

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE

EL DORADO COUNTY

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

2025-2045

(SCH: 2024110413)

OCTOBER 2025

Prepared for:

El Dorado County Transportation Commission
2828 Easy Street, Suite 1
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 642-5260



Prepared by:

De Novo Planning Group
1020 Suncastr Lane, Suite 106
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
(916) 580-9818

D e N o v o P l a n n i n g G r o u p

A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
Volume I Environmental Document

FOR THE

EL DORADO COUNTY
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
2025-2045
(SCH: 2024110413)

OCTOBER 2025

Prepared for:

El Dorado County Transportation Commission
2828 Easy Street, Suite 1
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 642-5260

Prepared by:

De Novo Planning Group
1020 Suncast Lane, Suite 106
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
(916) 580-9818

Chapter	Page Number
ES: Executive Summary.....	ES-1
Introduction	ES-1
Project Description.....	ES-1
Alternatives to the Proposed Project.....	ES-2
Comments Received.....	ES-4
1.0: Introduction	1.0-1
1.1 Purpose and Intended Uses of the EIR.....	1.0-1
1.2 Environmental Review Process	1.0-2
1.3 Organization of the Final EIR.....	1.0-3
2.0: Agency DEIR Comments and Responses.....	2.0-1
2.1 Introduction	2.0-1
2.2 List of Commenters	2.0-1
2.3 Comments and Responses	2.0-1
3.0: Errata.....	3.0-1
3.1 Revisions to the DEIR	3.0-1
4.0: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.....	4.0-1
4.1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	4.0-1

This page left intentionally blank.

INTRODUCTION

The El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) has determined that the 2025-2045 Regional Transportation Plan is a "Project" within the definition of CEQA. CEQA requires the preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) prior to approving any project, which may have a significant impact on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term "Project" refers to the whole of an action, which has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15378[a]).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following provides a summary and overview of the proposed Project. Chapter 2.0 of the Draft EIR includes a detailed description of the proposed Project, including maps and graphics. The reader is referred to Chapter 2.0 for a more complete and thorough description of the components of the proposed Project.

The proposed project is the adoption and implementation of the updated El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that has been prepared to address the 2025 to 2045 timeframe. 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. More specifically, the RTP is a twenty-year, comprehensive multi-modal transportation plan, including, but not limited to: highways, local streets and roads, transit, bicycle, aviation, and goods movement. EDCTC is required to adopt and submit an updated RTP to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) every five years. The RTP is action-oriented and pragmatic, considering both the short-term (10 years) and long-term (10- to 20-years and beyond) periods.

The purpose of the 2025-2045 RTP is to provide a clear vision of the regional transportation goals, objectives, and policies in the EDCTC planning area. The 2025-2045 RTP provides short-term and long-term strategies for implementation, including realistic and fiscally constrained alternatives. The following goals and objectives, by transportation mode and strategy, have been identified for the 2025-2045 RTP.

The RTP contains eight specific goals, each with supporting objectives and strategies including: integrated regional transportation planning; sustainable, adaptable, resilient; surface transportation system; public transit; aviation; active transportation; transportation systems management; and regional equity and collaboration. The goals reflect the region's transportation needs and priorities while the objectives represent a specific need or priority. The following goals and objectives, by transportation mode and strategy, have been identified for the 2025-2045 RTP.

The RTP embodies three primary elements: Policy Element, Action Element, and Financial Element.

The **Policy Element** presents guidance to decision-makers of the implications, impacts, and opportunities that will result from implementation of the RTP, as well as identifying mobility goals, objectives, and strategies for the region. California law (Government Code Section 65080 (b)) states that each RTP shall include a Policy Element that:

1. Describes the transportation issues in the region;
2. Identifies and quantifies regional needs expressed within both short- and long-range planning horizons; and,
3. Maintains internal consistency with the Financial Element and fund estimates.

The **Action Element** identifies short- and long-term actions needed to achieve the RTP's objectives and implement the RTP in accordance with the goals, objectives, and strategies set forth in the Policy Element.

The institutional actions needed to implement the Regional Transportation Plan and action plans are also discussed in this section, followed by a detailed assessment of all transportation modes. Priorities for regional transportation programs are established within the Action Element.

The **Financial Element** identifies the cost of implementing projects in the RTP within a financially constrained environment. All anticipated transportation funding revenues are compared with the anticipated costs of the transportation projects and actions identified in the Action Element. If shortfalls are identified, strategies are developed to potentially fund the otherwise unfunded projects. It includes regionally significant multimodal projects that currently have funding in place or that are projected to have funding in the future (Fiscally Constrained), while it also identifies other improvement projects that are needed but do not have funding (Fiscally Unconstrained). Fiscally unconstrained projects are listed for completion as beyond 2045.

See Chapter 2.0 for a complete Project Description.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The CEQA Guidelines require an 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 2025-2045 RTP is to guide short- and long-term transportation improvements countywide, a discussion of alternative sites is not appropriate. The alternatives analyzed in this EIR include the following four alternatives, in addition to the proposed project (also identified as the Fiscally Constrained alternative within this EIR):

- No Project Alternative
- Road Emphasis
- Transit Enhancement
- Financially Unconstrained

Alternatives are described in detail in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIR. Table ES-1 provides a comparison of the alternatives using a qualitative matrix that quantifies the impacts of each alternative relative

to the other alternatives. The Financially Constrained Alternative (i.e., the proposed project) has the lowest overall impact (score of 15) and is deemed the environmentally superior alternative because it provides the greatest reduction of potential impacts in comparison to the other alternatives. The Transit Enhancement Alternative ranks second with a score of 19, the Financially Unconstrained Alternative ranks third with a score of 21, the Road Emphasis Alternative ranks fourth with a score of 23, and the No Project alternative ranks last with a score of 25.

TABLE ES-1: COMPARISON SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE	FINANCIALLY UNCONSTRAINED	NO PROJECT	FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED (PROPOSED PROJECT)	ROAD EMPHASIS	TRANSIT ENHANCEMENT
Aesthetics	3 (Worst - Equal)	1 (Best)	2 (Better - Equal)	3 (Worst - Equal)	2 (Better - Equal)
	The No Project Alternative would result in the lowest overall potential for adverse impacts on aesthetics. As roadway infrastructure improvement projects would decrease under this alternative, the potential for development of roadway infrastructure to degrade scenic views, remove scenic resources, change visual character, and result in increased light and glare would be less under the No Project Alternative as compared to the other alternatives.				
Agricultural and Forest Resources	4 (Worst)	1 (Best)	2 (Better - Equal)	3 (Worse)	2 (Better - Equal)
	The No Project Alternative would result in the lowest potential for adverse impacts on agricultural and forest resources. As roadway infrastructure improvement projects would be significantly decreased under this alternative, the potential for development of roadway infrastructure to convert agricultural and forest lands to non-agricultural and non-forest uses, as well as the potential for conflicts with agricultural lands would be less under the No Project Alternative as compared to the other alternatives.				
Air Quality	2 (Medium)	4 (Worst)	1 (Best - Equal)	3 (Worse)	1 (Best - Equal)
	The Financially Constrained Alternative and Transit Enhancement Alternative would equally result in the lowest potential for adverse impacts to air quality. As roadway infrastructure improvement projects would increase to alleviate traffic congestion and transit service, and bicycle/pedestrian use would increase under these alternatives, the total VMT per capita would decrease, which would result in a corresponding decrease of vehicle-related air quality emissions.				
Cultural and Tribal Resources	5 (Worst)	1 (Best)	3 (Medium)	4 (Worse)	2 (Better)
	The No Project Alternative would result in the lowest potential for adverse impacts to cultural resources. As roadway infrastructure improvement projects would decrease under this alternative, there would be fewer construction and infrastructure development projects that would have the potential to degrade or destroy cultural resources, including archaeological, paleontological, historic, and human remains under the No Project Alternative as compared to the other alternatives.				
Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change and Energy	2 (Medium)	4 (Worst)	1 (Best - Equal)	3 (Worse)	1 (Best - Equal)
	The Financially Constrained Alternative and the Transit Enhancement Alternative would equally result in the lowest potential for adverse impacts to GHG emissions, climate change, and energy. As transportation infrastructure improvement projects would				

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE	FINANCIALLY UNCONSTRAINED	NO PROJECT	FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED (PROPOSED PROJECT)	ROAD EMPHASIS	TRANSIT ENHANCEMENT
	increase to alleviate traffic congestion deficiencies, and transit service and bicycle/pedestrian use would also increase under this alternative, the total VMT per capita would decrease, resulting in a corresponding decrease of vehicle-related energy usage and GHG emissions.				
Land Use and Population	1 (Best)	4 (Worst)	2 (Better)	3 (Medium - Equal)	3 (Medium - Equal)
	The Financially Unconstrained Alternative would result in the lowest potential for adverse impacts associated with land use and population, because this alternative is most consistent with the needs of the local general plans, specifically including their land use and circulation elements. This alternative would be the most consistent with land use planning activities in the County and with its jurisdiction, as this alternative would implement the transportation projects necessary to serve planned development, as well as provide transportation services at adequate levels. Therefore, the Financially Unconstrained Alternative would have less impacts on land use and population than other alternatives.				
Transportation and Circulation	1 (Best)	5 (Worst)	3 (Medium)	2 (Better)	4 (Worse)
	The Financially Unconstrained Alternative would reduce impacts associated with congestion and roadway safety in comparison to the other alternatives. Due to the combination of enhanced roadway capacity projects and transit improvements, congestion under this alternative would be expected to decrease in comparison to the other alternatives. This alternative would allow for more improvement projects that are needed to maintain acceptable transportation service levels.				
Wildfire	3 (Medium)	5 (Worst)	1 (Best)	2 (Better)	4 (Worse)
	The Financially Constrained Alternative would result in the lowest potential for exposing people or structures to the risk of wildfire while ensuring an efficient transportation system that would provide better access to for emergency evacuation. This alternative would also refrain from developing transportation improvements and expansions above and beyond what the current capacity warrants, reducing any impacts to the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk.				
Summary	21 (Medium)	25 (Worst)	15 (Best)	23 (Worse)	19 (Better)

COMMENTS RECEIVED

The Draft EIR addressed environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project that are known to EDCTC, were identified during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process or identified during preparation of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR discusses impacts associated with aesthetics, agricultural and forest resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural and tribal resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas, climate and energy resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and population, noise, transportation and circulation, utilities and service systems, wildfire and other CEQA required topics.

During the NOP process, three (3) comments were received related to the analyses that were included in the Draft EIR. These comments are included as Appendix A of the Draft EIR and were considered during preparation of the Draft EIR.

The EDCTC received three (3) comment letters regarding the Draft EIR 45-day comment period. These comment letters are identified, analyzed, and a formal response is provided in Section 2.0, Comments on DEIR and Responses.

This page intentionally left blank.

This Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15132). The El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) is the lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed Project and has the principal responsibility for approving the proposed Project. This Final EIR assesses the expected environmental impacts resulting from approval of the proposed Project and associated impacts from subsequent development and operation of the proposed Project, as well as responds to significant environmental issues raised in timely comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR).

1.1 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

CEQA REQUIREMENTS FOR A FINAL EIR

This Final EIR for the proposed Project has been prepared in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines. CEQA Guidelines Section 15132 requires that a Final EIR consists of the following:

- the Draft EIR or a revision of the draft;
- comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR, either verbatim or in summary;
- a list of persons, organizations and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR;
- the responses of the lead agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process; and
- any other information added by the lead agency.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, subdivision (a), the Draft EIR (July 2025) is incorporated by reference into this Final EIR.

An EIR must disclose the expected environmental impacts, including impacts that cannot be avoided, growth-inducing effects, impacts found not to be significant, and significant cumulative impacts, as well as identify mitigation measures and alternatives to the proposed Project that could reduce or avoid its significant adverse environmental impacts. CEQA requires government agencies to consider and, where feasible, minimize significant environmental impacts of proposed development, and an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors.

PURPOSE AND USE

The EDCTC, as the lead agency, has prepared this Final EIR to provide the public and responsible and trustee agencies with an objective analysis of the potential environmental impacts resulting from approval, construction, and operation of the proposed Project. Responsible and trustee agencies that may use the EIR are identified in Chapters 1.0 and 2.0 of the Draft EIR.

The environmental review process enables interested parties to evaluate the proposed Project in terms of its environmental consequences, to examine and recommend methods to eliminate or reduce potential adverse impacts, and to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to the

proposed Project. While CEQA requires that consideration be given to avoiding adverse environmental effects, the lead agency must balance significant adverse environmental effects against other public objectives, including the economic and social benefits of a project, in determining whether a project should be approved.

This EIR will be used as the primary environmental document to evaluate all aspects of construction and operation of the proposed Project. The details and operational characteristics of the proposed Project are identified in Chapter 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The review and certification process for the EIR has involved, or will involve, the following general procedural steps:

NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND INITIAL STUDY

The EDCTC circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed Project on November 13, 2024, to State Clearinghouse, State Responsible Agencies, State Trustee Agencies, Other Public Agencies, and Organizations and Interested Persons. A public scoping meeting was held on December 4, 2024, to present the project description to the public and interested agencies, and to receive comments from the public and interested agencies regarding the scope of the environmental analysis to be included in the Draft EIR. Concerns raised in response to the NOP were considered during preparation of the Draft EIR. The NOP and comments on the NOP are presented in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND DRAFT EIR

EDCTC published a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIR on July 2, 2025, inviting comment from the public, agencies, organizations, and other interested parties. The NOA was filed with the State Clearinghouse (SCH # 2024110413) and the County Clerk and was published in a local newspaper pursuant to the public noticing requirements under CEQA. The Draft EIR was available for public review and comment from July 2, 2025, through August 18, 2025, for a total of 47 days.

Additionally, the Draft EIR was made available at the EDCTC and was posted on the EDCTC website at:

<https://www.edctc.org/regional-transportation-plan-2025-2045>

The Draft EIR contains the Project Description, Environmental Setting, identification of Project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of Project alternatives, identification of significant irreversible environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts. The Draft EIR identifies issues determined to have no impact or a less-than-significant impact and provides detailed analysis of potentially significant and significant impacts. Comments received in response to the NOP were considered in preparing the analysis in the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS/FINAL EIR

EDCTC received three (3) comment letters regarding the Draft EIR. These comment letters on the Draft EIR, and minor text edits to the Draft EIR, are provided in this Final EIR.

EDCTC BOARD HEARING

The EDCTC Board will review and consider the EIR, which consists of both the Draft EIR and the Final EIR. If the EDCTC Board finds that the EIR is "adequate and complete," the EDCTC Board may certify the EIR in accordance with CEQA and the EDCTC Board's environmental review procedures and codes. Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15090(a), certification entails three separate determinations: (1) the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; (2) The Final EIR was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency, and that the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving the project; and (3) the Final EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.

In assessing whether the EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the EDCTC Board should generally consider whether:

- 1) The EIR shows a good faith effort at full disclosure of environmental information; and
- 2) The EIR provides sufficient analysis to allow decisions to be made regarding the proposed project in contemplation of environmental considerations.

Upon review and consideration of the EIR, the EDCTC Board may take action to approve, revise, or reject the proposed Project. A decision to approve the proposed Project, for which this EIR identifies significant environmental effects, must be accompanied by written findings in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, as described below, would also be adopted in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 for mitigation measures that have been incorporated into or imposed upon the proposed Project to reduce or avoid significant effects on the environment. This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is included as Chapter 4.0 of the Final EIR and has been designed to ensure that these measures are carried out during Project implementation, in a manner that is consistent with the EIR.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE FINAL EIR

This Final EIR is organized with the following four chapters. All comments and responses are included Chapter 2.0.

CHAPTER 1.0 – INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1.0 briefly describes the purpose of the environmental evaluation, identifies the lead agency, summarizes the process associated with preparation and certification of an EIR, and identifies the content requirements and organization of the Final EIR.

CHAPTER 2.0 – COMMENTS ON DRAFT EIR AND RESPONSES

Chapter 2.0 provides a list of commenters, copies of written and electronic comments made on the Draft EIR (coded for reference), and responses to those written comments.

CHAPTER 3.0 – ERRATA

Chapter 3.0 consists of minor revisions to the Draft EIR in response to comments received on the Draft EIR.

CHAPTER 4.0 – FINAL MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

Chapter 4.0 consists of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). The MMRP is presented in a tabular format that presents the impacts, mitigation measures, responsibility, timing, and verification of monitoring.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

No new significant environmental impacts or issues, beyond those already covered in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR or DEIR) for the proposed Project, were raised during the comment period. Responses to comments received during the comment period do not involve or reveal any new significant impacts or add any “significant new information” that would require recirculation of the DEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(a) states that: New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that: (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented. (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance. (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it. (4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. (*Mountain Lion Coalition v. Fish and Game Com.* (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 1043)

Sections 2.0, 3.0, and 4.0 of this Final EIR include information that has been added to the EIR since the close of the public review period in the form of responses to comments and revisions.

2.2 LIST OF COMMENTERS

Table 2.0-1 lists the comments that were submitted to the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) during the public review period for the DEIR. The assigned comment letter or number, letter date, letter author, and affiliation. Letters received are coded with letters (A, B, etc.). The EDCTC received a total of three (3) comment letters from public agencies and a member of the public, which are addressed in Section 2.0. These letters are shown in Table 2.0-1 below.

TABLE 2.0-1 LIST OF COMMENTERS ON DEIR

<i>RESPONSE LETTER</i>	<i>INDIVIDUAL OR SIGNATORY</i>	<i>AFFILIATION</i>	<i>DATE</i>
A	Caitlyn Oswalt	California Department of Fish and Wildlife	8-19-25
B	Sukhwinder Johal	California Department of Transportation	8-14-25
C	Kathileen Jermstad	Resident	8-17-25

2.3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

REQUIREMENTS FOR RESPONDING TO COMMENTS ON A DEIR

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that lead agencies evaluate all timely comments on the DEIR and respond in writing to all significant environmental issues raised in such comments. The written response

must address the significant environmental issue raised and provide a detailed response, especially when specific comments or suggestions (e.g., additional mitigation measures) are not accepted. In addition, the written response must reflect a good faith and reasoned analysis. However, lead agencies need only to respond to significant environmental issues associated with the proposed Project and do not need to provide all the information requested by the commenter, if a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15204).

