

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) has determined that a program-level Environmental Impact Report (EIR) should be prepared for the El Dorado County 2025 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). A program-level EIR is described in State CEQA Guidelines § 15168 as an EIR that examines the environmental impacts of a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either: (1) geographically, (2) as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions, (3) in connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program, or (4) as individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways.

The EDCTC has sought the assistance of Quad Knopf, Inc. to evaluate the environmental effects of the RTP and to present the results in a program-level EIR. This program-level EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) statutes and guidelines and is an informational document intended to inform public-decision-makers, responsible or interested agencies and the general public of the potential environmental effects of the proposed project, and where applicable, mitigation measures that can be implemented to reduce or avoid the potential adverse environmental effects. While CEQA requires that major consideration be given to avoiding adverse environmental effects, the lead agency and other responsible public agencies must balance adverse environmental effects against other public objectives, including the economic and social benefits of a proposed project, in determining whether a proposed project should be approved.

Project Description

The proposed project is the adoption and implementation of the El Dorado County RTP. The RTP has been prepared to fulfill the state requirements of AB 402 (Government Code Title 7, Chapter 2.5, Sections 65080-65082) using specific guidance from the California Transportation Commission Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines (revised December 2003). More specifically, the RTP is a blueprint for the systematic development of a balanced, comprehensive, multi-modal transportation system, including but not limited to: roadways, transit, aviation, goods movement, bikeways, pedestrian facilities, transportation systems management and intelligent transportation systems. The RTP is action-oriented and pragmatic, considering both the short-term (five to ten year) and long-term (ten to twenty year) periods. Additionally, The RTP focuses on those improvement projects that currently have funding in place or that are projected to have funding in the future, while it also identifies other improvement projects that are needed but do not have funding.

The Draft RTP is available for review at the EDCTC website (www.edctc.org). Chapters 1 through 5 of the RTP comprise the Policy Element of the RTP, which develops the process for implementing the short-term and long-term transportation strategies. Chapters 6 through 12 comprise the Action Element, which identifies the multi-modal projects which implement the RTP in accordance with the goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the Policy Element. The Action Plan is organized by transportation modes including roadway, transit, aviation, goods movement, non-motorized transportation, transportation systems management, and intelligent transportation systems. Chapter 13 is the Financial Element which summarizes the cost of implementing the projects in the RTP within a financially constrained environment. Chapter 14 is the Air Quality Conformity discussion and Chapter 15 introduces this Environmental Document.

Potential Areas of Controversy and Issues to Be Resolved

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123 (a) (2), this program-level EIR acknowledges the areas of controversy and issues to be resolved which are known to the EDCTC or were raised during the scoping process. No comment letters were received from agencies or the public during the NOP public review period.

Alternatives of the Project

Section 15126.6 of the state CEQA Guidelines requires the EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or to the location of the project which would reduce or avoid significant impacts, and which could feasibly accomplish the basic objectives of the proposed project. Since the primary objective of the RTP is to guide short- and long-term transportation improvements countywide, a discussion of alternative sites is not appropriate. The following four alternatives were selected for analysis in the alternatives section of this EIR. Each alternative is briefly described below and a summary comparison of the alternatives is then provided.

- Alternative 1: Fiscally Constrained Alternative (Short-term and Long-term Funded Projects)
- Alternative 2: No Project Alternative (SACOG 1999 MTP)
- Alternative 3: Fiscally Unconstrained Alternative (Funded and Unfunded Projects)
- Alternative 4: Transit/Travel Demand Management Alternative

FISCALLY CONSTRAINED ALTERNATIVE

The fiscally constrained alternative includes the list of short-term and long-term multi-modal projects with funding as identified in the 2025 RTP. It is assumed that these funded projects will be implemented, and those that do not have funding will not be implemented even though they may be needed. The projects included in this scenario have the highest funding priorities, because it has been determined that they are the most immediately important projects to help achieve the regional transportation goals identified in the 2025 RTP. Other factors considered in developing this list of fiscally constrained projects include the identification of likely funding sources, project feasibility, and environmental considerations.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

According to State CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(e)(3)(A), the “No Project Alternative” for a project, which is a “revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy or ongoing operation,” should analyze the scenario in which there is a “continuation of the existing plan, policy or operation into the future.”

Transportation planning in El Dorado County and the City of Placerville is currently operating under the SACOG 1999 MTP, which guides transportation planning in the Counties of Sacramento, Yolo, Sutter, Yuba, Placer, and the western slope of El Dorado. An interim MTP was adopted by SACOG in October 2004 and a comprehensive update is currently underway with completion estimated in 2005. However, the County of El Dorado is currently operating under the 1999 MTP, which is considered the no project alternative for this EIR.

