 mi W of Cameron Park Dr	2A	210	390	C	C	220	380	C	C
139	Durock Rd	50 ft W of S Shingle Rd	2A	810	1,100	C	D	810	1,100	C	D
140	El Dorado Rd	0.2 mi S of US 50	2A	640	810	C	C	640	820	C	C
141	El Dorado Rd	0.11 N of US 50	2A	420	630	C	C	420	630	C	C
142	El Dorado Rd	50 ft N of Missouri Flat Rd	2A	250	430	C	C	250	440	C	C
143	Francisco Dr	200 ft N of Green Valley Rd	4AD	1,160	1,670	C	C	1,170	1,680	C	C
144	Francisco Dr	100 ft S of Sheffield Dr	2A	190	230	C	C	190	230	C	C
145	Francisco Dr	300 yds N of Sheffield Dr	2A	90	110	C	C	90	110	C	C
146	Gold Hill Rd	100 ft E of Lotus Rd	2A	280	210	C	C	280	210	C	C
147	Gold Hill Rd	200 ft W of Cold Springs Rd	2A	270	210	C	C	270	210	C	C
148	Gold Hill Rd	100 yds E of Cold Springs Rd	2A	70	70	C	C	80	70	C	C
149	Green Valley Rd	200 ft W of Sophia Pkwy	4AU	1,710	2,200	C	D	1,710	2,200	C	D
150	Green Valley Rd	200 ft E of Sophia Pkwy	4AU	1,740	2,750	C	D	1,750	2,750	C	D
151	Green Valley Rd	200 ft E of County Line	4AU	1,710	2,200	C	D	1,710	2,200	C	D
152	Green Valley Rd	300 ft W of Silva Valley Pkwy	4AU	1,750	2,100	C	D	1,750	2,070	C	D
153	Green Valley Rd	200 ft W of Bass Lake Rd	2A	1,420	1,320	D	D	1,410	1,320	D	D
154	Green Valley Rd	300 ft W of Cameron Park Dr	2A	1,400	1,570	D	E	1,400	1,570	D	E

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class - Super Cumulative	SuperCumulative No Project				SuperCumulative Plus Project			
				Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
				AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
155	Green Valley Rd	300 ft E of La Crescenta Dr	2A	870	960	D	D	870	960	D	D
156	Green Valley Rd	500 ft E of Deer Valley Rd (E)	2A	440	560	C	C	450	550	C	C
157	Green Valley Rd	300 ft W of Lotus Rd	2A	930	1,160	D	D	930	1,160	D	D
158	Green Valley Rd	100 ft W of Greenstone Rd	2A	500	660	C	C	500	660	C	C
159	Green Valley Rd	400 ft W of Campus Dr	2A	520	710	C	C	520	710	C	C
160	Green Valley Rd	200 ft W of Missouri Flat Rd	2A	870	1,050	D	D	870	1,050	D	D
161	Green Valley Rd	100 ft W of Weber Creek Br	2A	270	470	C	C	270	480	C	C
162	Greenstone Rd	300 ft N of Mother Lode Dr	2A	160	210	C	C	160	210	C	C
163	Greenstone Rd	0.20 mi N of US 50	2A	400	540	C	C	390	540	C	C
164	Grizzly Flat Rd	200 yds E of Mt Aukum Rd	2A	210	260	C	C	210	260	C	C
165	Lake Hills Dr	100 ft N of Salmon Falls Rd	2A	290	310	C	C	280	320	C	C
166	Latrobe Rd	250 ft N of County Line	2A	730	820	C	C	730	820	C	C
167	Latrobe Rd	1.5 mi N of S Shingle Rd	2A	740	830	C	C	740	830	C	C
168	Latrobe Rd	At Deer Creek Bridge	2A	820	910	C	D	820	910	C	D
169	Latrobe Rd	100 ft S of Investment Bl	2A	920	1,000	D	D	920	1,000	D	D
170	Latrobe Rd	100 ft N of Investment Bl	4AD	1,190	1,250	C	C	1,170	1,310	C	C
171	Latrobe Rd	100 ft N of Golden Foothill Pw	6AD	2,470	2,550	C	C	2,440	2,530	C	C
172	Lotus Rd	300 ft N of Green Valley Rd	2A	1,000	1,300	D	D	1,000	1,300	D	D
173	Lotus Rd	300 ft S of Thompson Hill Rd	2A	500	710	C	C	500	710	C	C
174	Lotus Rd	0.25 mi S of SR 49	2A	450	730	C	C	450	730	C	C
175	Luneman Rd	100 ft W of Lotus Rd	2A	300	240	C	C	300	240	C	C
176	Marshall Rd	200 yds E of SR 49	2A	350	430	C	C	350	430	C	C