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 recommends that commenters provide detailed comments that focus on the sufficiency of the DEIR in identifying and analyzing the possible environmental impacts of the proposed Project and ways to avoid or mitigate the significant effects of the proposed Project, and that commenters provide evidence supporting their comments. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 also recommends that revisions to the DEIR be noted as a revision in the DEIR or as a separate section of the Final EIR. Chapter 3.0 of this Final EIR identifies all revisions to the DEIR.

RESPONSES TO COMMENT LETTERS

Written comments on the DEIR are reproduced on the following pages, along with responses to those comments. To assist in referencing comments and responses, the following coding system is used:

- Each letter is lettered or numbered (i.e., Letter A) and each comment within each letter is numbered (i.e., comment A-1, comment A-2).

ERRATA

Where changes to the DEIR text result from the response to comments, those changes are included in the response and identified with revision marks (underline for new text, ~~strike-out~~ for deleted text).

Letter A

From: Oswalt, Caitlyn@Wildlife <Caitlyn.Oswalt@Wildlife.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 9:57 AM
To: Jerry Barton <jbarton@edctc.org>
Cc: Wilson, Billie@Wildlife <Billie.Wilson@wildlife.ca.gov>; Sheya, Tanya@Wildlife <Tanya.Sheya@wildlife.ca.gov>; Kilgour, Morgan@Wildlife <Morgan.Kilgour@Wildlife.ca.gov>; Wildlife R2 CEQA <R2CEQA@wildlife.ca.gov>
Subject: 2025-2045 EL DORADO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP), DRAFT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (DPEIR) SCH NO. 2024110413

Dear Jerry Barton:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received and reviewed the Notice of Availability of a DPEIR from El Dorado County Transportation Commission for the 2025-2045 El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan (Project) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) statute and guidelines.¹¹ CDFW previously submitted comments in response to the Notice of Preparation of the DPEIR on December 12, 2024.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the Project that may affect California fish, wildlife, native plants, and their habitat. Likewise, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments regarding those aspects of the Project that CDFW, by law, may need to exercise its own regulatory authority under the Fish and Game Code.

CDFW ROLE

CDFW is California's Trustee Agency for fish and wildlife resources and holds those resources in trust by statute for all the people of the State (Fish & G. Code, §§ 711.7, subd. (a) & 1802; Pub. Resources Code, § 21070; CEQA Guidelines § 15386, subd. (a).) CDFW, in its trustee capacity, has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species. (Fish & G. Code, § 1802.) Similarly for purposes of CEQA, CDFW provides, as available, biological expertise during public agency environmental review efforts, focusing specifically on projects and related

A-1

activities that have the potential to adversely affect fish and wildlife resources.

CDFW may also act as a Responsible Agency under CEQA. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381.) CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code. As proposed, for example, the Project may be subject to CDFW's lake and streambed alteration regulatory authority. (Fish & G. Code, § 1600 et seq.) Likewise, to the extent implementation of the Project as proposed may result in "take" as defined by State law of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.), the project proponent may seek related take authorization as provided by the Fish and Game Code.

A-1 Cont.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

The Project site is located along highways, local streets and roads, transit, bicycle, aviation, and goods movement within El Dorado County.

The Project consists of the regional transportation goals, objectives, and policies in the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) planning area. The RTP is a 20-year, comprehensive multi-modal transportation plan, including, but not limited to: highways, local streets and roads, transit, bicycle, aviation, and goods movement. The RTP is action-oriented and pragmatic, considering both the short-term (10-year) and long-term (10- to 20-years and beyond) periods. The RTP contains eight specific goals, each with supporting objectives and strategies including: integrated regional transportation planning; sustainable, adaptable, resilient; surface transportation system; public transit; aviation; active transportation; transportation systems management; and regional equity and collaboration.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist EDCTC in adequately identifying and, where appropriate, mitigating the Project's significant, or potentially significant, direct and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife (biological) resources. Based on the Project's avoidance of significant impacts on biological resources with implementation of mitigation measures, CDFW concludes that a Program Environmental Impact Report is appropriate for the Project.

CDFW is primarily concerned with the project impacts to wildlife movement, habitat fragmentation, cumulative impacts from direct vehicle mortality, as well as impacts to creeks, streams, rivers, and plants, including those species state-listed as rare, candidate, threatened, or endangered under CESA or the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA).

COMMENT 1: Section 3.1-2, Aesthetics – Light and Glare, Page 3.1-2

Issue: While the Aesthetics section 3.1-2 of the DPEIR discusses the impacts from lighting on nearby residences, the DPEIR does not analyze adverse impacts from increased lighting on wildlife, nor does it provide any avoidance, minimization or

A-2

mitigation measures to reduce the impacts to less than significant. Light pollution has the potential to significantly and adversely affect biological resources, where unlike the natural brightness created by the monthly cycle of the moon, permanent and continuously powered lighting fixtures create an unnatural light regime that produces a constant light output. Continuous light output for 365 days a year can have a cumulatively significant impact on fish and wildlife populations.

Night lighting can disrupt the circadian rhythms of many species. Many wildlife species use photoperiod cues for communication (e.g., bird song; Miller 2006), determining when to begin foraging (Stone et al. 2009), behavior thermoregulation (Beiswenger 1977), and migration (Longcore and Rich 2004). Artificial night lighting has also been found to impact juvenile salmonid overwintering success by delaying the emergence of salmonids from benthic refugia and reducing their ability to feed during the winter (Contor and Griffith 1995).

Recommendation: CDFW strongly recommends reducing artificial light outputs within the Project limits to avoid potentially significant impacts from light pollution.

CDFW recommends analyzing light source outputs as described below and recommends reducing or removing the number of light sources proposed within the project such as informational signs, bicycle/pedestrian access light sources, and overhead light poles. Reduction in the number of light output sources can be accomplished by increasing the standard spacing from light pole source to light pole source within the Project limits and by avoiding light source installation in highly sensitive resource locations. In addition, utilizing light shielding, light output restrictions and measures discussed in detail below may reduce the potentially significant impacts created by artificial lighting sources within the project area.

CDFW recommends project proponents provide Isolux diagrams that analyze current light levels present during pre-project conditions and provide the predicted project light levels that will be created upon completion of the project within their subsequent CEQA document. The proposed analysis should include all potential light sources proposed for new installation or replacement. Upon project completion, project proponents should conduct a ground survey that compares current and predicated light levels with actual light levels achieved upon completion of the project through comparison of Isolux diagrams. If an increase from the projected levels to the actual levels is discovered additional avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures should be required.

COMMENT 2: Regulatory Setting, State, Native Plant Protection Act (Fish and Game Code Sections 1900 through 1913), Page 3.4-8

Issue: The PDEIR incorrectly interprets the protections provided by CESA and the NPPA and states, “*CFGC Sections 1900 through 1913 were developed to preserve, protect, and enhance Rare and Endangered plants in the State of California. The Native Plant Protection Act requires all State agencies to use their authority to carry out programs to conserve Endangered and Rare native plants. Provisions of the Native Plant Protection Act prohibit the taking of listed plants from the wild and*

A-2 Cont.

A-3

require notification of the CDFW at least ten days in advance of any change in land use which would adversely impact listed plants. This allows CDFW to salvage listed plant species that would otherwise be destroyed."

Recommendation: CDFW recommends the DPEIR be revised to state, "CFGC Sections 1900 through 1913 were developed to preserve, protect, and enhance Rare and Endangered plants in the State of California. The Native Plant Protection Act requires all State agencies to use their authority to carry out programs to conserve Endangered and Rare native plants **listed under that Act**. Provisions of the Native Plant Protection Act prohibit the taking of listed plants **listed under that Act** from the wild and require notification of the **to** CDFW at least ten days in advance of any change in land use which would adversely impact listed plants. This allows CDFW to salvage listed plant species that would otherwise be destroyed."

A-3 Cont.

COMMENT 3: Biological Resources, Lake and Streambed Alteration Program (California Fish and Game Code Section 1600 through 1616), Page 3.4-8

Issue: The DPEIR has identified perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral rivers, streams, and other hydrologically connected aquatic features, but did not analyze all potential temporary, permanent, direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to these features and the associated biological resources and habitats that may occur due to the nature of the DPEIR being a planning document.

Additionally, the DPEIR states, "Generally, the CDFW takes jurisdiction to the top of bank of the stream or to the outer limit of the adjacent riparian vegetation (outer drip line), whichever is greater." This statement is not correct. The topography and individual site conditions may affect how project activities impact rivers, streams, and lakes and which activities are subject to Fish and Game Code section 1602.

A-4

Recommendation: The DPEIR should propose appropriate avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level, including but not limited to project impacts to riparian habitat, water temperature, water nutrient concentrations, and turbidity.

The DPEIR has identified project activities that will require notification to CDFW pursuant to Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code. Notification is required for any activity that may do one or more of the following:

- Substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of any river, stream, or lake;
- Substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, or lake; or
- Deposit debris, waste, or other materials where it may pass into any river, stream or lake.

Please note that "any river, stream or lake" includes those that are episodic (i.e., those that are dry for periods of time) as well as those that are perennial (i.e., those that flow year-round). This includes ephemeral streams and watercourses with a

subsurface flow. It may also apply to work undertaken within the floodplain of a body of water or grading work adjacent to a waterway. Upon receipt of a complete notification, CDFW will determine if the project activities may substantially adversely affect existing fish and wildlife resources and whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement is required.

A-4 Cont.

Additionally, CDFW's issuance of a LSA Agreement is a "project" subject to CEQA (see Pub. Resources Code 21065). To facilitate issuance of an LSA Agreement, the DPEIR should fully identify the potential impacts to the lake, stream, or riparian resources, and provide adequate avoidance, minimization, mitigation, and monitoring and reporting commitments.

COMMENT 4: Biological Resources, El Dorado County General Plan, Objective 7.4.2: Identify and Protect Resources, Pg 3.4-11

Issue: The DPEIR mentions the El Dorado County General Plan contains the following goals, objectives, and policies related to biological resources that are relevant to the project:

Objective 7.4.2: IDENTIFY AND PROTECT RESOURCES - Identification and protection, where feasible, of critical fish and wildlife habitat including deer winter, summer, and fawning ranges; deer migration routes; stream and river riparian habitat; lake shore habitat; fish spawning areas; wetlands; wildlife corridors; and diverse wildlife habitat.

The CEQA document does not adequately address wildlife connectivity or wildlife vehicle collision mortality for the deer herds and other wildlife that migrate within the project area. Without the appropriate avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures, cumulatively significant impacts to deer herds and other wildlife populations will occur as a result of the project. For example, widening roads and curve realignments will increase vehicle speeds and traffic volume which will make it harder for wildlife to cross seasonal or daily.

A-5

Recommendation: CDFW recommends EDCTC and subsequent project proponents identify suitable locations and incorporate wildlife crossings into their design plans (e.g., larger culverts, open-bottom culverts, or a wildlife undercrossing structure with fencing and jump outs) where geographically feasible.

Furthermore, species occurrence data, road mortality data, linkage designs, and adjacent suitable habitat should inform the CEQA analysis regarding potential for impacts and the development of mitigation measures to improve or enhance wildlife movement as a result of the project. In weighing the impacts of the project on wildlife movement, beyond regional wildlife "corridors," analysis should address other common movement patterns. Food sources, water sources, migration routes, and breeding and sheltering areas that may be disconnected as a result of the project should be included in the impact analysis and considered when developing mitigation concepts. CDFW recommends incorporating survey data from sources such as the California Roadkill Observation System to establish scientific reasoning for crossing

locations and improvements for wildlife crossings as appropriate. CDFW also recommends surveys are done before, during, and after construction to identify key areas where wildlife are crossing, observe how wildlife migration is affected by the project, and assess the effectiveness of any newly constructed wildlife crossings. Additional suggestions can also be found in CDFW's *Transportation Planning Companion Plan*, associated with the State Wildlife Action Plan (CDFW, 2016).

A-5 Cont.

COMMENT 5: Section 3.4-13, Biological Resources - Wildlife Movement. Page 3.4-13

Issue: Section B discusses wildlife movement on 4, 6, and 8 lane roads, However, it does not discuss wildlife movement on 2 lane roads. Road widening within wildlife movement areas and increased barriers could lead to additional vehicle conflicts. Moreover, relative to mitigation for roadway construction projects additional vegetation can attract wildlife to the side of the road with re-planted vegetation leading to animal vehicle conflicts.

A-6

Recommendation: CDFW recommends expanding project considerations for wildlife movement to include 2 lane roads. CDFW also recommends analyzing increased barriers in wildlife movement corridors. CDFW encourages the project proponent to explore wildlife connectivity options (e.g., under crossings, up-sizing culverts, and wildlife friendly fencing). Projects along wildlife movement corridors should also analyze revegetation plans for potential animal vehicle conflicts as the additional vegetation can attract wildlife to the area. CDFW recommends not providing vegetation on roundabouts, or inside fences along roads, or along roads with no fencing as part of treatment.

COMMENT 6: Biological Resources, El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, – Rare Plants. Page 3.4-17

Issue: Within El Dorado County reside Pine Hill endemic plants and their gabbro soil-based habitat. NPPA prohibits the take or possession of state-listed rare and endangered plants, including any part or product thereof, unless authorized by CDFW or in certain limited circumstances. Please see Comment 9 for Incidental Take Permit (ITP) recommendations. Take of state-listed plants due to Project activities may only be permitted under appropriate CESA take authorization.

A-7

Additionally, the DPEIR also states that “acquisition and restoration of rare plant habitat must be equal to 1.5 times the number of acres developed. Off-site mitigation must be conducted according to guidelines established by the County and is subject to review by representatives of USFWS and CDFW. More commonly, development relies on the Zoning Ordinance’s in-lieu fee option. That option collects a per-unit fee from new development that is used to fund the local cost of the Rare Plant Mitigation Program.”

Recommendation: If special status plants have a probability to be within the project area based on habitat and soil type, CDFW recommends the PDEIR instructs future

project proponents to incorporate survey protocols such as those listed in Attachment 1, *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities* (CDFW, 3/2018), and to conduct a minimum of two focused special-status plant surveys prior to construction during the blooming season for special-status plant species that may occur on the project site. Surveys should be spaced a minimum of three (3) weeks apart during the blooming period. Exact survey timing should be determined by a qualified biologist with experience with the species being surveyed. If special-status plants are discovered during these surveys and take cannot be completely avoided during or after project implementation, mitigation measures shall be proposed to fully mitigate the impacts to state-listed species (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 783.2, subd.(a)(8)). Please note the use of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as the sole mitigation for impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered species are generally experimental in nature and largely unsuccessful. Therefore, the DPEIR should describe additional mitigation measures utilizing habitat restoration, conservation, and/or preservation, in addition to avoidance and minimization measures, if it is determined that there may be impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered species.

A-7 Cont.

Furthermore, please be aware that the County's in-lieu fee program may not meet the full mitigation standard under CESA. Depending on the quality of habitat impacted, the quality of the compensatory mitigation, temporal loss, and number of species impacted, 1.5:1 replacement for permanent impacts may result in a net loss of habitat. Through the CESA process, CDFW may require greater than 1.5:1 mitigation depending on project specific factors to ensure no net loss occurs. If mitigation is proposed through use of conservation bank credits, credit purchases should be from a CDFW-approved mitigation bank with appropriate credit types available. Project proponents may also propose alternative mitigation options for CDFW review and approval as part of the CESA application process.

COMMENT 7: Section 3.4-1, Biological Resources – Impact 3.4-1, Foothill Yellow Legged Frog. Page 3.4-20

Issue: The foothill yellow-legged frog (*Rana boylei*, FYLF) is known to occur throughout El Dorado County. The FYLF are separated into 5 clades within California. El Dorado County has populations part of the Northeast/Northern Sierra and East/Southern Sierra clades. The Northeast/Northern Sierra clade is currently listed as threatened under the CESA, while the East/Southern Sierra clade is listed as endangered. Projects including seasonal bridge installation, bridge and culvert replacements, road widening near waterways can take days or years to complete and have temporary and/or permanent impacts within stream reaches. Unfortunately, there is not a season of operation that completely avoids FYLF presence. If frogs are present and breeding, they may be encountered in various life-stages year-round. The DPEIR does not include the appropriate avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures to reduce impacts to FYLF to less than significant. Furthermore, take authorization issued pursuant to CESA requires project- and species-specific avoidance and minimization measures, as well as full mitigation for project related impacts.

Recommendation: CDFW recommends the DPEIR have considerations for avoiding

A-8

or minimizing project-related impacts to the species. CDFW recommends FYLF surveys and habitat assessments be conducted throughout all Project Study Area's under the DPEIR and include the results within the individual project analysis. Additionally, CDFW recommends the DPEIR provide examples of survey protocols for project proponents to incorporate into their subsequent CEQA document. Examples of survey protocols can be found within Attachment 2, CDFW's *Considerations for Conserving the Foothill Yellow-Legged Frog* (2018) document and a few are referenced below:

- a. Visual Encounter Surveys (VES) conducted during the late summer are often the easiest method for determining presence; subadults and occasionally adults are often observed along river margins, and subadult and adult frogs will likely also be observed in tributary streams (Crump and Scott 1994).
- b. To increase the likelihood of detection, surveys should include at least one VES during the breeding and/or oviposition period (generally April – June), a tadpole survey four to eight weeks after the breeding survey(s), a subadult survey in late summer/early fall (generally late August to early October), and a final VES within 3 to 5 days prior to starting work.
 - i. It is important to understand that frogs are ectothermic, so ambient temperature affects the likelihood of detection. Whether the life form is larval or subadult, both stages will shelter in place under substrate and emerge and become active with warmth (i.e., detection probability increases with temperature).
- c. If a survey fails to detect FYLF within suitable habitat, a follow-up survey should be conducted two to four weeks after the initial survey.
- d. Develop measures to avoid incidental take on a site- and project-specific basis.
 - i. For example, measures may vary based on the type and extent of disturbance, duration and timing of disturbance, and influence of environmental factors. A season of operation that completely avoids foothill yellow-legged frog presence does not exist; if frogs are present and breeding, they may be encountered in various life stages year-round. However, in locations that have periodic dry conditions, especially prolonged dry conditions, FYLF are unlikely to be encountered. Under dry conditions, FYLF usually seek refuge in wetted tributaries (or any wetted feature).