FISCALLY UNCONSTRAINED ALTERNATIVE

The El Dorado County region will not have the necessary funds to implement all of the transportation projects that are needed during the twenty-year horizon of this RTP. The most significant funding shortfall has been identified for major state highway improvements, including rehabilitation, maintenance and operations needs of the existing system. Additional revenues are also needed to implement the projects associated with other modes of transportation including: transit, aviation, goods movement, non-motorized, and other transportation system improvements. The “Fiscally Unconstrained Alternative” assumes that every improvement project identified in the RTP (projects that are funded and unfunded) will be implemented regardless of funding availability or level of priority. Table 4-2 and Table 4-3 located in Chapter 4 of this EIR summarizes the fiscally unconstrained projects.

TRANSIT/TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVE

This alternative assumes that funding will be given to those projects that will maintain, improve and expand public transit systems and other alternative modes of transportation such as carpooling. This alternative is intended to promote the use of transit and other alternative modes of transportation to manage the anticipated increase in population and associated transportation needs. In addition, this alternative would inhibit the expansion and construction of new roadway capacity improvements and would cost substantially less than the fiscally constrained alternative and would have fewer significant adverse environmental impacts. This alternative would not be expected to achieve all of the project goals and objectives because public transit and other transportation alternatives may not be able to manage all of the projected transportation needs. Table 4-5 located in Chapter 4 of this EIR summarizes the Transit/TDM projects.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an evaluation of the comparative merits of the alternatives. Alternatives that would reduce or avoid significant impacts represent an environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project. Table S-1 provides a summary of the relative impact level of significance (high, medium, low, or beneficial) of each environmental impact for each alternative. The alternatives that would require a larger number of improvements are considered more likely to have adverse environmental impacts that are characterized as high, medium, or low. Certain projects would result in reduced environmental impacts, and thus are characterized as beneficial. A full analysis of each environmental topic for each alternative is included in Chapter 4 of this EIR.

The “Transit/Travel Demand Management” alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because the impact level of significance is either low or beneficial on five of the impact topics that are analyzed. The “Fiscally Unconstrained” alternative is the second best alternative, with low impacts on three of the impact topics.

**Table S-1
Comparison Summary of Alternatives**

Issue	Fiscally Constrained Alternative (List of short- and long-term projects)	No Project Alternative – (SACOG 1999 MTP)	Fiscally Unconstrained Alternative - (List of Unfunded Projects)	Transit/Travel Demand Management Alternative
Aesthetics	Medium	Medium	High	Low
Air Quality	Medium	Medium	Low	Beneficial
Biological Resources	Medium	Medium	High	Low
Cultural Resources	Medium	Medium	High	Low
Land Use Planning	Medium	Medium	Low	High
Noise	Medium	Medium	High	Beneficial
Traffic	Low	Medium	Low	High

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table S-2 identifies the environmental impacts, the impact level of significance prior to mitigation, the proposed mitigation measures and/or adopted policies and standard measures that are already in place to mitigate an impact, and the impact level of significance after mitigation. It should be noted that the adopted General Plan policies, ordinances, rules and regulations, and applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures from El Dorado County and the City of Placerville are incorporated into this EIR by reference.

**Table S-2
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
3.1 Aesthetics			
<p>3.1-1: Substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas and resources or substantial degradation of visual character.</p>	Less Than Significant	<p>Policies and Standard Measures: The County and City have established policies and adopted Mitigation Measures that collectively protect the important elements of scenic vistas, including scenic resources, and the visual character of an area. Each subsequent improvement project would be required to be consistent with these adopted polices and mitigation measures. No mitigation measures above the following standard requirements are necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Dorado County General Plan Policies: 2.3.2.1, 2.4.1.1, 2.6.1.1, 2.6.1.2, 2.6.1.3, 2.6.1.5, 2.6.1.6, and 7.5.2.6. • El Dorado County General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures: 5.3-1(a), 5.3-1(b), and 5.3-1(d). • City of Placerville General Plan Policies: Section V Goal G Policy 1; Goal I Policies 3, 4, and 7; Section VII Goal A Policies 1 and 6; and Goal E Policy 1, 3, and 4. 	Less Than Significant
<p>3.1-2: Temporary construction effects on the scenic value of the region.</p>	Less Than Significant	<p>No mitigation measures are necessary. Temporary construction related impacts on the scenic value and qualities of the region are short lived and not considered significant.</p>	Less Than Significant
<p>3.1-3: Degradation of views within a State or locally designated scenic route.</p>	Less Than Significant	<p>Policies and Standard Measures: The County and City have established policies and adopted Mitigation Measures that collectively protect views within a scenic route. Each subsequent improvement project would be required to be consistent with these adopted polices and mitigation measures. No mitigation measures above the following standard requirements are necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Dorado County General Plan Policies: 2.3.2.1, 2.4.1.1, 2.6.1.1, 2.6.1.2, 2.6.1.3, 2.6.1.5, 2.6.1.6, and 7.5.2.6. • El Dorado County General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures: 5.3-1(a), 5.3-1(b), and 5.3-1(d). • City of Placerville General Plan Policies: Section V Goal G Policy 1; 	Less Than Significant