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class - Super Cumulative	SuperCumulative No Project				SuperCumulative Plus Project			
				Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
				AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
177	Marshall Rd	300 ft E of Garden Valley Rd	2A	540	520	C	C	540	520	C	C
178	Marshall Rd	300 yds S of Lower Main St	2A	90	120	C	C	90	120	C	C
179	Missouri Flat Rd	300 ft N of El Dorado Rd	2A	830	870	C	D	830	870	C	D
180	Mormon Emigrant Tr	100 ft E of Sly Park Rd	2A	130	190	C	C	130	190	C	C
181	Mosquito Rd	At City Limits	2A	520	650	C	C	520	650	C	C
182	Mother Lode Dr	200 ft W of Sunset Ln	2A	1,280	1,460	D	D	1,260	1,450	D	D
183	Mother Lode Dr	400 yds W of Pleasant Valley Rd	2A	1,050	1,380	D	D	1,060	1,390	D	D
184	Mother Lode Dr	0.43 mi E of Pleasant Valley Rd	2A	360	500	C	C	360	500	C	C
185	Mt Aukum Rd	0.25 mi N of County Line	2A	130	170	C	C	130	170	C	C
186	Mt Aukum Rd	300 ft S of Bucks Bar Rd	2A	390	430	C	C	390	430	C	C
187	Mt Aukum Rd	300 ft S of Pleasant Vly Rd	2A	270	380	C	C	270	380	C	C
188	Mt Murphy Rd	50 ft S of Marshall Rd	2A	130	160	C	C	130	160	C	C
189	Mt Murphy Rd	200 yds N of SR 49	2A	80	120	C	C	80	120	C	C
190	Newtown Rd	200 yds N of Pioneer Hill Rd	2A	220	280	C	C	220	280	C	C
191	Newtown Rd	100 ft E of Broadway	2A	310	390	C	C	310	390	C	C
192	Old Frenchtown Rd	400 yds S of Mother Lode Dr	2A	190	230	C	C	190	230	C	C
193	Omo Ranch Rd	100 ft E of Mt Aukum Rd	2A	70	90	C	C	70	90	C	C
194	Oxford Rd	50 ft E of Salida Wy	2A	820	1,150	C	D	820	1,150	C	D
195	Pleasant Valley Rd	200 yds E of Mother Lode Dr	2A	790	1,030	C	D	800	1,040	C	D
196	Pleasant Valley Rd	200 yds E of SR 49 (E)	2A	1,270	1,620	D	E	1,280	1,620	D	E