A-8 Cont.

COMMENT 8: Biological Resources, Mitigation Measure 3.4-3, Page 3.4-22

Issue: The El Dorado County General Plan includes scenic corridors but does not

mention wildlife friendly fencing, which is a component of RTP and should be considered by the EDCTC when adding Right of Way fencing to highways or roads. Generally, no fence is preferred, but where fencing is required, fencing height should be analyzed for wildlife impacts, especially if constructing wildlife fencing is adjacent to existing structures more common in high Wildlife Vehicle Conflict areas.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-3 describes using commercial-quality woven polypropylene fencing that is orange in color and at least four feet high during project activities. Please note that deer primarily see in shades of blue and yellow-green but struggle to distinguish between red and green. Orange appears gray to deer species (Attachment 3, *A Review of Color Vision in White-Tailed Deer* by Kurt C. VerCauteren and Michael J. Pipas; (2003)).

A-9

Recommendation: CDFW recommends constructing wildlife friendly fencing within the Right of Way of highways or roads as a part of the RTP. Four-foot fencing may not be an appropriate height for all projects, fencing height should be analyzed to not trap or harm wildlife. CDFW also recommends the use of blue temporary fencing when available. Blue fencing is more visible to ungulates and more appropriate in wildlife corridors with high traffic of these species. Please refer to Attachment 4, *A Landowner's Guide to Fences and Wildlife* for examples of wildlife friendly fencing.

COMMENT 9: Incidental Take Permit for CESA listed Species

Issue: The DPEIR covers multiple future projects throughout El Dorado County including highways, local streets and roads, transit, bicycle, aviation, and goods movement projects and may impact multiple CESA listed species. The DPEIR fails to mention and incorporate special status species into their site-specific biological resources technical reports. The DPEIR doesn't analyze impacts to special status species or include sufficient measures to reduce impacts to a less than significant level of future projects.

Recommendation: CDFW recommends the DPEIR includes measures that require a qualified biologist complete individual biological assessments for all project areas covered under this DPEIR. Furthermore, CDFW recommends an ITP be obtained where the project has the potential to result in take of a species state-listed as rare, candidate, threatened, or endangered under CESA or NPPA, either through construction or over the life of the project. Plant species not listed as rare, threatened, endangered, or candidates for listing under CESA or NPPA may nevertheless meet the definition of rare or endangered provided in CEQA (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15380, subd. (b)). Please note that mitigation measures that are adequate to reduce impacts to a less-than significant level to meet CEQA requirements may not be enough for the issuance of an ITP. To issue an ITP, CDFW must demonstrate that the impacts of the authorized take will be minimized and fully mitigated (Fish & G. Code § 2081 (b)). To facilitate the issuance of an ITP, CDFW recommends the DPEIR include species specific measures to minimize and fully mitigate the impacts to any state-listed species the project activities have the potential to take.

A-10

ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

CEQA requires that information developed in environmental impact reports and negative declarations be incorporated into a database which may be used to make subsequent or supplemental environmental determinations (Pub. Resources Code, § 21003, subd. (e).) Accordingly, please report any special-status species and natural communities detected during Project surveys to the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). The CNDDDB field survey form can be found at the following link: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Submitting-Data>. The completed form can be submitted online or mailed electronically to CNDDDB at the following email address: CNDDDB@wildlife.ca.gov.

FILING FEES

The project, as proposed, would have an impact on fish and/or wildlife, and assessment of filing fees is necessary. Fees are payable upon filing of the Notice of Determination by the Lead Agency and serve to help defray the cost of environmental review by CDFW. Payment of the fee is required in order for the underlying project approval to be operative, vested, and final. (Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, § 753.5; Fish & G. Code, § 711.4; Pub. Resources Code, § 21089.)

CONCLUSION

Pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21092 and § 21092.2, CDFW requests written notification of proposed actions and pending decisions regarding the proposed project. Written notifications shall be directed to: California Department of Fish and Wildlife North Central Region, 1701 Nimbus Road, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670 or emailed to R2CEQA@wildlife.ca.gov.

CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the DPEIR for the 2025-2045 El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan to assist El Dorado County Transportation Commission in identifying and mitigating Project impacts on biological resources. CDFW personnel are available for consultation regarding biological resources and strategies to minimize and/or mitigate impacts. Questions regarding this letter or further coordination should be directed to Caitlyn Oswald, Environmental Scientist at (916) 358-4315 or caitlyn.oswalt@wldlife.ca.gov.

REFERENCES

Beiswenger, R. E. 1977. Diet patterns of aggregative behavior in tadpoles of *Bufo americanus*, in relation to light and temperature. *Ecology* 58:98–108.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2016. *California State Wildlife Action Plan, Transportation Planning Companion Plan*. Prepared by Blue Earth Consultants, LLC., Sacramento, CA.

Cantor R., Craig, Griffith, J.S. 1995. Nocturnal emergence of juvenile rainbow trout from winter concealment relative to light intensity. *Hydrobiologia* Vol. 299: 179-18.

A-11

Longcore, T., and C. Rich. 2004. Ecological light pollution - Review. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 2:191–198.

Miller, M. W. 2006. Apparent effects of light pollution on singing behavior of American robins. *The Condor* 108:130–139.

Stone, E. L., G. Jones, and S. Harris. 2009. Street lighting disturbs commuting bats. *Current Biology* 19:1123–1127. Elsevier Ltd.

Thanks,

Caitlyn Oswald

(She/Her)

Environmental Scientist | 916.358.4315

North Central Region – Region 2

1701 Nimbus Road, Rancho Cordova

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

^[1] CEQA is codified in the California Public Resources Code in section 21000 et seq. The “CEQA Guidelines” are found in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, commencing with section 15000.

Response to Letter A: Caitlyn Oswalt, California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Response A-1: The commentor provides several introductory paragraphs providing their understanding of the project and stating their agency's responsibility relating to the Fish and Game Code. They have indicated that they are a Trustee Agency, and are a Responsible Agency for the proposed Project.

- This comment is noted. The EDCTC recognizes the role and regulatory oversight of the CDFW on projects within their jurisdiction. This comment does not warrant any revisions to the DEIR.

Response A-2: The comment is related to the discussion of Aesthetics in the Draft EIR, specifically related to potential lighting impacts (Impact 3.1-2) affecting biological resources.

- Section 3.1-2 of the Draft EIR evaluates the potential impacts related to new sources of light and glare associated with implementation of the proposed Project. This analysis is typically focused on sensitive receptors, such as residences; however, the same rationale can be applied towards other sensitive receptors, including biological resources and/or habitat areas. Nevertheless, this comment warrants text revisions to page 3.1-14 to include habitat areas.

It is important to note that not all the individual projects proposed under the RTP would include new sources of lighting, as lighting would mostly be associated with new roadways, new illuminated signage and/or temporary construction lighting. Most of the proposed RTP projects would not be sited adjacent to streams supporting salmonid species.

Furthermore, each individual implementing project under the RTP would be required to undergo its own project-specific review under CEQA, and future projects that could take place near streambeds or other areas with that may contain sensitive biological resources would be required to obtain permits from the appropriate authorities, including, but not limited to, CDFW. Based on the nature of the future project, CDFW may require specific mitigation measures to reduce risks on a project-by-project manner.

RTP EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1-3 requires that RTP projects shall be designed to meet minimum safety and security standards and to avoid spillover lighting to sensitive uses, including habitat and open space areas adjacent to a project site, consisting of a listing of design standards for luminaries and the minimization of light spillover. Exterior lighting features are to be shielded to confine light to the boundaries of the subject project. Where more intense lighting is necessary for safety purposes, the design shall include landscaping to block light from sensitive

uses, such as residences; however, this measure would also minimize impacts to biological resources, as well.

The intent of the mitigation measure is to ensure that lighting provides sufficient visibility and color rendering for human safety while avoiding overly harsh or unnatural illumination. The term does not prescribe specific spectral output. The DEIR clarifies that lighting fixtures selected for the Project will comply with the latest energy efficiency standards (California Title 24) and will utilize fixtures designed to minimize ecological disruption.

RTP EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1-3 requires that RTP projects shall be designed to meet minimum safety and security standards and to avoid spillover lighting to sensitive uses, including habitat and open space areas adjacent to a project site, consisting of a listing of design standards for luminaries and the minimization of light spillover. Exterior lighting features are to be shielded to confine light to the boundaries of the specific project. Where more intense lighting is necessary for safety purposes, the design shall include landscaping to block light from sensitive uses, such as residences; however, this mitigation measure will be revised to address lighting impacts to biological resources, as well.

While the scientific literature is still evolving, it is generally recognized that light in the 400–500 nanometer (nm) range, particularly around 460 nm, can influence melatonin production. To further reduce potential biological effects, the Project will utilize warm-white light emitting diode (LED) fixtures with a correlated color temperature (CCT) of 3000 Kelvin or lower, consistent with recommendations by the American Medical Association (AMA, 2016) and the International Dark-Sky Association (IDA). Such lighting emphasizes longer wavelengths (amber/red) and reduces the proportion of blue light compared to higher-CCT LEDs.

Therefore, Mitigation Measure 3.1-1 has been refined to clarify that:

1. All luminaries will be shielded and directed away from adjacent habitat and open space areas; and
2. Exterior lighting will utilize warm-white (≤ 3000 K CCT) LED fixtures or equivalent to minimize blue light emissions, while maintaining safety and functionality for project users.

The revisions are reflected in Section 3.0 Errata. This refinement ensures that the measure is both enforceable and environmentally responsive, consistent with CEQA requirements. The revisions enhance the existing text.

Response A-3: The commentor states that the Draft EIR incorrectly interprets the protections provided by the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA).

- This comment warrants text revisions to page 3.4-8 to include CDFW's preferred interpretation of California Fish and Game Code Sections 1900 through 1913, as recommended by the commenter. The revisions are reflected in Section 3.0 Errata. The revisions enhance the existing text.

Response A-4: The commentor states that due to the programmatic nature of the Draft EIR, all potential temporary, permanent, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral rivers, streams, and other hydrologically connected aquatic features could not be fully analyzed. In addition, the comment states that the Draft EIR does not accurately define which activities are subject to CDFW jurisdiction.

- As noted in the comment, due to the programmatic nature of the Draft EIR, full and complete analysis of all potential impacts to biological resources and hydrologic features under the jurisdiction of CDFW could not be fully evaluated therein. However, each individual implementing project under the RTP would be required to undergo its own project-specific review under CEQA, and future projects that could take place near streambeds or other areas that may contain sensitive biological resources would be required to obtain permits from the appropriate authorities, including, but not limited to, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Based on the nature of the future RTP project, CDFW may require specific avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures, as appropriate, to reduce risks on a project-by-project manner.

The commentor states that CDFW jurisdiction depends upon the topography and individual site conditions which may affect how project activities impact rivers, streams, and lakes and which activities are subject to California Fish and Game Code Section 1602. This comment warrants text revisions to page 3.4-8 to include CDFW's preferred interpretation of Fish and Game Code Sections 1600 through 1616. The revisions are reflected in Section 3.0 Errata. The revisions enhance the existing text.

Response A-5: The commentor states that the Draft EIR does not adequately address wildlife connectivity and specifically wildlife vehicle collision mortality for deer herds and other wildlife that may migrate within the project area.

- Project design and details is not developed at the RTP stage, instead, the project list offers conceptual project ideas that require design, engineering, and evaluation before they could be constructed. At the time of individual project applications, project-specific studies would be required to address specific wildlife connectivity impacts, including wildlife vehicle collision risks. As each individual project location has unique circumstances, those risks would need to be evaluated on a project-by-project basis, as indicated in the DEIR. Furthermore, this issue is already addressed in the El Dorado General Plan Conservation and

Open Space Element, as indicated on DEIR pages 3.4-11 to 3.4-14, which lists Objective 7.4.2, *Identify and Protect Resources*, and its related policies, including Policy 7.4.2.5, relating to setbacks and conservation of contiguous blocks of important habitat to offset the effects of habitat loss and fragmentation for special status species, and habitats, including migratory deer. Policy 7.4.2.5(B) also requires wildlife movement protection for future roadway construction projects, stating that wildlife movement impacts will be considered based on the conditions of the project site and surrounding property to determine how best to mitigate a project's impacts on wildlife movement and associated public safety. Furthermore, the RTP project list includes the installation of "Animal Vehicle Collision Avoidance Systems" along Highway 49 and US 50, which would provide additional protection for wildlife along these roadways in the future. As all future implementing projects would be required to comply with existing regulations, this comment does not warrant any revisions to the DEIR. No further response to this comment is warranted.

Response A-6: The commentor indicates that the above-mentioned El Dorado General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element Policy 7.4.2.5(B) is not applicable to two-lane highways.

- El Dorado General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element Policy 7.4.2.5(B) is an existing requirement applicable to all projects in El Dorado County. Project-specific requirements for individual projects implemented under the 2045 RTP would be required to comply with the existing regulations and the mitigation measures incorporated in the DEIR. It is important to note that at the program level, not every conceivable circumstance can be considered because project details are not known at this early planning stage. At the time of individual project applications, project-specific studies would be required to address specific wildlife connectivity impacts, including wildlife vehicle collision risks. As each individual project location has unique circumstances, those risks would need to be evaluated on a project-by-project basis, as indicated in the DEIR.

Furthermore, EIR Mitigation Measure 3.4-5 includes requirements for projects that contain movement habitat, to allow wildlife or fish to move through the transportation corridor, both during and after construction. Consideration is given to projects where El Dorado County and El Dorado County General Plan requirements are insufficient, including requiring coordination with the appropriate regulatory agency, prior to any construction activities. Since all future project implementation would be required to comply with existing regulations and the mitigation measures included in the DEIR, this comment does not warrant any revisions to the DEIR. No further response to this comment is warranted.

Response A-7: The commentor provides suggestions regarding appropriate procedures for potential impacts related to State-listed rare and endangered plants, including Pine Hill endemic plants and their gabbro soil-based habitat. In addition, the commentor restates the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance regarding the acquisition and restoration of rare plant habitat, suggesting that the DEIR instruct future project proponents to incorporate survey protocols.

- The proposed project does not directly cause impacts to special status species and the design process for individual improvements included as part of the proposed project would require that each project demonstrate consistency with the policies that are established in the El Dorado County General Plan for the purpose of protecting biological resources, including special status species and their habitat. The DEIR incorporates Mitigation measure 3.4-1, which requires that prior to final approval of individual projects, the implementing agency shall have a qualified biologist conduct a field reconnaissance of the environmental limits of each project in an effort to identify any biological constraints for the project, including special status plants, animals, and their habitats, as well as protected natural communities including wetland and terrestrial communities. If the biologist identifies protected biological resources within the limits of the project, the implementing agency shall first prepare alternative designs that seek to avoid and/or minimize impacts to the biological resources. If the project cannot be designed without complete avoidance, the implementing agency shall coordinate with the appropriate regulatory agency (i.e., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) to obtain regulatory permits and implement project-specific mitigation prior to any construction activities. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 provides the appropriate protections for potential impacts to special-status plants and their habitats, and any additional mitigation measures utilizing habitat restoration, conservation, and/or preservation, in addition to avoidance and minimization measures, would be addressed as required by the appropriate agency on a project-by-project basis. This comment is noted and does not warrant any revisions to the DEIR.

Response A-8: The commentor provides suggestions related to the foothill yellow-legged frog (*Rana boylei*, or FYLF), which is known to occur in El Dorado County. The commentor states that the DEIR does not include the appropriate avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels, including full mitigation for project-related impacts in accordance with CESA. The commentor recommends that the DEIR include considerations for avoiding or minimizing project-specific impacts to FYLF, and a list of survey protocols is referenced.

- The proposed project does not directly cause impacts to special status species and the design process for individual improvements included as part of the proposed project would require that each individual project demonstrate consistency with the policies that are established in the El Dorado County General Plan for the purpose of protecting biological resources, including special status species that their habitat. As noted in the DEIR, field reconnaissance would be required to precisely identify the potential impacts to special-status species, including the FYLF. The requirement to obtain regulatory permits and demonstrate consistency with applicable local, regional, State and federal regulations that protect special-status species would be applicable for all implementing projects. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 provides the appropriate protections for potential impacts to FYLF and their habitats, and any additional mitigation measures utilizing habitat restoration, conservation, and/or preservation, in addition to avoidance and minimization measures, would be address and required by the appropriate agency on a project-by-project basis. This comment is noted and does not warrant any revisions to the DEIR.

Response A-9: The comment is related to the wildlife-friendly fencing within the right of way or highways or roads as part of the RTP, indicating that four-foot fencing may not be an appropriate height for all projects and that blue fencing is a preferred color for deer visibility, as compared to the orange fencing included in Mitigation Measure 3.4-3.