**Table S-2
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Continued.**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>3.1-4: Creation of light and glare effects near sensitive land uses.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>Goal I Policies 3, 4, and 7; Section VII Goal A Policies 1 and 6; Goal E Policy 1, 3, and 4.</p> <p>Policies and Standard Measures: The County and City have established lighting standards (consistent with the State lighting standards) that would be required of each improvement project. No mitigation measures above the following standard requirements are required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Dorado County General Plan Policy: 2.8.1.1. • El Dorado County, California: County Code; Chapter 17.14 Outdoor Lighting: Section 17.14.170. • City of Placerville standard lighting requirements. 	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p>3.2 Air Quality</p>			
<p>3.2-1: Long-term - Conflict with, or obstruct, the applicable Air Quality Plan, cause a violation of air quality standards, contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant in a non-attainment area.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>	<p>The RTP includes transportation projects, including alternative mode projects, that would improve traffic circulation and decrease congestion, which is expected to decrease vehicle run and idle times and decrease air emissions. New federal and state vehicle emissions requirements would allow El Dorado County and the City of Placerville to contribute toward regional conformance with the State Implementation Plan as the population grows and the total vehicle trips per day grow. As such, implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact from Reactive Organic Gas, Nitrogen Oxide, and Carbon Monoxide emissions.</p> <p>The region has been classified as non-attainment for PM10 since the early 90s. As the population in the region grows, the PM10 emissions are expected to increase due primarily from tire and brake wear. The RTP proposes programs that are intended to reduce the total vehicle miles traveled per capita, although these programs would not offset the total emissions contributed from the expected population increases. Therefore, there are not any programs that can prevent, reduce, or avoid this impact, although it is not a new impact. Furthermore, there are no feasible</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

**Table S-2
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Continued.**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>3.2-2: Temporary - Conflict with, or obstruct, the applicable Air Quality Plan, cause a violation of air quality standards, contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant in a non-attainment area.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>mitigation measures or new foreseeable technologies that can prevent, reduce, or avoid this impact. This is a significant and unavoidable impact.</p> <p>Policies and Standard Measures: The County and City have established policies, adopted Mitigation Measures, and Rules and Regulations that requires the construction operators to take special precautions during construction activities to prevent unnecessary PM10 emissions. Each subsequent improvement project would be required to be consistent with these requirements. No mitigation measures above the following standard requirements are necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Dorado County General Plan Policy: 6.7.7.1. • El Dorado County General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure: 5.11-1. • El Dorado Air Quality Management District Rules: 223 and 224. 	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p>3.2-3: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.</p>	<p>No impact</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are necessary. People located near the transportation improvements identified in the RTP would not experience objectionable odors caused by the improvements.</p>	<p>No Impact</p>
<p>3.3 Biological Resources</p>			
<p>3.3-1: Direct or indirect effects on species, identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species including their habitat, or movement corridors.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>Policies and Standard Measures: The County and City have established policies and adopted mitigation measures, and the federal and state governments have rules and regulations that protect special-status species including their habitat and movement corridors. Each subsequent improvement project would be required to be consistent with these adopted policies, mitigation measures, and rules and regulations. No mitigation measures above the standard requirements are required, although specific measures may be required of an individual project to ensure consistency with these requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Dorado County General Plan Policies: 7.4.1.1, 7.4.1.5, 7.4.1.6, 7.4.2.2, and 7.4.2.8. • El Dorado County General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures: 5.12-2(a) 	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