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class - Super Cumulative	SuperCumulative No Project				SuperCumulative Plus Project			
				Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
				AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
197	Pleasant Valley Rd	300 ft W of Oak Hill Rd	2A	970	1,150	D	D	970	1,150	D	D
198	Pleasant Valley Rd	100 ft E of Cedar Ravine Rd	2A	1,080	1,180	D	D	1,080	1,180	D	D
199	Pleasant Valley Rd	0.10 mi E of Bucks Bar Rd	2A	710	660	C	C	710	660	C	C
200	Pleasant Valley Rd	0.40 mi E of Newtown Rd	2A	510	600	C	C	510	600	C	C
201	Ponderosa Rd	300 ft N of Wild Chaparral Dr	2A	920	870	D	D	920	870	D	D
202	Pony Express Tr	200 yds E of Carson Rd	2A	200	310	C	C	200	310	C	C
203	Pony Express Tr	300 ft E of Gilmore Rd	2A	340	530	C	C	340	530	C	C
204	Pony Express Tr	300 ft W of Forebay Rd	2A	380	570	C	C	380	570	C	C
205	Salmon Falls Rd	50 ft S of Malcolm-Dixon Rd	2A	660	700	C	C	660	700	C	C
206	Salmon Falls Rd	At New York Creek Bridge	2A	340	390	C	C	340	390	C	C
207	Salmon Falls Rd	400 yds S of Pedro Hill Rd	2A	220	290	C	C	220	290	C	C
208	Salmon Falls Rd	200 yds S of Rattlesnake Bar Rd	2A	140	170	C	C	140	170	C	C
209	Sand Ridge Rd	300 ft E of SR 49	2A	110	110	C	C	110	110	C	C
210	Serrano Pkwy	300 ft W of Bass Lake Rd	4AD	950	910	C	C	960	900	C	C
211	Shingle Springs Dr	0.20 mi S of US 50	2A	910	1,170	D	D	910	1,170	D	D
212	Sly Park Rd	0.35 mi E of Mt Aukum Rd	2A	300	370	C	C	300	370	C	C
213	Sly Park Rd	1.62 mi W of Mormon Emigrant Tr	W18	200	260	B	B	200	260	B	B
214	Sly Park Rd	0.35 mi E of Mormon Emigrant Tr	2A	370	480	C	C	370	480	C	C
215	Sly Park Rd	100 ft S of Gold Ridge Tr (N)	2A	440	500	C	C	440	500	C	C
216	Sly Park Rd	100 ft S of Pony Express Tr	2A	650	820	C	C	650	820	C	C

ID	Roadway	Segment	Class - Super Cumulative	SuperCumulative No Project				SuperCumulative Plus Project			
				Volume		2010 Method LOS		Volume		2010 Method LOS	
				AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
217	South Shingle Rd	100 ft S of Sunset Ln	W20	650	900	C	D	660	900	C	D
218	SR49	North of China Hill	2A	630	780	C	C	630	780	C	C
219	SR49	West of Missouri Flat Rd	2A	950	1,030	D	D	960	1,040	D	D
220	SR49	West of Hastings Creed Rd	2A	390	510	C	C	390	510	C	C
221	SR49	At the Placer County Line	2A	860	1,070	D	D	860	1,070	D	D
222	SR 193	West of American River Road	2A	570	740	C	C	570	740	C	C
223	SR 193	North of SR 49 in Placerville	2A	210	230	C	C	210	230	C	C
224	Union Mine Rd	200 yds S of SR 49	2A	320	190	C	C	320	190	C	C
225	Wentworth Springs Rd	0.7 mi E of Main St	2A	190	260	C	C	190	260	C	C
226	White Rock Rd	At County Line	4AD	1,410	2,570	C	D	1,460	2,580	C	D
227	White Rock Rd	100 ft W of Latrobe Rd	4AD	1,490	2,480	C	D	1,530	2,500	C	D

Page 5-27, revise the discussion under 5.1.11 Water Supply as follows:

Surface Water

The availability of domestic water to serve future development has been a concern in El Dorado County for decades. Most of this concern has been focused on the fastest growing areas of the County, particularly those served by EID. These are the areas in which the lands with most of the potential for future development under the General Plan are located. The 2004 General Plan EIR identified water supply impacts as a significant, unavoidable impact of future development pursuant to the General Plan. That continues to be the case within the Georgetown Divide PUD and Grizzly Flats CSD during the planning period to 2035. However, that is no longer the case within EID during that time frame, based on EID's forecasts of supplies that will be available to meet the demand created by future development under the existing General Plan. Beyond 2035, all three water districts will lack the supplies to meet forecasted demand. (El Dorado County Water Agency 2014)

California is in its ~~third~~^{fourth} year of drought. As discussed in Chapter 3.10, *Water Supply*, the county's water supply districts have adopted contingency plans for dry years, which result in substantial reductions in water use and extend available supplies.