- DEIR Mitigation Measure 3.4-3 is related to the protection of riparian habitats, focused on erosion control and slope stabilization, near environmentally sensitive areas around wetlands, riparian areas, and other aquatic habitats. It states that temporary fences around the environmentally sensitive areas will be installed as the first order of work. Temporary fences will be furnished, constructed, maintained, and removed as shown on the plans, as specified in the special provisions, and as directed by the project engineer. The fencing will be commercial-quality woven polypropylene, orange in color, and at least four feet high (Tensor Polygrid or equivalent). The fencing will be tightly strung on posts with a maximum 10-foot spacing. Should project-specific fencing be required in a right of way in areas more common in high Wildlife Vehicle Conflict Areas, this would be addressed by incorporating EIR Mitigation Measure 3.4-5, which includes requirements for projects that contain movement habitat, in order to allow wildlife or fish to move through the transportation corridor, both during and after construction. Consideration is given to projects where El Dorado County and El Dorado County General Plan requirements are insufficient, including requiring coordination with the appropriate regulatory agency, prior to any construction activities. Should blue fencing at a specific height be required at specific areas to protect ungulates or other species movement, all future

implementing projects would be required to comply with existing regulations and the mitigation measures included in the DEIR. This comment is noted and does not warrant any revisions to the DEIR.

Response A-10: The commentor indicates that the DEIR fails to mention and incorporate special-status species into site-specific biological resources technical reports and that there are insufficient measures to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The commentor further recommends that measures include a requirement for individual biological assessments for all project areas covered under the DEIR. In addition, it is further recommended that an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) be obtained where the project has the potential to result in a take of a special-status species.

- As discussed above in Responses A-7 and A-8, the proposed project does not directly cause impacts to special status species because it does not have any direct physical changes to the environment, rather, the proposed RTP is a long range planning document. The design process for individual improvements listed in the RTP and included as part of the proposed project would require that each project demonstrate consistency with the policies that are established in the County and City General Plans, in addition to State and federal regulations, for the purpose of protecting biological resources, including special status species and their habitat. Furthermore, project-specific requirements for individual projects implemented under the 2045 RTP would be required to comply with the existing regulations and the mitigation measures incorporated in the DEIR.

As noted in the DEIR, field reconnaissance would be required to precisely identify the potential impacts to identified special-status species. Field reconnaissance of a project can not be performed at this early planning stage, because there are no project details, no project footprint, and no physical changes to the environment that are proposed. The requirement to obtain regulatory permits and demonstrate consistency with applicable local, regional, State and federal regulations that protect special-status species would be applicable for all implementing projects. Should an ITP be required for a specific project, compliance with CDFW regulations, in accordance with CESA and any other applicable regulations, would be required. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 provides the appropriate protections for potential impacts to FYLF and their habitats, and any additional mitigation measures utilizing habitat restoration, conservation, and/or preservation, in addition to avoidance and minimization measures, would be addressed and required by the appropriate agency on a project-by-project basis. This comment is noted and does not warrant any revisions to the DEIR.

Response A-11: The commentor provides a conclusion to the letter, as well as restating standard CDFW procedures related to reporting any special-status species and natural communities detected during project surveys to the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) and the requirement to pay filing fees, as required.

- The requirement to provide appropriate reporting to CNDDDB and the payment of fees is understood and will be complied with on a project-by-project basis, as required by CDFW. This comment is noted and does not warrant any revisions to the DEIR.

Letter B

CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

GAVIN NEWSOM, GOVERNOR

California Department of Transportation

DISTRICT 3
 703 B STREET | MARYSVILLE, CA 95901-5556
 (530) 741-4572 | FAX (530) 741-4245 TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov



August 14, 2025

Jerry Barton
 Senior Transportation Planner
 El Dorado County Transportation Commission
 2828 Easy Suite 1
 Placerville, CA 95667

Dear Mr. Barton:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) Draft 2025 RTP. Our team appreciates the opportunity to contribute to the plan's development and are providing the following comments, which are aligned with the RTP Checklist for Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs).

Environmental Impact Report (EIR):

- **Page 3.3-15-3.3-17:** The president has revoked the CA waiver, meaning that the Omnibus Low-NOx Rule, Low Emission Vehicle (LEV) program, and the On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicles program are no longer enforceable. B-1
- **Page 3.4-12:** The policy outlined in objective 7.5.2 highlights historic or eligible buildings but does not mention bridges, even though the county has several listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). B-2
- **Page 3.4-3 (PDF Page 157):** Trout Fisheries: first sentence, trout are not anadromous unless they are steelhead. B-3
- **Page 3.4 (PDF Page 167 B):** In addition to adding extra lanes or widening roads, which can trigger the need for connectivity considerations, Caltrans recommends including other scoping elements such as concrete median barriers and guard rails as they impact wildlife movement and necessitate remediation. B-4

"Improving lives and communities through transportation."

- **Page 3.6-19:** Although Mitigation Measures 3.6-1 through 3.6-5 provides a broad policy-based framework, the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) concludes that Impact 3.6-1, concerning greenhouse gas emissions, would remain significant even after mitigation. However, the EIR does not clearly show that all feasible mitigation measures, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), have been explored to decrease the impact to a less-than-significant level. Please provide a clear justification for why the impact remains significant despite the application of all feasible mitigation measures.
- **Page 3.12-15:** "Walking " El Dorado County has many challenges with where existing sidewalk are located. However, where feasible, enhancements to these sidewalks should aim to meet the Federal Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) standards. Additionally, when county roads intersect with the state highway system, improvements should adhere to Caltrans ADA standards.
- **Page 3.12-31:** Please confirm if the study includes a comparison between a "no-RTB project" scenario and the RTP scenario to help isolate the specific impact of the RTP projects. Additionally, please identify which types of RTP projects, such as new lanes or transit service expansions, are primarily responsible for the anticipated increases or decreases in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).
- **ES 3.4-3:** Caltrans recommends looking at all potential crossing options to enhance wildlife connectivity. This includes considering under crossings where feasible, installing fencing around existing underpasses, and enlarging culverts. There are various methods available under CEQA to improve connectivity, and Caltrans encourages El Dorado County to explore these possibilities.

B-5

B-6

B-7

B-8

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Project List:

- Managed lanes projects and strategies identified in the Draft 2025 RTP should align and be consistent with those identified in the Caltrans District 3 Managed Lanes System Plan, Deputy Directive on Managed Lane Facilities (DD-43-R2), and all other Managed Lane guidance developed by the department.
- There are multiple bicycle and pedestrian projects improvements that intersect at US 50 interchanges. It is crucial to ensure that these improvements should not be implemented on local streets where overpasses or underpasses cannot geometrically accommodate bicycles, which would trap bikes in vehicular traffic. While some cyclists may feel comfortable, others may not. Therefore, it is always a good practice to separate bicycles from vehicles

B-9

"Improving lives and communities through transportation."

- **Page 1 MAPID 10:** Please modify the project description to include a reference to new signals at Bass Lake Road interchange as Caltrans previously met with El Dorado County regarding potential upgrades, and we want to ensure those are reflected in the RTP.
- **Page 1:** Lead Agency should be updated to Caltrans District 3 for Cameron Park Dr. to Ponderosa Rd. & Ponderosa Rd. to Greenstone Rd projects.

B-9 Cont.

Chapter 1:

- **Page 1:** The RTP vision/purpose section does not outline specific climate adaptation or resiliency goals. Please clarify how the commission plan ensures alignment with state climate change legislation and executive orders.

B-10

Chapter 4:

- **Page 15:** Priority 8 lists requirements and policies set forth in regard to air quality, environmental quality, and adoption of electric vehicles, but does not list how the County/Commission is prioritizing environmental quality.

B-11

Chapter 5:

- **Page 2 (Goal 2, Objective A, Strategy 4):** Please clarify how the County ensures this effort goes beyond the minimal requirements set forth by CEQA/NEPA.

B-12

Chapter 7:

- **Goal 2:** There are numerous descriptions of issues and related policies in California. However, there is insufficient discussion on how the County/Commission is actively working to achieve policy goals or address climate/resiliency issues. The performance measures themselves appear inadequate to accomplish Goal 2. Additionally, there seems to be a greater emphasis on climate disaster response compared to other sustainability and resiliency issues.

B-13

Chapter 9:

- **Page 12:** Please consider evaluating opportunities for mobility hubs lots along US 50 to serve as future connections to intercity or commuter rail services. This would enhance long-term multimodal access and facilitate future integration with regional rail systems.
- **Page 14:** The existing transit schedule between South Lake Tahoe and

B-14

"Improving lives and communities through transportation."

Sacramento is not ideal for day trips in either direction. To enhance support for day-use travel and tourism, it would be beneficial to explore schedule adjustments or service expansions that permit longer stays at each destination.

B-15

RTP Check List:

- The RTP checklist specifies that the policy, action, and financial elements are addressed in Chapters 1, 6, and 14. To provide clarity and ease of reference, please provide page numbers within these chapters where each of these elements is discussed.
- #1-8: The Financial Section of the RTP checklist is currently blank. It is noted that it has been marked as "in progress" Once the chapter is finalized, please ensure to fill in the boxes with the appropriate information.
- In several sections of the RTP, the Financial Element is identified as Chapter 13. However, Chapter 13 is the Regional Equity and Collaboration Chapter. According to the RTP checklist, the Financial Element should be Chapter 14. Once the Financial Elements Chapter is finalized, please update references from Chapter 13 to Chapter 14 (such as on Chapter 2, page 12).
- Please specify the page number #4 can be found in the EIR.
- Since an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared, ND or MND is not applicable. Please ensure that "YES" is removed for a Negative or Mitigated Negative Declaration in section #5.

B-16

If you have questions regarding the comments or require additional information, please contact Randeep Lally by email Randeep.Lally@dot.ca.gov or by phone (530) 821-3897.

Sincerely,

Sukhwinder K. Johal

Sukhwinder (Sukhi) Johal
Branch Chief – Regional Planning – South Office
California Department of Transportation, District 3

c: Neil Dixon, Regional Coordination Acting Branch Chief, Caltrans HQ
Camilo Juarez, Regional Planning Liaison, Caltrans HQ

"Improving lives and communities through transportation."

Caltrans District 3 EDCTC RTP Comment Letter

Final Audit Report

2025-08-14

Created:	2025-08-14
By:	Randeep Lally (s154262@dot.ca.gov)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAx3rh0RYNyww/vxteRMQPZrYRPy3lrxGn

"Caltrans District 3 EDCTC RTP Comment Letter" History

-  Document created by Randeep Lally (s154262@dot.ca.gov)
2025-08-14 - 10:41:48 PM GMT - IP address: 149.136.17.252
-  Document emailed to Sukhi Johal (s114158@dot.ca.gov) for signature
2025-08-14 - 10:42:14 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Sukhi Johal (s114158@dot.ca.gov)
2025-08-14 - 10:42:24 PM GMT - IP address: 54.85.243.228
-  Document e-signed by Sukhi Johal (s114158@dot.ca.gov)
Signature Date: 2025-08-14 - 10:58:14 PM GMT - Time Source: server - IP address: 149.136.17.246
-  Agreement completed.
2025-08-14 - 10:58:14 PM GMT



Powered by
Adobe
Acrobat Sign

Response to Letter B: Sukhwinder Johal, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

Response B-1: The comment is introductory in nature and provides information regarding how President Trump has revoked the California Waiver, including the California Omnibus Low-NOx Rule, Low Emission Vehicle (LEV) program, and the On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicles program, and these programs are now no longer enforceable.

- The DEIR acknowledges recent federal actions affecting the State’s waiver authority. The CEQA analysis presents a regulatory framework, including the California Air Resources Board’s (CARB) Scoping Plan and State Implementation Plan (SIP) commitments. The comment warrants text revisions to the DEIR. The revisions are reflected in Section 3.0 Errata. The revisions enhance the correct text.

Response B-2: The comment refers to El Dorado County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element Objective 7.5.2, *Visual Integrity*, focused on the maintenance of the visual integrity of historic resources, noting that this objective does not mention bridges, even though El Dorado County has several listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

- The El Dorado County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element is an existing planning document, guiding growth and development throughout El Dorado County; therefore, the DEIR would not be able to revise the language of an existing regulatory document. However, Section 3.5, *Cultural Resources*, of the DEIR includes the analysis of potential impacts to historical resources, in the discussion of Impact 3.5-1. The evaluation of historical resources indicates that implementation of individual RTP improvement projects “may occur near or in close vicinity to architectural resources (buildings/structures/features) that are 50 years or older.” This could include resources that are historically significant and eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) of the NRHP. While historical bridges are not specifically referenced in the DEIR, architectural resources, such as buildings, structures and features, are referenced.

Furthermore, DEIR Mitigation Measure 3.5-1 includes the requirement that during the environmental review process of individual RTP improvement projects, the implementing agencies shall retain a qualified architectural historian to inventory and evaluate architectural resources located in the project area using criteria for listing in the CRHR. There are specific procedures regarding the preparation of the appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms and recordation procedures. If architectural resources are

deemed as potentially eligible for the CRHR or NRHP, the implementing agency shall consider avoidance through project redesign and/specific documentation and recordation procedures. As such, Mitigation Measure 3.5-1 would be applicable to all eligible structures, including bridges. This comment is noted and does not warrant any revisions to the DEIR.

Response B-3: The comment provides clarifying information that trout are not considered anadromous unless they are steelhead.

- The text related to *Salmon and Trout Fisheries*, provided on page 3.4-3 of the DEIR, will be revised to clarify that trout is generally non-anadromous, except for steelhead. This correction does not alter the impact analysis. As such, this comment warrants text revisions to the DEIR. The revisions are reflected in Section 3.0 Errata. The revisions enhance the existing text.

Response B-4: The comment refers to El Dorado County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element Policy 7.4.2.(B) and recommends adding extra lanes or widening roads, which can trigger the need for connectivity considerations and recommends including other scoping elements, such as concrete median barriers and guard rails, as they impact wildlife movement and necessitate remediation.

- Refer to response A-6, above. El Dorado General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element Policy 7.4.2.5(B) are an existing requirement which is applicable to all projects in El Dorado County; however, project-specific requirements for individual projects implemented under the 2045 RTP would be required to comply with the existing regulations and the mitigation measures incorporated in the DEIR. At the time of individual project applications, project-specific studies would be required to address specific wildlife connectivity impacts. Furthermore, the RTP project list includes the installation of “Animal Vehicle Collision Avoidance Systems” along Highway 49 and US 50, which would provide additional protection for wildlife along these roadways in the future. As each individual project location has unique circumstances, including the presence of concrete median barriers and guard rails, those risks would need to be evaluated on a project-by-project basis, as indicated in the DEIR.

Furthermore, EIR Mitigation Measure 3.4-5 includes requirements for projects that contain movement habitat, to allow wildlife or fish to move through the transportation corridor, both during and after construction. Consideration is given to projects where El Dorado County and El Dorado County General Plan requirements are insufficient, including requiring coordination with the appropriate regulatory agency, prior to any construction activities. As all future implementing projects would be required to comply with existing regulations and

the mitigation measures included in the DEIR, this comment is noted and does not warrant any revisions to the DEIR.

Response B-5: The comment discusses the evaluation in DEIR Section 3.6, Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change, and Energy, specifically that even with incorporation of Mitigation Measures 3.6-1 through 3.6-5, which provide programmatic mitigation measures regarding greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The comment states that the DEIR does not clearly show that all feasible mitigation measures, as required by CEQA, have not been fully explored to decrease impacts to less than significant levels. Justification for why these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable is requested.

- The EIR concludes that GHG impacts remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation, consistent with CEQA Guidelines §15126.4. All feasible measures—including VMT reduction strategies, infill prioritization, and consistency with SB 375 GHG targets—were incorporated based on what is known at this time. It is noted that individual project details are not known at this time and project specific mitigation cannot be developed, nor can a conclusion be provided at this time that the impacts of those individual projects will be, are can be, reduced to an insignificant level. It is anticipated that a project specific environmental analysis will be performed on individual projects once those projects are designed and ready for analysis.

Implementation of the Mitigation Measures 3.6-1 through 3.6-5 would assist in the further reduction of per capita VMT levels throughout El Dorado County, reducing overall emissions beyond what would be expected without mitigation, which will assist in meeting the stated goals of Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 32. However, even after implementation of all the policies, action plans, and mitigation measures included in the RTP and the DEIR, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) has estimated that there will be an overall increase in transportation-related CO₂ emissions generated in El Dorado County over the planning horizon. A Statement of Overriding Considerations will be adopted, as required under CEQA. This comment is noted and does not warrant any revisions to the DEIR.

Response B-6: The comment is related to EDCTC's adopted 2020 Active Transportation Plans (ATP) for the City of Placerville and El Dorado County, specifically related to the pedestrian network. The comment indicates that sidewalk enhancements should aim to meet the federal Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) standards, and where El Dorado County roads intersect with the State highway system, improvements should adhere to Caltrans standards with respect to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

EDCTC's 2020 ATP is an existing set of plans, which are applicable to all projects in El Dorado County and the City of Placerville. As such, the proposed project would not result in changes to the existing regulatory setting; however, project-specific requirements for individual projects implemented under the 2045 RTP would be required to comply with the existing regulations, such as PROWAG and Caltrans ADA standards, in addition to the mitigation measures incorporated in the DEIR. Therefore, this comment is noted and does not warrant any revisions to the DEIR.

Response B-7: The comment requests clarification regarding the comparison of impacts related to project and the no project scenarios. In addition, the comment requests information regarding which types of RTP projects would be responsible for the anticipated increase or decrease in total Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

- The DEIR included a no-project scenario consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e). The No Project alternative represents the existing conditions, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved. CEQA says that when a project involves the revision of an existing plan, the no-project alternative should reflect continuation of the existing plan. For purposes of the EIR analysis, the No Project Alternative is the continuation of El Dorado County's currently adopted 2040 RTP into the future. However, it was noted in the DEIR that some of the funding programmed for projects under the adopted RTP will not be available until such time that there is an update to the RTP. Therefore, under the No Project Alternative, the EDCTC would not be able to carry out all the transportation projects in the current RTP, because it would fall into a lapse and the approved RTP would no longer be valid. Hypothetically, the EDCTC could consider approving an unchanged RTP instead of letting it lapse, however, this hypothetical is not what was analyzed—No Project scenario was analyzed as No Action alternative.