**Table S-2
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Continued.**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>3.3-2: Adverse effects on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Placerville General Plan Policies: Section V Goal D Policies 1, 7, 9, 11; and Goal I Policy 5. and 5.12-2(b). <p>Policies and Standard Measures: The County and City have established policies and the federal and state governments have rules and regulations that protect riparian habitat, other sensitive natural communities, and wetlands. Each subsequent improvement project would be required to be consistent with these adopted policies and federal and state rules and regulations. No mitigation measures above the standard requirements are required, although specific measures may be required of an individual project to ensure consistency with these requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Dorado County General Plan Policies: 7.3.2.1, 7.3.3.1, 7.3.3.4, 7.3.4.2, 7.4.1.6, 7.4.2.3, 7.4.2.8, and 7.4.5.2. • El Dorado County General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures: 5.12-1(e) and 5.12-1(f). • City of Placerville General Plan Policies: Section V Goal D Policies 1, 7, 9, 11; and Goal I Policy 5. 	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p>3.3-3: Interference with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-3: An agency that implements an RTP improvement project shall incorporate economically viable design measures, as applicable, necessary, and consistent with the policies and standards of the agency with jurisdiction over the facility, to allow wildlife to move through the transportation corridor. Such measures may include appropriately spaced breaks in a center barrier, or other measures that are designed to allow wildlife to move through the transportation corridor.</p> <p>Policies and Standard Measures: The County has established a policy and mitigation measures that protect sensitive habitat from fragmentation. Each subsequent improvement project would be required to be consistent with these requirements.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**Table S-2
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Continued.**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>3.3-4: Conflicts with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, recovery plan, or local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Dorado County General Plan Policy: 7.4.1.6 and 7.4.2.8. • El Dorado County General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures: 5.12-3(a) and 5.12-3(b). <p>Policies and Standard Measures: There are no applicable Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans. Both the County and the City have established policies that protect biological resources. There are also two recovery plans that provide for the protection of biological resources. Improvement plan designs would be required to be consistency with local policies, ordinances, and recovery plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Dorado County General Plan Policies. • El Dorado County General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures. • City of Placerville General Plan Policies. • Recovery plans (Pine Hill and California red-legged frog). 	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p>3.4 Cultural Resources</p>			
<p>3.4-1: Cause a substantial adverse change to a significant historical or archaeological resource, or directly or indirectly destroy or disturb a unique paleontological resource or human remains.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-1: Appropriate identification and evaluation efforts should be employed during the earliest possible planning phase for any proposed project. Every effort should be made to avoid significant cultural resources, with preservation an important goal. If significant sites cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation measures such as data recovery excavations or photographic documentation of buildings must be undertaken consistent with applicable state and federal regulations.</p> <p>Should archeological or human remains be discovered during construction, work shall be immediately halted within 50 meters (164 feet) of the find until the discovery can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. If it is determined to be historically or culturally significant, appropriate mitigation measures to avoid, protect, and preserve the resource shall be formulated and implemented.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

**Table S-2
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Continued.**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Policies and Standard Measures: The County and City have established policies that protect cultural resources. Each subsequent improvement project would be required to be consistent with these adopted policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Dorado County General Plan Policies: 7.5.1.3, 7.5.1.4, 7.5.2.4, and 7.5.2.5. • City of Placerville General Plan Policies: Section V Goal G Policy 1; and Goal H Policy 1, 2, and 3. 	
3.5 Land Use and Planning			
3.5-1: Result in the physical division of an established community.	No Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary. The RTP does not include projects that will divide an established community. Some RTP projects (i.e. Headington Road and Saratoga Way extensions) would provide connectivity within the community resulting in a beneficial impact on the established community.	No Impact/ Beneficial Impact
3.5-2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation resulting in the substantial loss of open space or recreational land or the creation of incompatible land uses.	Less Than Significant	Policies and Standard Measures: The RTP contains several policies and performance measures intended to prevent any conflicts with local plans, policies, or regulations by encouraging local jurisdictions to adhere to them and by directing transportation planners to use them as the basis for their plans. Each subsequent improvement project would be required to be consistent with these adopted policies. No mitigation measures above the standard requirements of these policies are required.	Less Than Significant
3.5-3: Indirectly induce substantial growth in the County or City.	Less Than Significant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Dorado County 2025 RTP: Policy 1 (Goal 1, Objective B), Policy 1 (Goal 7, Objective B), and Policy 3 (Goal 7, Objective D). <p>Policies and Standard Measures: The RTP contains several objectives, policies, and performance measures that are intended to prevent population growth that is not planned for in local General Plans. Each subsequent improvement project would be required to be consistent with these adopted policies. No mitigation measures above these requirements are necessary.</p>	Less Than Significant