The EID Board of Directors approved Water Supply Assessments (WSAs) for Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, Dixon Ranch Development, Lime Rock Valley Specific Plan, and Village of Marble Valley Specific Plan on August 26, 2013. Consistent with the requirements of SB 610 (California Water Code Section 10910), the WSAs examine the water agency's capacity to supply these developments with water in normal and dry years, considering foreseeable future development within its service area, over a 20-year period. The period covers anticipated water demands through 2035. These WSAs constitute a cumulative impact analysis of EID's water supply taking into account both the development proposed under the General Plan and estimated demand of these four large-scale proposed projects. As of this writing, no WSA has been prepared for the San Stino project, so, although that project would contribute to cumulative water supply impacts, that impact has not been quantified. EID serves two parcels (Sacramento County APNs 072-0070-001 and 072-270-028) totally approximately 174.3 acres in the~~The Folsom South of Highway 50 area. The future demand related to that service is included in the WSAs and EID's UWMP and IWRMP. is not dependent upon water from El Dorado County and therefore is not a contributor to~~ The demand attributable to the small area in Folsom that is served by EID has therefore been included in the examination of cumulative impacts on water supply.

~~The WSAs assessment also serves as the~~ and the El Dorado County Water Agency's 2014 Water Resources Development and Management Plan, West Slope Update (2014 Update) are the main documents on which the cumulative impact analysis of ~~the water supply on which the project (i.e., TGPA and ZOU) proposal will depend.~~ As noted elsewhere, the project does not include substantial changes in the land use intensity or extent described in the 2004 General Plan. Therefore, its contribution to total water demand is essentially the same as that projected in the 2004 General Plan. EID based its total water demand calculations in the WSAs on development planned under the 2004 General Plan, projected growth rate (estimated to be somewhat higher than the county's accepted rate), and the specific demands of the four proposed projects. The projections of the proposed sites' water demands under the existing 2004 General Plan designations were subtracted from the total cumulative water demand to avoid double-counting the water demand from the four

proposed sites. The El Dorado County Water Agency employed somewhat different assumptions in its 2014 Update.

Table 5-4 summarizes the total water cumulative demand and supply within EID to the year 2035, taken from EID's WSAs. EID has calculated demand based on its most recent baseline for annual customer use, considering water conservation efforts (assumed to reduce existing customer demand 2% by 2020 and an additional 1% by 2035), and with an additional 13% demand added to account for estimated system losses. This methodology and base data is somewhat different than what EID has used for overall demand and supply estimates in its UWMP and IWRMP. As a result, the supply estimate in Table 5-4 differs somewhat from that in Table 3.10-2 in ~~the preceding water chapter~~ Chapter 3.10.

The total water supply projection for 2035 has been based on EID's secured water assets and planned water assets. There are two planned water supplies that will be available from the El Dorado County Water Agency: 30,000 AFY under the El Dorado-SMUD Cooperation agreement and 7,500 AFY of water from Folsom Reservoir under PL-101-514 ("Fazio water"). The former supply is expected in 2025, the latter supply will be available in 2015. The total water supply also includes recycled water from EID's treatment plants. Recycling will provide 2,400 AFY in 2015 and is expected to provide 5,600 AFY by 2035 (El Dorado Irrigation District 2013a).

[No change to Table 5-4]

As discussed in the staff report for Action Item No. 8 at the EID Board's August 26, 2013 meeting, EID anticipates that it will have sufficient water to support anticipated growth, including four of the five proposed projects, through 2035, including during multiple dry years. The estimated water demand of each of these four cumulative projects is described in Table 5-5. The annual water demand estimates for the cumulative projects are based on the anticipated demands of their component parts and their estimated rate of buildout to 2035. Table 5-1 illustrates that these projects vary in size, mix of residential densities, and types of other uses.

The WSAs' conclusion that there will not be a significant cumulative impact on water supply does not include the demand for the San Stino project and no WSA has been prepared for that cumulative project. However, the San Stino project, consisting of 1,041 residential units, would be expected to have a water demand similar to that of Dixon Ranch (proposing 605 residential units and two parks) at 482 AFY in 2035; Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (proposing 1,028 residential units and 11 acres of commercial development) at 450 AFY in 2035; and Lime Rock Valley Specific Plan (800 residential units and a park) at 472 AFY in 2035. Using a conservative estimate of 500 AFY for San Stino, the cumulative impacts of these five projects would not result in a supply shortfall by 2035 even in a third dry-year scenario. ~~Therefore, because sufficient water is expected to be available to meet future demand within EID's service area to the year 2035, the project (i.e., the TGPA/ZOU) will not make a considerable contribution to the cumulative effect on water supply within EID's service area during that time frame.~~