It is noted, however, that as shown in DEIR Table 3.12-5, *Total Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Service Population – El Dorado County*, total VMT is presented for the baseline (2020) condition and the 2050 forecast. As described in the DEIR, the increase in VMT is due to the increase in population and new jobs in the region and not because of the RTP. As such, the additional population would be primarily responsible for the increase in VMT.

Increased transit service and alternative methods of transportation are a strategy to decrease VMT in the region, and the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.12-1 would be expected to result in VMT reductions as it would implement a number of VMT reduction strategies, such as increasing the diversity of land uses, providing pedestrian network improvements, providing traffic calming measures

and low-stress bicycle network improvements, implementing car-sharing programs, increasing transit service frequency and speed, encouraging telecommuting and alternative work schedules, and providing ride-share programs. In addition, at the regional level, for roadway capacity expansion projects, demand management through transportation systems management and operations, including the use of pricing, would be required, as well as other programs intended to provide infill incentives and support for transit and innovative mobility as key elements of filling the VMT gap. This comment does not warrant any revisions to the DEIR.

Response B-8: The comment is related to Biological Resources Impact 3.4-3, related to the project's potential to interfere with the movement of any native or resident migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The comment indicates that Caltrans recommends looking at all potential crossing options to enhance wildlife connectivity, including under crossings, fencing around existing underpasses, and enlarging culverts.

- Project design and details are not developed at the RTP stage; instead, the project list offers conceptual project ideas that require design, engineering, and evaluation before they could be constructed. At the time of individual project applications, project-specific studies would be required to address specific wildlife connectivity impacts. As each individual project location has unique circumstances, those risks would need to be evaluated on a project-by-project basis, as indicated in the DEIR. Furthermore, this issue is addressed in the El Dorado General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element, as indicated on DEIR pages 3.4-11 to 3.4-14, which lists Objective 7.4.2, *Identify and Project Resources*, and its related policies, including Policy 7.4.2.5, relating to setbacks and conservation of contiguous blocks of important habitat to offset the effects of habitat loss and fragmentation for special status species, and habitats, including migratory wildlife. Policy 7.4.2.5(B) also requires wildlife movement protection for future roadway construction projects, stating that wildlife movement impacts will be considered based on the conditions of the project site and surrounding property to determine how best to mitigate a project's impacts on wildlife movement and associated public safety. Furthermore, the RTP project list includes the installation of "Animal Vehicle Collision Avoidance Systems" along Highway 49 and US 50, which would provide additional protection for wildlife along these roadways in the future.

The proposed project does not directly cause impacts to special status species and the design process for individual improvements included as part of the proposed project would require that each project demonstrate consistency with the policies that are established in the County and City General Plans for the

purpose of protecting biological resources, including special status species and their habitat. At the time of individual project applications, project-specific studies would be required to address specific wildlife connectivity impacts. As each individual project location has unique circumstances, those risks and potential engineered controls would need to be evaluated on a project-by-project basis, as indicated in the DEIR.

Furthermore, EIR Mitigation Measure 3.4-5 includes requirements for projects that contain movement habitat, to allow wildlife or fish to move through the transportation corridor, both during and after construction. Compliance with regulatory agency requirements related to project-specific wildlife crossing protections would be required. Consideration is also given to projects where El Dorado County and El Dorado County General Plan requirements are insufficient, including requiring coordination with the appropriate regulatory agency, prior to any construction activities. As all future implementing projects would be required to comply with existing regulations and the mitigation measures included in the DEIR, this comment does not warrant any revisions to the DEIR. No further response to this comment is warranted.

Response B-9: This comment is related to the 2045 RTP document, and it is not related to the evaluation of environmental impacts presented the DEIR. The comment notes five RTP checklist items as follows:

“Managed lanes projects and strategies identified in the Draft 2025 RTP should align and be consistent with those identified in the Caltrans District 3 Managed Lanes System Plan, Deputy Directive on Managed Lane Facilities (DD-43-R2), and all other Managed Lane guidance developed by the department.”

- The managed lane projects in the EDCTC RTP 2025-2045 include the following:
 1. US 50 HOV Lane Extension: Cameron Park Drive to Ponderosa Road
 2. US 50 HOV Lane Extension: Ponderosa Road to Greenstone Road

Both projects are listed as Beyond 2045 and as such are included in the unconstrained project list.

“There are multiple bicycle and pedestrian projects improvements that intersect at US 50 interchanges. It is crucial to ensure that these improvements should not be implemented on local streets where overpasses or underpasses cannot geometrically accommodate bicycles, which would trap bikes in vehicular traffic. While some cyclists may feel comfortable, others may not. Therefore, it is always a good practice to separate bicycles from vehicles.”

- This is an issue to be addressed in engineering design.

“Page 1 MAPID 10: Please modify the project description to include a reference to new signals at Bass Lake Road interchange as Caltrans previously met with El Dorado County regarding potential upgrades, and we want to ensure those are reflected in the RTP.”

- The project description has been edited and now reads as follows: This project includes study to identify and complete improvements as needed including new signals; Phase 1 may also include ramp widening, road widening, and WB auxiliary lane (lane between ramps of adjacent interchanges) between Bass Lake and Silva Valley interchanges.

“Page 1: Lead Agency should be updated to Caltrans District 3 for Cameron Park Dr. to Ponderosa Rd. & Ponderosa Rd. to Greenstone Rd projects.”

- Updated as requested.

Response B-10: This comment is related to the 2045 RTP document, and it is not related to the evaluation of environmental impacts presented the DEIR. The comment notes *“The RTP vision/purpose section does not outline specific climate adaptation or resiliency goals. Please clarify how the commission plan ensures alignment with state climate change legislation and executive orders.”*

- The vision/purpose of the RTP reflects the direct and intentional coordination with local partner agencies of El Dorado County, the City of Placerville, El Dorado Transit and others. This is not a statewide plan solely focused on combating climate change through transportation investments. The EDCTC RTP reflects the actual transportation investments that are needed to support the safety, well-being and prosperity of El Dorado County and all those who use the transportation system throughout. Nonetheless, the EDCTC RTP includes strategies and projects that align with and support state directives around sustainability and climate resiliency.

Response B-11: This comment is related to the 2045 RTP document, and it is not related to the evaluation of environmental impacts presented the DEIR. The comment notes *“Priority 8 lists requirements and policies set forth in regard to air quality, environmental quality, and adoption of electric vehicles, but does not list how the County/Commission is prioritizing environmental quality.”*

- Environmental quality, specifically air quality, is one of many priorities identified throughout the RTP. While not a sole focus, many of the investments contained in the RTP, such as active transportation and transit projects, will contribute to improving and protecting our environment.

Response B-12: This comment is related to the 2045 RTP document, and it is not related to the evaluation of environmental impacts presented the DEIR. The comment notes *“(Goal 2, Objective*

A, Strategy 4): *Please clarify how the County ensures this effort goes beyond the minimal requirements set forth by CEQA/NEPA.”*

- Requirements set forth in CEQA/NEPA while important, often come with high costs and additional resource allocation. Project delivery in rural regions of California already presents significant costs, therefore any attempts to go beyond the standards set in statute are likely unreasonable and unrealistic.

Response B-13: This comment is related to the 2045 RTP document, and it is not related to the evaluation of environmental impacts presented the DEIR. The comment notes *“Goal 2: There are numerous descriptions of issues and related policies in California. However, there is insufficient discussion on how the County/Commission is actively working to achieve policy goals or address climate/resiliency issues. The performance measures themselves appear inadequate to accomplish Goal 2. Additionally, there seems to be a greater emphasis on climate disaster response compared to other sustainability and resiliency issues.”*

- This RTP is not a mitigation plan focused solely on combating climate change in the region, nor should it be. Many of the projects are focused on climate adaptation and will assist the region in becoming more resilient to wildfire, flood, and other natural climate related disasters. The included performance measures are consistent with the regions rural characteristics and while not perfect, they demonstrate alignment with and support the stated goal.

Response B-14: This comment is related to the 2045 RTP document, and it is not related to the evaluation of environmental impacts presented the DEIR. The comment notes *“Please consider evaluating opportunities for mobility hubs lots along US 50 to serve as future connections to intercity or commuter rail services. This would enhance long-term multimodal access and facilitate future integration with regional rail systems.”*

- While intercity or regional commuter rail services are not included in the EDCTC RTP 2025-2045, the consideration, analysis, and identification of potential locations for mobility hubs have been added to the RTP. We added a Mobility Zones Implementation Strategy to the Programs and Planning Category of the short-term project list with the following description; Identification and analysis of Mobility Hub locations for US 50 to include, or not limited to; a rest stop on US 50 and Mobility Hub in El Dorado Hills and Camino.

Response B-15: This comment is related to the 2045 RTP document, and it is not related to the evaluation of environmental impacts presented the DEIR. The comment notes *“The existing transit schedule between South Lake Tahoe and Sacramento is not ideal for day trips in either direction. To enhance support for day-use travel and tourism, it would be beneficial to explore schedule adjustments or service expansions that permit longer stays at each destination.”*

- This is a very subjective claim and frankly not supported by any data or analytics on performance of this relatively new service. This service has the best farebox recovery out of all services for El Dorado Transit and has been highly requested for many years.

Response B-16: This comment is related to the 2045 RTP document, and it is not related to the evaluation of environmental impacts presented the DEIR. The comment notes five RTP checklist items as follows:

“The RTP checklist specifies that the policy, action, and financial elements are addressed in Chapters 1, 6, and 14. To provide clarity and ease of reference, please provide page numbers within these chapters where each of these elements is discussed.”

#1-8: The Financial Section of the RTP checklist is currently blank. It is noted that it has been marked as “in progress” Once the chapter is finalized, please ensure to fill in the boxes with the appropriate information.

In several sections of the RTP, the Financial Element is identified as Chapter 13. However, Chapter 13 is the Regional Equity and Collaboration Chapter. According to the RTP checklist, the Financial Element should be Chapter 14. Once the Financial Elements Chapter is finalized, please update references from Chapter 13 to Chapter 14 (such as on Chapter 2, page 12).

Please specify the page number #4 can be found in the EIR.

Since an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared, ND or MND is not applicable. Please ensure that “YES” is removed for a Negative or Mitigated Negative Declaration in section #5.”

- These checklist items are noted, and EDCTC will update the RTP as appropriate.

Letter C

Lighting design not only affects AESTHETICS but also BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

AESTHETICS, 3.1-2. Creation of new sources of light and glare

- **Luminaries will be directed away from habitat and open space areas adjacent to the project site.**
- **Luminaries will provide good color rendering and natural light qualities.**

Mitigation referring to ‘habitat’ and ‘open space areas’ nicely expresses respect for *all forms of life*.

The phrase “natural light qualities” in the 2nd mitigation is not defined. Does it mean full spectrum? LED amber hues? Research shows that light in the 400-500 nm range (blue) suppresses the production of melatonin by the pineal gland in birds and mammals, with 460 nm having a very strong effect. Plants also produce melatonin which regulates circadian parameters related to growth, flowering, leaf drop and other important seasonal development. For EDC projects, wavelengths on the red end of the spectrum are more eco-friendly than LED lights in the blue end of the spectrum.

Links to the research findings mentioned here can be found at:

<https://naturalbornferret.com/alan>

Best,

Kathileen Jermstad
530-957-7337

C-1

Response to Letter C: Kathileen Jermstad, Resident

Response C-1: This comment is regarding the directionality of luminaries and acknowledges the Project’s commitment to minimizing spillover lighting into adjacent habitat and open space areas. The comment seeks further clarity regarding “natural light qualities” and how different ranges and wavelengths of light can affect biological resources. The comment provides a link to research regarding this topic.

- Refer to Response A-2, above. Section 3.1-2 of the Draft EIR evaluates the potential impacts related to new sources of light and glare associated with implementation of the proposed Project. It is important to note that not all the individual projects proposed under the RTP would include new sources of lighting, as lighting would mostly be associated with new roadways, new illuminated signage and/or temporary construction lighting. The comment raises concerns regarding spectral characteristics of light and their potential effects on circadian rhythms of birds, mammals, and plants.

With respect to the reference to “natural light qualities,” the intent of the measure is to ensure that lighting provides sufficient visibility and color rendering for human safety while avoiding overly harsh or unnatural illumination. The term does not prescribe specific spectral output. The DEIR clarifies that lighting fixtures selected for the Project will comply with the latest energy efficiency standards (California Title 24) and will utilize fixtures designed to minimize ecological disruption.

Furthermore, each individual implementing project under the RTP would be required to undergo its own project-specific review under CEQA, and future projects that could take place near streambeds or other areas with that may contain sensitive biological resources would be required to obtain permits from the appropriate authorities, including, but not limited to, CDFW. Based on the nature of the future project, CDFW may require specific mitigation measures to reduce risks on a project-by-project manner.

RTP EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1-3 requires that RTP projects shall be designed to meet minimum safety and security standards and to avoid spillover lighting to sensitive uses, including habitat and open space areas adjacent to a project site, consisting of a listing of design standards for luminaries and the minimization of light spillover. Exterior lighting features are to be shielded to confine light to the boundaries of the subject project. Where more intense lighting is necessary for safety purposes, the design shall include landscaping to block light from sensitive uses, such as residences; however, this mitigation measure will be revised to address lighting impacts to biological resources, as well.

While the scientific literature is still evolving, it is generally recognized that light in the 400–500 nanometer (nm) range, particularly around 460 nm, can influence melatonin production. To further reduce potential biological effects, the Project will utilize warm-white light emitting diode (LED) fixtures with a correlated color temperature (CCT) of 3000

Kelvin or lower, consistent with recommendations by the American Medical Association (AMA, 2016) and the International Dark-Sky Association (IDA). Such lighting emphasizes longer wavelengths (amber/red) and reduces the proportion of blue light compared to higher-CCT LEDs.

Therefore, Mitigation Measure 3.1-1 has been refined to clarify that:

1. All luminaries will be shielded and directed away from adjacent habitat and open space areas; and
2. Exterior lighting will utilize warm-white (≤ 3000 K CCT) LED fixtures or equivalent to minimize blue light emissions, while maintaining safety and functionality for project users.

The revisions are reflected in Section 3.0 Errata. This refinement ensures that the measure is both enforceable and environmentally responsive, consistent with CEQA requirements. The revisions enhance the existing text.

This chapter includes minor edits, or errata, to the EIR. These modifications resulted from responses to comments received during the Draft EIR public review period or other minor modifications and clarifications to text which are more editorial in nature. Revisions herein do not result in new significant environmental impacts, do not constitute significant new information, and do not alter the conclusions of the environmental analysis that would warrant recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. Changes are provided in revision marks with underline for new text and ~~strike out for deleted text~~. One exception, however, is that Table 2.0-1 has been entirely replaced with an updated RTP project list as provided in Appendix 6A of the RTP, and the changes are reflected by red text for new text, and the yellow cells denote edited text.

3.1 REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following edits are made to page 2.0-7 in Section 2.5 of the DEIR.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

The RTP embodies three primary elements: Policy Element, Action Element, and Financial Element.

The **Policy Element** presents guidance to decision-makers of the implications, impacts, and opportunities, ~~and foreclosed options~~ that will result from implementation of the RTP, as well as identifying ~~ies~~ mobility goals, objectives, and ~~policies of strategies for~~ the region. California law (Government Code Section 65080 (b)) states that each RTP shall include a Policy Element that:

1. Describes the transportation issues in the region;
2. Identifies and quantifies regional needs expressed within both short- and long-range planning horizons; and,
3. Maintains internal consistency with the Financial Element and fund estimates.

The **Action** identifies short- and long-term actions needed to achieve the RTP's objectives and implement the RTP in accordance with the goals, objectives, and ~~policies~~ strategies set forth in the Policy Element.

The institutional ~~and legal~~ actions needed to implement the Regional Transportation Plan and action plans are also discussed in this section, followed by a detailed assessment of all transportation modes. Priorities for regional transportation programs are established within the Action Element.

The **Financial Element** identifies the cost of implementing projects in the RTP within a financially constrained environment. All anticipated transportation

funding revenues are compared with the anticipated costs of the transportation ~~programs~~ projects and actions identified in the Action Element. If shortfalls are identified, strategies are developed to potentially fund the otherwise unfunded projects. It includes regionally significant multimodal projects that currently have funding in place or that are projected to have funding in the future (Fiscally Constrained), while it also identifies other improvement projects that are needed but do not have funding (Fiscally Unconstrained). Fiscally unconstrained projects are listed for completion as beyond 2045. ~~It also identifies potential funding shortfalls and sources for the unconstrained project list.~~

The following edits are made to pages 2.0-8 through 2.0-23 in Section 2.5 of the DEIR and Table 2.0-1, the *2025-2045 RTP Projects List*. Table 2.0-1 has been replaced with a revised version in this Final EIR, to provide an updated RTP project list as provided in Appendix 6A of the RTP. The table has been broken into two tables, Table 2.0-1a and Table 2.0-1b. These revisions serve to reconcile the Project List with the final Project list as represented in the RTP. The revisions in Tables 2.0-1a and 2.0-1b are reflected by red text for new text, and the yellow cells denote edited text.