**Table S-2
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Continued.**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Dorado County 2025 RTP: Policy 1 (Goal 7, Objective A) and Policy 1 (Goal 7, Objective B). • El Dorado County General Plan Land Use Plan. • City of Placerville General Plan Land Use Plan. 	
3.6 Noise			
<p>3.6-1: Grading and construction activities associated with the proposed highway, arterial, and transit projects identified in the RTP would intermittently and temporarily generate noise levels above ambient background levels. Noise levels in the immediate vicinity of the construction sites would increase substantially sometimes for extended durations.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable	<p>Policies and Standard Measures: The County and City have established policies and adopted Mitigation Measures that limit construction activities to normal business hours to limit construction related noise to the least sensitive times of the day. Each subsequent improvement project would be required to be consistent with these adopted policies and mitigation measures. Consistency with the following policies, mitigation measures, and standard requirements would ensure consistency with the local General Plans; however, there are no mitigation measures that can fully mitigate this impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Dorado County General Plan Policies: 6.5.1.11 and 6.5.1.15. • El Dorado County General Plan Mitigation Measures: 5.10-1(a) and 5.10-1(b). • City of Placerville General Plan Policies: Section VI Goal I Policy 1, 7, 10, 13, and 14. 	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>3.6-2: Noise-sensitive land uses could be exposed to noise in excess of normally acceptable noise levels or substantial increases in noise as a result of the operation of expanded or new transportation facilities (i.e., increased traffic resulting from new highways, addition of highway lanes, new transit facilities, airport modifications,</p>	Significant and Unavoidable	<p>Policies and Standard Measures: The County and City have established policies and adopted Mitigation Measures that protect noise sensitive receptors. The policies that are laid out in the Noise Element(s) are consistent with federal and state regulations designed to protect noise sensitive receptors. Each subsequent improvement project would be required to be consistent with these adopted policies and mitigation measures. Consistency with the following policies, mitigation measures, and standard requirements would ensure consistency with the local General Plans; however, there are no mitigation measures that can fully mitigate this impact.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-2
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Continued.**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
etc.).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Dorado County General Plan Policies: TC-1X, 6.5.1.5, 6.5.1.9, 6.5.1.12, and 6.5.1.15. • El Dorado County General Plan Mitigation Measures: 5.10-2(a) and 5.10-1(b). • City of Placerville General Plan Policies: Section VI Goal I Policy 1, 7, 10, 13, and 14. 	
3.7 Traffic			
<p>3.7-1: Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections) or exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways</p>	Significant and Unavoidable	<p>Policies and Standard Measures: The County and City have established policies and adopted Mitigation Measures that guide the development of transportation improvements in the region consistent with the Land Use Plans, Circulation Plans and consistent with the traffic standards. The RTP lays out the regionally significant traffic improvements, which are consistent with the General Plans, in an effort to relieve congestion and level of service deficiencies. Implementation of the RTP improvements and consistency with the following policies and mitigation measures would ensure consistency with the local General Plans; however, there are no mitigation measures that can fully mitigate the traffic impacts from growth in the region. The significant and unavoidable regional traffic impacts that are identified in the El Dorado County General Plan EIR will remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Dorado County General Plan Land Use Plan. • El Dorado County General Plan Circulation Plan. • El Dorado County General Plan Circulation Policies. • El Dorado County General Plan Traffic Mitigation Measures. • City of Placerville General Plan Land Use/Circulation Diagram and Standards. • City of Placerville General Plan Transportation Policies. 	Significant and Unavoidable

**Table S-2
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Continued.**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>3.7-2: Result in a change in the air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are necessary. The RTP includes an Action Plan for aviation that is intended to accommodate aviation forecasts. The RTP would allow for an increase in air traffic levels over the next 20 years, but would not result in a change in the air traffic patterns.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p>3.7-3: Substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are necessary. The RTP would not directly cause hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. The design and review process for individual projects would require the implementing agency to review the design to ensure that it is consistent with local, state, and federal design standards to ensure that there are not any unnecessary hazards and to ensure that there are not any incompatible uses.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p>3.7-4: Interfere substantially with implementation of any adopted non-motorized transportation plan.</p>	<p>No Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are necessary. The RTP includes non-motorized transportation projects for the region and a Transit/Travel Demand Alternative is included in Chapter 4 Alternatives. The proposed RTP is designed to be consistent with adopted regional plans, including non-motorized transportation plans.</p>	<p>No Impact</p>
<p>3.7-5: Result in inadequate emergency access.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are necessary. The implementing agency for each improvement project would be responsible for coordinating with the emergency providers to ensure that emergency routes remain available.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p>3.7-6: Result in inadequate parking capacity.</p>	<p>No Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are necessary. This Appendix G CEQA criterion is not relevant to the proposed RTP.</p>	<p>No Impact</p>