The El Dorado Hills Apartments project (a 250-unit apartment complex) located in the El Dorado Town Center was approved in late 2014. It would be served water by EID. The El Dorado Hills Apartments project is currently in litigation over its CEQA analysis. Although that litigation is not resolved, the following assumes that the project is reasonably foreseeable to occur in order to meet CEQA's requirements for cumulative impact analysis.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the El Dorado Hills Apartments project states that the project would require 191.50 equivalent dwelling unit of water supply, or approximately 106 acre-feet/year (AFY) based on information from EID. Table 5-2 of the TGPA/ZOU EIR describes the short and long-term (to 2035) water supply available from EID. Table 5-3 describes the water demands of the four cumulative projects for which WSAs have been prepared. Subtracting the demands of those and the San Stino project's estimated demand (500 AFY), EID would have a surplus of 42,495 AFY in normal, 6,725 AFY in first dry year, and 11,904 AFY in third dry year scenarios, respectively. Subtract the estimated El Dorado Hills Apartments project demand of 109 AFY, and EID would still have sufficient supplies for its service area under all three future scenarios to the year 2035.

However, as discussed in Chapter 3.10, *Water Supply*, EDCWA's *Water Resource Development and Management Plan 2014 Update* indicates that there will be insufficient water supplies to serve anticipated demand within EID, GDPUD, and GFCSD after 2035.

[No change is made to Table 5-5]

~~The contribution of the project to impacts on surface water supply is considerable outside of the EID service area before 2035, where future water supply availability is more tenuous and dry-year shortages are predicted. The contribution is considerable within all West Slope water districts, including EID, after 2035 when future water supply availability is expected to fall short of demand. The El Dorado County Water Agency's 2014 Update takes a longer view of water supply availability and demand within western El Dorado County, particularly in the EID service area. As discussed in Chapter 3.10, *Water Supply*, the 2014 Update concludes that future development on the West Slope under the General Plan will have a significant and unavoidable impact on water supplies in EID after 2035. GDPUD and GFCSD will similarly be subject to significant and unavoidable impacts due to insufficient supply to meet customer demand. The project will therefore make a considerable contribution to water demand in excess of forecasted supplies within the Georgetown Divide PUD and Grizzly Flats CSD service areas during the planning period to 2035, and within EID after 2035.~~

Groundwater

Future development under the TGPA/ZOU will place greater demands on groundwater supplies in those parts of the West Slope that are not served by public water agencies. As discussed in Chapter 3.10, *Water Supply*, El Dorado County's West Slope lacks cohesive groundwater basins and is instead underlain by fractured rock that supports aquifers of varying size, depth, and dependability. The project's impact on groundwater is significant and unavoidable. At the program EIR level, impacts on groundwater are cumulative in nature because they are based on the ability of groundwater supplies within the county to meet expected future demand.

El Dorado County is underlain by fractured rock groundwater aquifers that do not provide reliable water supplies. Because the aquifers are fractured, the availability and reliability of groundwater supplies vary from place to place, depending upon the underlying geology, size and accessibility of the aquifer, and the source and dependability of recharge. Impacts tend to be localized and accurately predicting how groundwater withdrawals at a particular location may affect surrounding areas is difficult if not impossible at the scale of a program EIR because of underlying aquifers have not been mapped nor is their capacity known. Clearly, as development continues under the 2004 General Plan, as amended by the TGPA and implemented by the ZOU, groundwater resources will be subject to increasing demand.

The TGPA would not substantially increase the overall level of development analyzed in the 2004 General Plan EIR. 2004 General Plan EIR Table 5.5-13 (Potential Groundwater Demand Increases in West Slope Areas Not Served by Public Water Purveyors) provides a gross estimate of the demands on groundwater resulting from future development under the alternatives examined at that time. Although the adopted General Plan does not precisely correspond to any of those alternatives (as adopted, the General Plan combines policies from more than one alternative), quite clearly future demand on groundwater will increase substantially as new development occurs. Table 5.5-13 estimated that under build-out conditions groundwater demand would increase by at least 39,413 acre-feet per year (Environmentally Constrained Alternative) and as much as 45,015 acre-feet per year (Roadway Constrained 6-Lane "Plus" Alternative). These totals included the estimated agricultural demand.