Tables 2.0-1a and 2.0-1b provides the project list as provided in Appendix 6A of the RTP. ~~These tables~~ presents those projects categorized as: A- Bike Ped, B- Road & Highway Capacity, C- Maintenance and Rehabilitation, D- Programs and Planning, E- Transit Capital, F- Transit Operations and Maintenance, G- System Management, Operations, and ITS. ~~Following this project lists is the short term and long term transit capital plan.~~

TABLE 2.0-1A: EL DORADO CO. 2025-2045 RTP PROJECT LISTS (APPENDIX 6A) – ROADWAY PROJECTS

Appendix 6A - El Dorado County Transportation Commission 2025-2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List								
Roadway Projects								
MapID Final	Category	Lead Agency	Title	Description (to publish)	Project Year	Cost	Funded	
1	B- Road & Highway Capacity	City of Placerville	Placerville Dr at Hangtown Creek Bridge Replacement	Hangtown Creek Bridge at Placerville Dr, 0.3 mi west of Cold Springs Rd: Replace existing functionally obsolete 2-lane bridge with a new bridge.	2025-2035	\$10,423,800	Funded	
2	G-System Management, Operations, and ITS	City of Placerville	Placerville Highway 50 Corridor Intersection Pedestrian Safety Project	On US Highway 50 in the City of Placerville, enhance pedestrian crossing safety through the use of dynamic warning signs at various state highway and local road at-grade pedestrian / school crossings.	2025-2035	\$250,000	Funded	
3	B- Road & Highway Capacity	City of Placerville	Western Placerville Interchanges Phase 3	Replacement and widening of the Placerville Dr/US 50 Overcrossing with upgraded intersections on and off ramps	Beyond 2045	\$61,000,000		
4	G-System Management, Operations, and ITS	City of Placerville	Wiltse Rd Intersection Improvements	Wiltse Rd Intersection Improvements/Signalization. Construct 400 feet of 2 lane roadway with sidewalk, curb and gutter both sides. A new bridge over Hangtown Creek.	2025-2035	\$6,000,000		
5	G-System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	Auxiliary Lane Project: WB Bass Lake	This project includes study to determine complete improvements needed; Phase 1 may include ramp widening, road widening, signals, and WB auxiliary lane (lane between ramps of adjacent interchanges) between Bass Lake and Silva Valley interchanges.	2035-2045	\$1,500,000		
6	G-System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	Auxiliary Lane Project: WB Latrobe Rd/ED Hills Blvd	Add auxiliary lane (lane between ramps of adjacent interchanges) from WB Latrobe Rd/ ED Hills Blvd to Empire Ranch	2035-2045	\$1,500,000		
7	G-System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	Auxiliary Lane Project: WB Silva Valley	Add auxiliary lane (lane between ramps of adjacent interchanges) from WB Silva Valley to El Dorado Hills Blvd	2035-2045	\$1,500,000		
8	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	Bass Lake Rd Widening	Widen and reconstruct Bass Lake Rd from US 50 to Serrano Pkwy to 4-lane divided road. Includes a median, sidewalk and bike lanes.	2025-2035	\$14,257,000		
9	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	Cameron Park Dr Widening - Palmer Drive to Sudbury Rd	Widen Cameron Park Dr to 4 lanes (divided) from Palmer Dr to Sudbury Rd Includes a curb, gutter, and sidewalk.	2025-2035	\$8,687,000		
10	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	Country Club Dr Extension - Bass Lake Rd to Tong Rd	Construct 2-lane extension of Country Club Dr from Tong Rd to Bass Lake Rd. Roadway includes 8-foot paved shoulders, curb, and gutter	2025-2035	\$13,258,000		
11	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	Country Club Dr Extension - El Dorado Hills Blvd to Silva Valley Pkwy	Construct new 2-lane extension of Country Club Dr from El Dorado Hills Blvd to Silva Valley Pkwy. Includes curb, gutter, and sidewalk on both sides.	2035-2045	\$11,451,000		
12	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	Country Club Dr Extension - Silva Valley Pkwy to Tong Rd	Construct new 2-lane extension of Country Club Dr from Silva Valley Pkwy to Tong Rd. Includes curb, gutter and sidewalk on both sides.	2025-2035	\$6,930,000		
13	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	Diamond Springs Pkwy - Phase 1B	Construct new 4-lane divided arterial roadway from Missouri Flat Rd east of Golden Center Dr to a new T-intersection with SR-49 south of Bradley Dr; includes planning, environmental clearance, grading, required improvements to SR-49 and three new signals.	2025-2035	\$38,753,157	Funded	
14	G-System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	El Dorado Hills ITS	ITS technology implementation along major signalized corridors in the El Dorado Hills area, including El Dorado Hills Blvd, Latrobe Rd, White Rock Rd, and Silva Valley Pkwy.	2025-2035	\$5,000,000		
15	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	Green Valley Rd Widening - Francisco Dr to Silva Valley Pkwy	Widen existing Green Valley Rd from Francisco Dr to Silva Valley Pkwy from two to four lanes; includes curb gutter and sidewalk.	2035-2045	\$6,421,000		
16	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	Latrobe Rd Widening - Golden Foothill Pkwy to Investment Blvd	Widen Latrobe Rd from Golden Foothill Pkwy (south end) to Investment Blvd from 2-lanes undivided to 4-lanes divided with curb, gutter, and Class II bike lanes; modify signal at Investment Blvd.	2035-2045	\$3,516,000		
17	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	Missouri Flat Rd Widening - China Garden Rd to Pleasant Valley Rd/SR49	Widening of Missouri Flat Rd from China Garden to Pleasant Valley Rd/State Route 49. Work includes widening the road to 4 lanes, sidewalk, curb, and gutter.	2035-2045	\$4,175,000		
18	G-System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	Bridlewood/Bass Lake Rd Roundabout	The project will construct a single-lane roundabout at the intersection of Bass Lake Rd and Bridlewood Dr.	2025-2035	\$4,197,739	Partial	
19	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	Saratoga Wy (Phase 2)	Phase 2 will widen the existing two-lane road to four-lanes from the Sacramento County line to El Dorado Hills Blvd with full curb, gutter and sidewalk on the north side only.	2035-2045	\$3,300,000		
20	G-System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	Silva Valley Pkwy/Golden Eagle Ln - Signalization	Signalize intersection at Silva Valley Pkwy and Golden Eagle Ln (Silva Valley Elem School).	2035-2045	\$2,750,000		

Appendix 6A - El Dorado County Transportation Commission 2025-2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List

Roadway Projects



MapID Final	Category	Lead Agency	Title	Description (to publish)	Project Year	Cost	Funded
21	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	US 50 Auxiliary Lane Eastbound - Bass Lake Rd to Cambridge Rd	This project consists of widening US 50 and adding an auxiliary (an added lane between ramps of two adjacent interchanges) lane to eastbound US 50 connecting Bass Lake Rd Interchange and the Cambridge Rd Interchange.	2035-2045	\$9,404,000	
22	G-System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	US 50 Auxiliary Lane Eastbound - Cameron Park Dr to Ponderosa Rd	Project provides eastbound continuous auxiliary lane (an added lane between ramps of two adjacent interchanges) from Cameron Park Dr Interchange to Ponderosa Rd Interchange.	2035-2045	\$8,926,000	
23	G-System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	US 50 Auxiliary Lane Westbound Eastbound - Sacramento County Line to El Dorado Hills Blvd	Widening US 50 and adding an auxiliary lane (lane between ramps of adjacent interchanges) to eastbound US 50 from El Dorado Hills Blvd/Latrobe Rd Interchange. This project will eventually connect to the City of Folsom's future Empire Ranch Road Interchange.	2035-2045	\$4,460,000	
24	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	US 50 Auxiliary Lane Westbound - Cameron Park Dr to Cambridge Rd	Widening US 50 and adding an auxiliary lane (an added lane between ramps of two adjacent interchanges) to westbound US 50, connecting Cameron Park Dr Interchange to Cambridge Rd Interchange.	2035-2045	\$11,900,000	
25	G-System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	US 50 Auxiliary Lane Westbound - Ponderosa Rd to Cameron Park Dr	Widening US 50 and adding an auxiliary lane (an added lane between ramps of two adjacent interchanges) to westbound US 50, connecting Cameron Park Dr Interchange to Ponderosa Rd Interchange.	2035-2045	\$9,543,000	
26	G-System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	US 50 Westbound Auxiliary Lane - Cambridge Rd to Bass Lake Rd	This project consists of widening US 50 and adding an auxiliary lane (an added lane between ramps of two adjacent interchanges) to westbound US 50 connecting Cambridge Rd Interchange to Bass Lake Rd Interchange.	2035-2045	\$9,250,000	
27	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	US 50/Cambridge Rd Interchange	Improvements to Cambridge Rd Interchange: 1) widening EB and WB off-ramps; 2) new WB on-ramp from SB Cambridge Rd; 3) reconstruction of the local intersections for additional capacity; 4) installation of traffic signals at EB ramp terminal intersection	2035-2045	\$9,173,000	
28	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	US 50/Cameron Park Dr Interchange Improvements	This project includes study to identify capacity improvements alternatives and selection of preferred alternative; assumes reconstruction of existing US50 bridges to widen Cameron Park Dr to 8 lanes under the overcrossing; road and ramp widenings.	2035-2045	\$61,116,000	
29	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	US 50/El Dorado Hills Blvd Interchange Phase 2B- Eastbound Ramps	Reconstruct EB diagonal on-ramp and EB loop off-ramp; add a lane to NB El Dorado Hills Blvd under overpass (eliminates merge lane and improves traffic flow from the EB loop off-ramp); EB diagonal on-ramp will be metered with an HOV bypass. Includes Class 1 Bike Path from EB Ramps to Town Center Blvd on east side of EDH Blvd.	2025-2035	\$23,261,178	Funded
30	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	US 50/ Ponderosa Rd Durock Rd/So. Shingle Rd Interchange Improvements	Interchange Improvements: Includes the detailed study to identify alternatives and select preferred alternative; as well as construction of the first phase to realign approximately ¼ mile of Durock Rd to South Shingle Rd/Sunset Ln and signalize the new intersection. Durock Rd will be two through lanes with turn pockets at the intersection. The first phase will also realign approx. ¼ mile of N. Shingle Rd about 600ft. north at Ponderosa Rd; realign the WB off-ramp to align with Wild Chaparral Dr. and signalize the new intersection. Realigned N. Shingle Rd will be two through lanes with turn pockets at the intersection. Includes PS for all phases; Will coordinate with future project to widen the US 50 overcrossing to 5 lanes.	2035-2045	\$46,565,900	Partial
31	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	Ponderosa Rd, Interchange Overcrossing Future Improvements	Project provides capacity improvements to the interchange, includes a detailed study to identify a preferred alternative. This phase of the project includes the widening of the existing US 50 overcrossing to accommodate five lanes and the realignment of the westbound on-ramp and eastbound loop on-ramp, and widenings along Mother Lode Dr and South Shingle Rd.	Beyond 2045	\$25,000,000	
32	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	US 50/Silva Valley Pkwy Interchange - Phase 2	Final phase of US 50/Silva Valley Pkwy Interchange. Due to future growth in the area this project will be necessary to accommodate traffic projected for 2030. Project includes eastbound diagonal and westbound loop on-ramps to US 50.	2035-2045	\$8,156,000	
33	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Capital Southeast Connector JPA and El Dorado County	Capital SouthEast Connector - E1	In El Dorado Hills, on White Rock Rd between western County line near Carson Crossing Dr to Windfield Way: widen from 2 to 4 lanes (Thoroughfare). (CIP 72381/36105041)	2035-2045	\$8,248,000	Partial
34	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	City of Placerville	US 50 Trip to Green Congestion Management and Resiliency Strategy	Along US 50 and at each of the three signalized intersections between Canal St and Bedford Ave, install intelligent transportation systems, barriers, and advanced warning signals to notify the motoring public when signals are held in a solid green phase.	2025-2035	\$23,250,000	Partial
35	B- Road & Highway Capacity	City of Placerville	Western Placerville Interchanges Phase 2.3	Construct the westbound US 50 off-ramp to Ray Lawyer Dr, construct intersection improvements at the US 50 Ramps/Ray Lawyer Dr, and provide bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements along Ray Lawyer Dr within the project limits.	2035-2045 2025-2035	\$15,000,000	Partial
36	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	City of Placerville	Clay St/Hangtown Creek Bridge and Cedar Ravine Intersection Improvements	Clay St over Hangtown Creek, 150' north of Main St: Replace 1 lane bridge with 2 lane bridge. Realign Clay St with Cedar Ravine and create a four way stop intersection.	2025-2035	\$4,308,864	Partial
37	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	Roundabout at Luneman and Lotus Rds	Construct a roundabout at Luneman and Lotus Rds for safety improvement	2025-2035	\$4,500,000	

Appendix 6A - El Dorado County Transportation Commission 2025-2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List

Roadway Projects



MapID Final	Category	Lead Agency	Title	Description (to publish)	Project Year	Cost	Funded
38	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	City of Placerville	Canal St Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Project Phase 2	In Placerville, along Canal St from Cougar Ln to US Highway 50, rehabilitate pavement, improve drainage, repair or replace utilities, and improve bicycle and pedestrian safety and access.	2025-2035	\$7,600,000	
39	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	El Dorado County	Breedlove Rd Bridge Replacement	North of Buckeye in El Dorado County, Breedlove Road Over Canyon Creek, 1 mi. North of Wentworth S. Rd.: Replace 1-lane timber bridge with 2-lane bridge. Not capacity increasing.	2025-2035	\$2,558,000	
40	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	El Dorado County	Bucks Bar Rd/North Fork Cosumnes River Bridge Replacement	Bucks Bar Rd over north fork of Cosumnes River, 1.2 miles north of Mount Aukum Rd: Replace existing 1 lane bridge with new 2 lane bridge, including approaches. (CIP77116)	2025-2035	\$15,082,001	
41	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	El Dorado County	El Dorado Drainage Improvement Project	In El Dorado on Pleasant Valley beginning prior to Hillman Alley and ending after Oriental Street: Replacement and restoration of drainage infrastructure. Toll Credits for ENG, ROW, CON	2025-2035	\$2,700,000	
42	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	El Dorado County	Green Valley Rd/Mound Springs Creek Bridge Rehabilitation	Green Valley Rd over Mound Springs Creek, 0.8 miles west of Missouri Flat Rd. Replace functionally obsolete 2 lane bridge with 2 lane bridge. No added lane capacity. (CIP77136)	2025-2035	\$5,016,501	Funded
43	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	El Dorado County	Grizzly Flat Rd Over Steely Fork Cosumnes River Bridge Replacement	Grizzly Flat Rd over Steely Fork Cosumnes River, 7 miles east of Mt. Aukum Rd: Replace 2-lane bridge with 2-lane bridge. Toll Credits for ENG, ROW, CON	2025-2035	\$6,749,000	
44	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	El Dorado County	Mosquito Rd/South Fork American River Bridge Replacement	Mosquito Rd, over South Fork American River, 5.7 miles north of US 50: Replace existing structurally deficient 1 lane bridge with new 2 lane bridge. High Cost Project agreement required. Toll Credits for ENG, ROW, CON	2025-2035	\$102,252,750	Funded
45	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	El Dorado County	Mount Murphy Rd/South Fork American River Bridge Replacement	Mount Murphy Rd, over South Fork American River, 0.1 mile east of SR49. Replace existing 1 lane truss bridge with new 2 lane bridge. (CIP77129). Toll Credits for ENG, ROW, CON	2025-2035	\$22,440,000	Partial
46	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	El Dorado County	Newtown Rd/South Fork Weber Creek – Bridge Rehab	Newtown Rd, Over S Fork Weber Cr., 0.7Mi W of Snows Rd. Replace existing 2 lane bridge. CIP77122	2025-2035	\$5,869,000	Funded
47	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	El Dorado County	Oak Hill Rd/Squaw Hollow Creek Bridge Replacement	Oak Hill Rd over Squaw Hollow Creek, 0.6 miles south of Pleasant Valley Rd: Replace existing 2 lane bridge with new 2 lane bridge. (CIP77134). Toll Credits for ENG, ROW, CON	2025-2035	\$6,949,650	Funded
48	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	Headington Rd Ext - Missouri Flat to El Dorado	Construct new 2-lane arterial with median extension of Headington Rd from Missouri Flat Rd to El Dorado Rd. Does include curb, gutter or sidewalk. (CIP71375)	2035-2045	\$6,747,000	
49	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	US 50/El Dorado Rd Interchange - Phase 1	Phase 1 project includes signalization and widening of existing ramps and minor widening/lane adjustments on El Dorado Rd. See project 71376/36104012 for Phase 2 improvements. (CIP 71347/36104011)	Beyond 2045	\$5,488,000	
50	B- Road & Highway Capacity	El Dorado County	White Rock Road Widening – Windfield Way to Sacramento County Line	Widen White Rock Road between the County line and Windfield Way from two to four-lane divided roadway with curb, gutter and Class I bike/pedestrian trail and/or an on-street Class II bike facility. This roadway is part of the Capital Southeast Connector. (CIP 72381/36105041)	2025-2035	\$4,404,000	
51	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	Golden Foothill Pkwy/Carson Crossing Intersection Improvements	Intersection improvements at Golden Foothill Pkwy (south) and Carson Crossing Dr. Sidewalk, curb and gutter are not TIM Fee Funded (CIP 66116/36105024)	2025-2035	\$747,000	
52	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	El Dorado County	El Dorado Hills Blvd Overlay Project	El Dorado Hills Blvd, from Saratoga Way/Park Dr to Harvard Way: Roadway overlay, ADA ramp improvements, Class II bike lanes, and bicycle and pedestrian loop detection improvements and signal modification system at all intersections. Toll Credits for ENG	2025-2035	\$6,209,474	Partial
53	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	El Dorado County	Green Valley Rd/Indian Creek Bridge Replacement	Green Valley Rd, over Indian Creek, 0.9 miles north of Greenstone Rd. Replace existing 2 lane bridge with 2 lane bridge	2025-2035	\$4,495,434	
54	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	Green Valley at Loch Way Intersection Improvements	The proposed project may include a left turn pocket and shoulder widening at the Loch Way Intersection with Green Valley Rd	2025-2035	\$450,000	
55	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	Roundabout at Robert J. Mathews Dr and Golden Foothill Pkwy	Construct a roundabout at Robert J. Mathews Dr and Golden Foothill Pkwy	2025-2035	\$3,021,000	
NA	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Caltrans D3	US 50 HOV Lane Extension: Cameron Park Dr to Ponderosa Rd	HOV lane extension between Cameron Park Dr and Ponderosa Rd	Beyond 2045	\$23,800,000	
NA	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Caltrans D3	US 50 HOV Lane Extension: Ponderosa Rd to Greenstone Rd	HOV lane extension between Ponderosa Rd and Greenstone Rd	Beyond 2045	\$34,730,208	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	Caltrans D3	SR 49/193 Intersection Control Improvements - Roundabout	In Cool, at intersection of SR49 and SR193, Construct Roundabout (PM 34.4)	2035-2045	\$11,400,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	Caltrans D3	US 50 Broadway Eastbound Exit (#47) - Signalization and ramp lengthening	Lengthen eastbound exit ramp of US 50 at Broadway (#47) and install traffic signal.	2025-2035	\$4,308,864	

Appendix 6A - El Dorado County Transportation Commission 2025-2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List

Roadway Projects



MapID Final	Category	Lead Agency	Title	Description (to publish)	Project Year	Cost	Funded
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	Deck Treatments on 6 Bridges	Deck Treatments on 6 Bridges	2035-2045	\$484,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	ED 50 Apple Hill Pavement Rehab	In and near Placerville, from westbound on-ramp at Schnell School Rd OC (Br#25-0063) to 0.3 mi east of Sly Park Rd UC (Br#25-0150).	2025-2035	\$71,682,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	ED 50 CAPM	On US 50, Near Pollock Pines, Kyburz, and Strawberry, from west of Icehouse Rd to 0.5 mile east of Cedar St (PM 39.7/58.9). Rehabilitate pavement and drainage systems, and upgrade lighting and guardrail.	2025-2035	\$42,620,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	ED 50 Census Station	On Route 50, in El Dorado County, at the Nevada border (PM 80.439/80.439): Install/repair census station.	2025-2035	\$410,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	ED 50 Echo Summit pavement rehab	In El Dorado County from Sierra-At-Tahoe Rd to Pioneer Trail in Meyers.	2025-2035	\$28,588,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	ED 50 Kyburz Storm Damage Repair	In El Dorado County on Hwy 50 in the town of Kyburz. Repair Rock wall from culvert damage. Permanent Restoration.	2035-2045	\$620,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	ED 50 Riverton Drainage rehab	In El Dorado County 0.2 mile east of Sly Park Rd UC to 0.1 mile west of Sand Flat Campground.	2025-2035	\$14,000,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	ED 50 Shingle Springs Pavement Rehab	In El Dorado County on Route 50 from Cambridge Rd OC (Br#25-0083) to on-ramp from Koto Rd.	2025-2035	\$14,800,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	In El Dorado County from Kyburz Dr to Strawberry Lodge Dr. CIR w/HMA Overlay.	In El Dorado County from Kyburz Dr to Strawberry Lodge Dr. CIR w/HMA Overlay.	2025-2035	\$6,200,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	In El Dorado County on Route 50 approx. 0.2 miles west of Alder Creek Rd, stabilize the slope to prevent or mitigate further slide activity	In El Dorado County on Route 50 approx. 0.2 miles west of Alder Creek Rd, stabilize the slope to prevent or mitigate further slide activity. EA 3H470. US 50, PM 43.69	2035-2045	\$4,830,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	In El Dorado County on Route 50 approx. 0.2 miles west of Alder Creek Road, stabilize the slope to prevent or mitigate further slide activity (EA 3H470)	In El Dorado County on Route 50 approx. 0.2 miles west of Alder Creek Road, stabilize the slope to prevent or mitigate further slide activity	2035-2045	\$4,830,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	Repair slipout by construction of a multi-layered geotextile-reinforced fill ("bridging element") on Route 50 approx. 0.4 miles west of Forest Rd/Fresh Pond	Repair slip out by construction of a multi-layered geotextile-reinforced fill ("bridging element") on Route 50 approx. 0.4 miles west of Forest Rd/Fresh Pond. PM 33.86-34. EA 3H450	2035-2045	\$18,410,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	In El Dorado County on Route 50 at the Placerville Maintenance Station (3065 Blairs Ln, Placerville), install retaining structure or repair slope and fencing along stream bank (EA 3H960)	In El Dorado County on Route 50 at the Placerville Maintenance Station (3065 Blairs Ln, Placerville), install retaining structure or repair slope and fencing along stream bank (EA 3H960). US 50'	2035-2045	\$2,570,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	In El Dorado County on Route 50 from approx. 1.0 mile west of Snows Rd UC (Br#25-56) to Sawmill UC (Br#25-41). CAPM.	In El Dorado County on Route 50 from approx. 1.0 mile west of Snows Rd UC (Br#25-56) to Sawmill UC (Br#25-41). CAPM.	2035-2045	\$3,698,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	Install wash facility	SLT Maintenance Station	2035-2045	\$975,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	Placerville CAPM	On US 50 in and near Placerville, from west of Carson Rd Overcrossing to west of Still Meadows Rd; also at 5 Mile Rd in westbound direction (PM 22.6/22.9); also near Camino, from 1.1 miles west of Snow Rd Undercrossing to east of Ridgeway Dr Undercrossing (PM 24.2/R29.1). Rehabilitate pavement, construct acceleration lane, upgrade facilities to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, rehabilitate drainage systems, upgrade concrete barrier, signs, and Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, and construct maintenance vehicle pullouts.	2025-2035	\$45,770,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	Placerville MTCE Mechanic shop	Placerville Resident Mechanic	2025-2035	\$2,600,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	Route 49 El Dorado County	On SR 49 in and near Placerville, from 0.1 mile north of Skyline Dr to 0.1 mile north of Diana St (PM 14.2/16.5): Rehabilitate pavement and drainage systems, construct maintenance vehicle pullouts, and upgrade signs, Traffic Management System (TMS) elements, and facilities to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.	2025-2035	\$13,220,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	SR 193 Cool Pavement Rehabilitation	In El Dorado County on Route 193 from Jct Rte 49 to Pilgram Rd.	2025-2035	\$5,700,000	

Appendix 6A - El Dorado County Transportation Commission 2025-2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List

Roadway Projects



MapID Final	Category	Lead Agency	Title	Description (to publish)	Project Year	Cost	Funded
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	SR 193 Cutback slope and install slope drainage	Cutback slope and install slope drainage on Route 193 approx. 0.2 miles west of the Route 49 Jct to approx. 0.4 miles west of the Route 49 Jct	2035-2045	\$2,880,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	SR 193 Georgetown Pavement Rehabilitation	In El Dorado County on Route 193 from Greenwood Rd to Jct SR 49/End of County.	2025-2035	\$15,400,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	SR 193 Storm Damage Repair	In El Dorado County on Route 193, 0.31 mile west of the SR49/193 Junction and 0.41 mile west of the SR 49/Coloma Ct intersection. Permanent Damage Restoration.	2035-2045	\$3,510,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	SR 49 Pavement Rehabilitation A	In El Dorado County in and near Diamond Springs from 0.5 miles north of Maisy Ln to Coon Hollow Rd. Pavement Rehab. SHOPP ID 13330	2025-2035	\$36,650,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	SR 49 Pavement Rehabilitation B	In El Dorado and Placer County from approximately 0.1 mile north of Rattlesnake Bar Rd to Elm Ave. CAPM. SHOPP ID 20486	2025-2035	\$18,870,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	SR-49 CAPM from Skyline Dr to Diana St	In El Dorado County on Route 49 from 0.1 mile north of Skyline Dr to 0.1 mile north of Diana St. CAPM. SHOPP ID 22872	2025-2035	\$9,600,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	US 50 Crash Cushion Upgrade	In El Dorado, Butte, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, and Yolo Counties, on Routes 50, 65, 70, 80, 89, and 99 at various locations. Upgrade crash cushions and sand barrel arrays to make more durable.	2035-2045	\$3,360,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	US 50 Drainage Improvements A	In and near Placerville, from west of El Dorado Rd to 0.1 mile east of Braeburn Ln. Rehabilitate deteriorated culverts and provide access for wildlife crossing the route.	2035-2045	\$8,230,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	US 50 Drainage Improvements B	Near Cameron Park and Shingle Springs, from east of Silva Valley Pkwy to west of El Dorado Rd. Rehabilitate culverts.	2035-2045	\$6,760,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	US 50 Point View Dr Landscape Rehabilitation	In El Dorado County on Route 50 from EB off ramp at Point View Dr to approx. 0.2 mile west of Newtown Rd. Highway Planting Rehab.	2025-2035	\$1,040,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	US 50 Storm Damage Repair	In El Dorado County on Route 50 approx. 0.6 miles west of Bridal Veil Falls Rd.	2035-2045	\$7,720,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	US-50 CAPM Sawmill UC to Ice House Rd	In El Dorado County on Route 50 from Sawmill UC (Br#25-41) to Ice House Rd. Pavement CAPM. SHOPP ID 21965	2025-2035	\$28,800,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	US-50 CAPM Snows Rd to Sawmill UC	In El Dorado County on Route 50 from approx. 1.0 mile west of Snows Rd UC (Br#25-56) to Sawmill UC (Br#25-41). CAPM. SHOPP ID 21274	2025-2035	\$3,700,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	US-50 REHAB Cambridge Rd to El Dorado Rd	In El Dorado County on Route 50 from Cambridge Rd OC (Br#25-0083) to El Dorado Rd OC (Br#25-76). REHAB. SHOPP ID 22820	2025-2035	\$77,500,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	Caltrans D3	CCTV at Emerald Bay	On Route 89, in El Dorado County at postmile 17.0: Install Closed Circuit Television (CCTV).	2025-2035	\$233,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	Caltrans D3	El Dorado 50 TMS	On Route 50, in El Dorado County at various locations: Install TMS Elements.	2025-2035	\$240,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	Caltrans D3	El Dorado and Placer County Traffic Signal Operational Improvements	In El Dorado and Placer Counties, on Routes 50 and 80 at various locations. Install Audible Pedestrian System (APS) and Video Detection System.	2025-2035	\$269,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	Caltrans D3	SR 49/193 Intersection Control Improvements - Roundabout	In Cool, at intersection of SR49 and SR193, Construct Roundabout (PM 34.4)	2025-2035	\$10,000,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	Caltrans D3	SR 50 Deer Crossing Flashing Beacon	On SR 50 In El Dorado County install deer crossing flashing beacons at various locations (0.00/0.00).	2025-2035	\$208,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	Caltrans D3	US-50 Snows Rd Undercrossing Improvements	In El Dorado County about 7 miles east of Placerville at the Snows Rd Undercrossing, Replace Snow Rd Undercrossing #25 0056, replace approach slabs, replace approach MBGR, replace AC dike and overside drain. SHOPP ID 22587	2025-2035	\$14,025,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	Build pre-wash facilities	SLT & Truckee MS	2035-2045	\$800,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans D3	Complete Streets Improvements to the SHS	Complete Streets improvements in various locations on the State Highway System (SHS) in El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yuba and Yolo Counties.	2035-2045	\$50,000,000	

Appendix 6A - El Dorado County Transportation Commission 2025-2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List

Roadway Projects



MapID Final	Category	Lead Agency	Title	Description (to publish)	Project Year	Cost	Funded
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	Caltrans D3	US 50 Integrated Corridor Management Projects	ICM projects on US 50 between Enterprise Blvd in West Sacramento and Cameron Park Dr in El Dorado County (Non-capacity)	2035-2045	\$45,530,000	
NA	D- Programs & Planning	El Dorado County	El Dorado County Housing Assessment and Taskforce Outreach	In El Dorado County, El Dorado County, in partnership with El Dorado Community Foundation, will be pursuing a comprehensive, community-designed Affordable Housing Strategic Plan, which will include clearly defined achievable actions to address housing, transportation, and mobility needs of El Dorado County. The Strategic Plan will be linked to mobility as a means to plan for infrastructure and improve access to jobs, services, and amenities, which influence commuting patterns and reduce travel times. This project will look at how affordable housing needs interconnect with the transportation network and explore the expansion of their housing and jobs balance as a way to improve mobility and access. Includes SACOG earmark funding. Toll Credits for CON	2025-2035	\$250,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County, Caltrans District 3	STARNET Integration B	STARNET Integration, El Dorado County, Caltrans District 3, SACOG	2025-2035	\$46,500	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	El Dorado County, Caltrans District 3	Critical Intersection Improvements	Critical Intersection Improvements	2025-2035	\$5,000,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Improvements (Phase 1)	Identification of various Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) improvements along US 50 and regionally significant corridors in the County; projects may include upgrading all controllers, building the communications infrastructure, adding CCTVs, adding DMS, connecting all the signals.	2035-2045	\$5,833,200	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Improvements (Phase 2)	Minor ITS Improvement: Deployment of various ITS improvements along U.S. 50 and regionally significant corridors in the County. Includes: implementation of ITS projects listed and prioritized in El Dorado County	2035-2045	\$5,000,000	
NA	D- Programs & Planning	El Dorado County	Long-Term Regional ITS Plan Update	Long-Term Regional ITS Plan Update	2035-2045	\$200,000	
NA	D- Programs & Planning	El Dorado County	Medium-Term Regional ITS Plan Update	Medium-Term and Long-Term Regional ITS Plan Update	2035-2045	\$200,000	
NA	D- Programs & Planning	El Dorado County	Remote Traffic Control Workstation	Remote Traffic Control Workstation	2035-2045	\$8,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County, Caltrans District 3	AVI/AVL For Emergency Vehicles	AVI/AVL For Emergency Vehicles	2035-2045	\$400,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County, Caltrans District 3	Portable Traffic Management Devices	Portable Traffic Management Devices	2035-2045	\$350,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County, Caltrans District 3	Procure and deploy Portable Dynamic Message Signs (DMS) and Trailblazers	Procure and deploy Portable Dynamic Message Signs (DMS) and Trailblazers	2035-2045	\$90,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	Metal Beam Guardrail Installation - Various Locations	Construction/reconstruction of guardrail at various locations (TBD) throughout the County that are most in need and for which FHWA HSIP grant funds are anticipated to be available.	2035-2045	\$672,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	Safety Improvements	Safety improvements at various locations throughout the County. Includes intersections, curves, and roadway segments.	2035-2045	\$2,400,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	El Dorado County, Caltrans District 3	Install Animal Vehicle Collision Avoidance Systems-Hwy 49 and US 50	Install Animal Vehicle Collision Avoidance Systems-Hwy 49 and US 50	2025-2035	\$2,500,000	
NA	G- System Management, Operations, and ITS	El Dorado County	Camino Agritourism Congestion Relief Project Phase 1	Includes innovative technology-based solutions to address yearly congestion in Camino, as well as ITS, signage, planning studies, etc.	2025-2035	\$5,000,000	
NA	D- Programs & Planning	El Dorado County, EDCTC, Caltrans District 3	Mobility Zones Implementation Strategy	Identification and analysis of Mobility Hub locations for US 50 to include or not limited to a rest stop on US 50 and Mobility Hub in El Dorado Hills and Camino	2025-2035	\$300,000	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	El Dorado County	County Roadway Maintenance and Rehabilitation - Lump Sum - Long Term	Streets and Roads Maintenance Lump Sum	2035-2045	\$72,920,000	

Appendix 6A - El Dorado County Transportation Commission 2025-2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List								
Roadway Projects								
MapID Final	Category	Lead Agency	Title	Description (to publish)	Project Year	Cost	Funded	
NA	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	City of Placerville	City of Placerville Maintenance and Rehabilitation - Short Term	City of Placerville Maintenance and Rehabilitation	2025-2035	\$30,000,000		
NA	C-Maintenance & Rehabilitation	City of Placerville	City of Placerville Maintenance and Rehabilitation - Long Term	City of Placerville Maintenance and Rehabilitation	2035-2045	\$30,000,000		

Sources: EDCTC, 2025.