To put these amounts of water into perspective, over a 10-year period between 1997 and 2006, the yearly per capita water use within EID averaged 102,565 gallons. (El Dorado Irrigation District 2011) Based on the 2010 U.S. Census finding that the average household in El Dorado County contains 2.55 individuals, this would translate to about 0.80 acre-feet per household per year.

The County does not have a method in accurately estimating the available volume of groundwater in the fractured aquifers. Nor is there an accurate method by which to determine the point at which withdrawals may exceed the ability for sufficient recharge to support existing land uses or future uses that may be allowed under the provisions of the ZOU. The water levels in water wells within the county are not routinely tested, are not reported to the County, and there is no comprehensive database on groundwater levels. Although El Dorado County Policy 800-02 regulates the installation of wells and limits well permits when sufficient water flow is not available, this does not take into account cumulative demands on a given aquifer. Therefore, no estimates of groundwater supplies in normal and dry years are available for any of the many aquifers in the county.

Groundwater resources and future demand under the General Plan, as revised by the TGPA and implemented by the ZOU, do not need to be quantified in order to conclude that future development will result in a significant cumulative effect on groundwater supplies.

As discussed in Section 3.10, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

It is reasonably foreseeable that there will also be an adverse impact on groundwater supplies from an expansion of agricultural plantings and of development under the General Plan. This will be compounded by components of the ZOU such as ranch marketing, rural industrial, and home occupations that can intensify very localized water demands in rural areas where groundwater is the sole source of water. Although the County's General Plan policies, individual project review through the conditional use permit process, and the County's water well ordinance all act to reduce the potential to approve development that will generate demand in excess of groundwater supplies, these policies and regulations would allow incremental increases in the number of wells and water demand on the county's fractured aquifers without accounting for total available water supply in the affected aquifers and their ability to meet cumulative demands in dry and multiple dry years. The TGPA/ZOU will therefore make a considerable contribution to this significant impact.

Page 5-30, insert the following after the fourth paragraph:

Independent from the TGPA/ZOU, SACOG is updating its employment and housing projections for use in the 2016 MTP/SCS. SACOG's February 2015 review of the County's housing and employment

projections found the County and SACOG projections are very similar at the traffic analysis zone level. (Sacramento Area Council of Governments 2015) SACOG has advised the County that the SACOG projection is different from the County's growth estimates because the General Plan and MTP/SCS service different purposes, and that differences in the growth forecasts do not mean that the two plans are not in alignment with each other.

Chapter 6, Preparers/Persons and Organizations Consulted

Under ICF International add: Paul Shigley, Technical Editor

Chapter 7, References Cited

The following are additional references not already included in either the Draft EIR or the partial recirculated Draft EIR.

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. 2008. *CEQA & Climate Change, Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Project Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act*. January.

California Independent System Operator. 2015. *2014-2015 Transmission Plan*. Roseville, CA. March 26.

_____. 2014. *2015 Local Capacity Technical Analysis*. Roseville, CA. April 30.

California Planning Roundtable and California Housing and Community Development Department. 2002. *Myths and Facts About Affordable and High Density Housing*. Sacramento, CA.

Cervero, Robert. 1996. "Jobs-Housing Balance Revisited: Trends and Impacts in the San Francisco Bay Area." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 62, Issue 4.

El Dorado County Transportation Commission. 2014. *Western El Dorado County Short- and Long-Range Transit Plan*. Final Report. Placerville, CA. July 11.

National Main Street Center. 2011. "What Retailers Want." From *Main Street Story of the Week*. July 20. Available at: <http://www.preservationnation.org/main-street/special-content/what-retailers-want.html>. Accessed: March 11, 2015.

Pacific Gas and Electric. 2015. "Notification Stages Chart." Available: <http://www.pge.com/myhome/customerservice/energystatus/notification/index.shtml>. Accessed: April 13, 2015.

SACOG. 2015. "mtp/scs 2016 update coordination." E-mail from Jennifer Hargrove to Shawna Purvines. February 13.

Baughman, Adam. Air Quality Engineer. El Dorado County Air Quality Management District, Placerville, CA. May 23, 2014—email message to Laura Yoon, ICF International.

Huss, Karen. Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, Sacramento, CA. April 9, 2014—email message to Laura Yoon, ICF International.