TABLE 2.0-1B: EL DORADO Co. 2025-2045 RTP PROJECT LISTS (APPENDIX 6A) – BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, AND TRANSIT PROJECTS

Appendix 6A - El Dorado County Transportation Commission 2025-2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List								
Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Projects								
MapID Final	Category	Lead Agency	Class	Title	Description	Plan Year	Project Cost	Funded
101	A- Bike & Ped	City of Placerville	3	Canal St Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Project Phase 1	ENV clearance for bicycle and pedestrian improvements on Canal St from US 50 to Geugar Ln to Combella Rd: Provide bicycle facilities and replace existing sidewalk.	2025-2035	\$5,974,088	Partial
102	A- Bike & Ped	City of Placerville	NA	Combella Rd Sidewalk Project (Canal St. Phase 1A)	Along Combella Rd, from the east end of David Cir to Canal St: Construct approximately 1,080 feet of new sidewalk.	2025-2035	\$1,253,000	Yes
103	A- Bike & Ped	City of Placerville	2	Mallard Ln/Green Valley Rd Bike Lanes	Install bicycle lanes on Mallard Ln at the intersection of Green Valley Rd, and on Green Valley Rd from Mallard Ln to Placerville Dr.	2025-2035	\$1,750,000	
104	A- Bike & Ped	City of Placerville	2	Middletown Rd Bike Lanes	Install bike lanes on Middletown Rd from Canal St to Cold Springs Rd.	2035-2045	\$8,100,000	
105	A- Bike & Ped	City of Placerville	2	Placerville Dr Pedestrian Connectivity Project	Along Placerville Dr between Fair Ln and Armory Rd: Construct sidewalks and improvements for pedestrian crossing	2025-2035	\$2,500,000	Yes
106	A- Bike & Ped	City of Placerville	2	Placerville Dr Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities	In the City of Placerville along Placerville Dr from west of the US 50 undercrossing to Armory Rd: Construct bicycle facilities and sidewalks; on the west side of Green Valley Rd from Placerville Dr to Mallard Ln: construct sidewalk. (Both Class II bike lanes and Class IV bikeways will be evaluated during the preliminary engineering phase.) (Phase 1 programmed as ELD19545). Toll Credits for ENG	2025-2035	\$12,568,444	Yes
107	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Cameron Park Dr Bike Lanes	Install bike lanes from US 50 north to Meder Rd along entire length of Cameron Park Dr. (CIP72307)	2025-2035	\$162,000	
108	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Carson Rd Bike Lanes	Install Bike Lanes on Carson Rd from Jacquier Rd to Larsen Dr (On climbing Shoulder between Jacquier Rd. and Union Ridge)	2035-2045	\$787,500	
109	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Coach Ln Bike Lanes	Install bike lanes on entire length of Coach Ln.	2025-2035	\$131,250	
110	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	NA	Diamond Springs Pedestrian Facility Improvements	Pleasant Valley Rd between Pearl Place and SR 49, Pearl Place, Racquet Way, Wimbledon Dr, and Black Rice Rd. Install various bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	2025-2035	\$2,982,676	Partial
111	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	1	El Dorado Trail Extension East - Halcon to US 50	Extend Existing Class 1 El Dorado Trail east from Halcon Rd to Ponderado Rd	2025-2035	\$2,231,068	Partial
112	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Enterprise Dr Bike Route	Install bicycle route signs and markings on entire length of Enterprise Dr.	2035-2045	\$1,000	
113	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Gold Hill Rd Bike Route	Install bicycle route signs and markings on Gold Hill Rd from State Route 49 to Lotus Rd.	2025-2035	\$4,000	
114	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	1	Henningsen Park/Lotus Rd Class I Multi-Use Trail Improvements	Along Lotus Rd between Henningsen Lotus Park and the intersection of Lotus Rd and SR 49: Construct new Class I bike path connecting to bicycle and pedestrian facilities on SR 49, construct elevated boardwalk, and install guardrail.	2025-2035	\$5,824,674	Partial
115	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Jacquier Rd Bike Lanes	Placerville City limit to Carson Rd	2025-2035	\$175,000	
116	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	La Canada Dr and Gateway Dr Pedestrian/Bicycle Improvements	Along segments of Parkdale Ln, Gateway Dr, Cambridge Rd, La Canada Dr, and Cameron Park Dr: Construct new sidewalk, bike lanes, two crosswalks, install four solar flashing beacons, and replace or upgrade curbs, ramps, and gutters.	2025-2035	\$3,163,000	Partial

Appendix 6A - El Dorado County Transportation Commission 2025-2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List

Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Projects



MapID Final	Category	Lead Agency	Class	Title	Description	Plan Year	Project Cost	Funded
117	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Latrobe Rd Bike Lanes	Investment Blvd to Deer Creek/SPTC	2035-2045	\$525,000	
118	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Lotus Rd Bike Lanes	Phase 1: Gold Hill Rd to SR 49	2025-2035	\$525,000	
119	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Marshall Rd Bike Lanes	Class II bike lanes from the top of Prospectors Rd to Black Oak Mine Rd	2025-2035	\$525,000	
120	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Marshall Rd Bike Route	Class III Bike Route on Marshall Rd from Black Oak Mine Rd to SR 193	2025-2035	\$20,000	
121	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Meder Rd Bike Lanes	Phase 1: Cameron Park Dr to Paloran Ct	2025-2035	\$175,000	
122	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Missouri Flat Rd Bike Lanes Phase 1	Phase 1: Campus Dr to existing Class II on the south side of US 50	2025-2035	\$350,000	
123	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Missouri Flat Rd Bike Lanes Phase 2	Phase 2: Golden Center Dr near Wal-Mart to Pleasant Valley Rd	2025-2035	\$175,000	
124	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Mother Lode Dr Bike Lanes	Phase 1: Missouri Flat Rd to Lindberg Ave	2025-2035	\$175,000	
125	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Old Bass Lake Rd - EDH to Bass Lake Connection	Phase 1: EDH to Bass Lake Connection. Between gates, using existing roadway as Class I path from Tong Rd to Old Bass Lake Rd.	2025-2035	\$200,000	
126	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Palmer Dr Bike Lanes	Add bike lanes along full length of Palmer Drive	2035-2045	\$87,500	
127	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	1	US 50 Corridor Bike Route: Wild Chaparral Dr to Palmer Dr Bike Path Connection	From Wild Caparral Drive to Palmer Dr - Construct Class I bike path in rare plan preserve in coordination with BLM	2025-2035	\$200,000	
128	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Ponderosa Rd Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	Ponderosa Rd, between Foxwood Ln and Ponderosa High School (at Meder Rd): Install 0.72 miles of Class II bike lanes, 0.36 miles sidewalk, ADA upgrades, and other improvements.	2025-2035	\$2,216,500	Partial
129	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Prospectors Road Class III Bike Route	Class III bike route on the entire length of Prospectors Rd	2035-2045	\$12,500	
130	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	1	El Dorado Trail - Central Shingle Springs	On the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor from Shingle Springs Dr to South Shingle Rd: Construct El Dorado Trail Class I multi-use bicycle and pedestrian path	2025-2035	\$6,685,000	Partial
131	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	1	US 50/El Dorado Hills Blvd Pedestrian Overcrossing	Construct ped/bike overcrossing over US 50 just east of El Dorado Hills Blvd Interchange; includes a Class 1 mixed-use path; Construction and ROW acquisition for 10-ft wide sidewalk and adjacent retaining walls, barriers, railings	2035-2045	\$6,783,000	
132	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	1	US 50 Corridor Bike Route: Bike Path Parallel to US 50 on the north side - Silva Valley to EDH Village Center	Class I Bike Path From Silva Valley Rd to El Dorado Hills Village Center Shopping Center	2035-2045	\$300,000	
133	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	El Dorado Hills Blvd Bike Lanes	Phase 1: Saratoga Way to Governor Dr/St. Andrews	2035-2045	\$297,500	
134	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	El Dorado Hills Blvd Bike Path	Phase 2: Utilizing an existing golf cart undercrossing of Serrano Pkwy, extend the bike path from the current terminus at Serrano Pkwy to Raleys Center	2035-2045	\$200,000	
135	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	El Dorado Hills to Bass Lake Connection (phase 1)	Class III Bike Route on Tong Rd, Class III Bike Route on Old Bass Lake Rd.	2035-2045	\$25,000	
136	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	4	Silva Valley Pkwy Bike Facilities	Class 4 bike facilities on Silva Valley Pkwy from Clarksville Rd to Valley View Pkwy	2025-2035	\$960,000	
137	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	1	El Dorado Trail - County Line East to Latrobe	On the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor from from Latrobe Rd west to County Line: Construct El Dorado Trail Class I multi-use bicycle and pedestrian path	2025-2035	\$2,800,000	
138	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Green Valley Rd Bike Lanes	Class II bike lanes from Loch Way to Francisco Dr	2025-2035	\$250,000	
139	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Bass Lake Rd Bike Lanes	Class II bike lanes on Bass Lake Rd from Serrano Pkwy to Green Valley Rd	2035-2045	\$600,000	
140	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	1	Bass Lake Park Class I Bike Path	Class I bike path near the proposed Bass Lake park along Bass Lake Rd from Serrano Pkwy to Silver Springs Pkwy	2025-2035	\$1,000,000	
141	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Bass Lake Bike Facilities	Class II bike path near the Bass Lake on Bass Lake Rd from Serrano Pkwy to Silver Springs Pkwy	2035-2045	\$400,000	

Appendix 6A - El Dorado County Transportation Commission 2025-2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List

Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Projects



MapID Final	Category	Lead Agency	Class	Title	Description	Plan Year	Project Cost	Funded
142	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	1	Latrobe Road Bike Path, EDH Blvd Interchange to Town Center Blvd.	Class I bike path to connect US 50 interchange at Latrobe Rd to Town Center Blvd	2025-2035	\$3,500,000	Funded
143	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Bike lanes on Mother Lode Dr	Class II bike lanes on Mother Lode Dr from French Creek Rd to Pleasant Valley Rd	2035-2045	\$1,600,000	
144	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Bike lanes on S Shingle Rd	Class II bike lanes on S Shingle Rd to connect Monarch Ln to the interchange	2035-2045	\$250,000	
145	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	1	Community bike path connection to White Rock Rd	Class I bike path on Suncastr Ln connecting to White Rock Rd	2035-2045	\$450,000	
146	A- Bike & Ped	City of Placerville	NA	Canal St Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Project Phase 2	In Placerville, along Canal St from Cougar Ln to US Highway 50, rehabilitate pavement, improve drainage, repair or replace utilities, and improve bicycle and pedestrian safety and access.	2025-2035	\$7,600,000	Partial
147	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Durock Rd bike lanes	Class II bike lanes on Durock Rd from S Shingle Rd to west	2035-2045	\$450,000	
148	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Cameron Park Dr bike lanes at US 50 interchange	Class II bike lanes on Cameron Park Dr from Durock Rd to County Club Dr	2035-2045	\$420,000	
149	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Country Club Dr bike lanes	Class II bike lanes on Country Club Dr from Knollwood Dr to Cameron Park Dr	2025-2035	\$700,000	
150	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Meder Rd Bike Lanes	Class II bike lanes on Meder Rd from Ponderosa Rd to Paloran Ct	2035-2045	\$520,000	
151	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Cambridge Rd Bike Lanes	Class II bike lanes on Cambridge Rd from Oxford Rd to Green Valley Rd	2025-2035	\$450,000	
152	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Oxford Rd Bike Routes	Class III bike route on Oxford Rd from Cambridge Rd to Cameron Park Dr	2025-2035	\$24,000	
153	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Cambridge Rd Bike Lanes	Class II bike lanes on Cambridge Rd from Oxford Rd to Country Club Dr	2025-2035	\$42,000	
154	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Castana Dr Bike Route	Class III bike route on Castana Dr from Country Club Dr to Aventine Rd	2025-2035	\$21,000	
155	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Green Valley Rd Bike Route	Class III bike route on Green Valley Rd from N Shingle Rd to Gold Hill Rd	2035-2045	\$120,000	
156	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Marshall Rd bike lanes	Class II bike lanes on Marshall Rd from Prospectors Rd to Coloma Rd	2025-2035	\$150,000	
157	A- Bike & Ped	City of Placerville	3	Armory Dr bike route	Class III bike route on Armory Dr connecting Placerville Dr to Ray Lawyer Dr	2035-2045	\$9,000	
158	A- Bike & Ped	City of Placerville	2	Fair Ln bike lanes	Class II bike lanes on Fair Ln east of Placerville Dr	2025-2035	\$140,000	
159	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Pony Express Trail Bike Lanes	Class II bike lanes on Pony Express Trail from Sanders Dr to Carson Rd	2035-2045	\$1,250,000	
160	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Ridgeway Dr bike route	Class III bike route on Ridgeway Dr from Sly Park Rd to US 50 Crossing	2035-2045	\$90,000	
161	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Sly Park Rd bike lanes	Class II bike lanes on Sly Park Rd from Gold Ridge Trail to Pony Express Trail	2025-2035	\$125,000	
162	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Gold Ridge Trail Bike Route	Class III bike route on Gold Ridge Trail from Sly Park Rd to Onyx Trail	2035-2045	\$36,000	
163	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Onyx Trail Bike Route	Class III bike route on Onyx Trail from Gold Ridge Trail to Sly Park Rd	2035-2045	\$24,000	
164	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Sly Park Rd bike lanes	Class II bike lanes on Sly Park Rd from Onyx Trail to Mormon Emigrant Trail	2035-2045	\$1,200,000	
165	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Snows Rd bike lanes	Class II bike lanes on Snows Rd from Valley Vista Dr to Carson Rd	2025-2035	\$200,000	
166	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Diamond Springs Pkwy bike lanes	Class II bike lanes on Diamond Springs Pkwy connecting Missouri Flat Rd and SR 49	2025-2035	\$490,000	

Appendix 6A - El Dorado County Transportation Commission 2025-2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List

Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Projects



MapID Final	Category	Lead Agency	Class	Title	Description	Plan Year	Project Cost	Funded
167	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Suffolk Way bike route	Class III bike route on Suffolk Way from Sophia Pkwy to El Dorado Hills Blvd	2035-2045	\$42,000	
168	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Golden Foothill Pkwy bike lanes	Class II bike lanes on Golden Foothill Pkwy connecting to Latrobe Rd	2025-2035	\$1,190,000	
169	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Windfield Way bike lanes	Class II bike lanes on Windfield Way from Golden Foothill Pkwy to White Rock Rd	2025-2035	\$350,000	
170	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Suncast Ln bike lanes	Class II bike lanes on Suncast Ln from Monte Mar Dr to Latrobe Rd	2025-2035	\$420,000	
171	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Ponderosa Rd bike route	Class III bike route on Ponderosa Rd from Meder Rd to Green Valley Rd	2035-2045	\$90,000	
172	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Green Valley Rd bike lanes	Class II bike lanes on Green Valley Rd east of Lotus Rd	2035-2045	\$1,800,000	
173	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	1	US 50 Corridor Bike Route: Old Lincoln Highway Bike Path	Old Bass Lake Rd to Tong Rd: Use Old Lincoln Hwy as Class I Bike Path	2025-2035	\$450,000	
174	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Green Valley Rd Bike Route	Class II bike lanes on Green Valley Rd from N Shingle Rd to Lotus Rd	2025-2035	\$200,000	
175	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	3	Tong Rd Bike Route	Class III Bike Route on Tong Rd connecting to Silva Valley Pkwy	2025-2035	\$200,000	
176	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	1	El Dorado Trail - Shingle Springs to El Dorado	On the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor from Shingle Springs Dr east to Oriental St: Construct Class I Multi-Use bicycle and pedestrian path	2025-2035	\$200,000	
177	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Pleasant Valley Rd Bike Lanes East	Big Cut Rd to Sly Park Rd	2035-2045	\$1,575,000	
178	A- Bike & Ped	City of Placerville	2	Placerville Dr Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Ph 1	In the City of Placerville, along Placerville Dr between Cold Springs Rd and the Ray Lawyer Dr/Green Valley Rd intersection and Green Valley Rd from Placerville Dr to Mallard Ln: construct Class 2 and Class 4 bicycle facilities, sidewalks, crossing improvements, curb ramps, and transit improvements. (PA & ED completed under ELD19509).	2025-2035	\$16,795,064	Yes
179	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	1	El Dorado Trail - South Shingle Rd southwest to Latrobe	On the Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor from South Shingle Rd southwest to Latrobe: Construct Class I Multi-Use bicycle and pedestrian path	2035-2045	\$8,500,000	
180	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	1	Latrobe Rd Bike Path South	Class I bike path along the east side of Latrobe Rd connecting El Dorado Hills Town Center and Suncast Ln	2025-2035	\$1,000,000	
181	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County	2	Pleasant Valley Rd Bike Lanes 2	Big Cut Rd to SR 49/Fowler Ln	2035-2045	\$575,000	
NA	A- Bike & Ped	Caltrans	2	Pleasant Valley Rd Bike Lanes 1	1: SR 49/Fowler Ln to SR 49 in El Dorado		\$1,600,000	
NA	A- Bike & Ped	Caltrans	2	Pleasant Valley Rd Bike Lanes 3	SR 49 in El Dorado to Mother Lode Dr Y	2035-2045	\$525,000	
NA	A- Bike & Ped	Caltrans	2	SR 49 Bike Lanes	Class II bike lanes on SR 49 from SR 193 to Spring St	2035-2045	\$280,000	
NA	A- Bike & Ped	Caltrans	2	SR 193 Bike Lanes	Class II bike lanes on SR 193 from SR 49 to Georgetown Main St	2035-2045	\$6,000,000	
NA	A- Bike & Ped	Caltrans	2	SR 49 Bike Lanes	Class II bike lanes on SR 49 from Marshall Rd to Old Foresthill Rd	2035-2045	\$5,600,000	
NA	A- Bike & Ped	Caltrans	2	SR 49 Bike Lanes	Class II bike lanes on SR 49 from Coloma St to Pleasant Valley Rd	2035-2045	\$1,600,000	
NA	A- Bike & Ped	Caltrans	2	SR 49 Bike Lanes	Class II bike lanes on SR 49 from Pleasant Valley Rd south to county boundary	2035-2045	\$4,000,000	
NA	A- Bike & Ped	Caltrans	2	SR 193 Bike Lanes	Class II bike lanes on SR 193 from Georgetown Main St to SR 49	2035-2045	\$5,000,000	
NA	A- Bike & Ped	Caltrans	2	SR 49 Bike Lanes	Class II bike lanes on SR 49 from SR 193 to Lotus Rd	2035-2045	\$3,600,000	

Appendix 6A - El Dorado County Transportation Commission 2025-2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List

Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Projects



MapID Final	Category	Lead Agency	Class	Title	Description	Plan Year	Project Cost	Funded
NA	A- Bike & Ped	El Dorado County, Caltrans D3	NA	Install bicycle loop detection at all major intersections B	Install bicycle loop detection at all major intersections	2025-2035	\$6,000	
NA	A- Bike & Ped	Caltrans D3	2	SR 49 - Construct Class II Bike Lane	On SR 49, from Southview Ct. in Placerville (south of US 50) to Gold Hill Rd (Approximately 5 miles north of US 50), where feasible Construct Class II Bike Lane	2035-2045	\$2,880,000	
NONE	A- Bike & Ped	City of Placerville		Canal St Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Project Phase 1B	In Placerville, along Canal St from Cougar Ln to Combellaack Rd, rehabilitate pavement, improve drainage, repair or replace utilities, and improve bicycle and pedestrian safety and access.	2025-2035	\$4,400,912	Partial
201	F - Transit Ops and Maintenance	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Revise Route 20 on Weekdays	Revise Route 20 to provide hourly service between the Senior Center and Placerville Station. Provide hourly service on Saturdays between the Senior Center and Placerville Station from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.	2025-2035	\$850,000	
202	F - Transit Ops and Maintenance	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Revise Route 30 on Weekdays	Revise Route 30 to provide hourly service on weekdays between Diamond Springs and the Missouri Flat Transfer Center.	2025-2035	\$745,000	
203	F - Transit Ops and Maintenance	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Revise Route 40 on Weekdays	Revise Route 40 to provide hourly service on weekdays between Cameron Park and Ponderosa Park and Ride. Provide hourly service on Saturday between Cameron Park and Cambridge Rd Park and Ride between 9:00 am and 5:00 p.m.	2025-2035	\$406,000	
204	F - Transit Ops and Maintenance	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Revise Route 50 on Weekdays	Revise Route 50 to provide hourly service on weekdays between Historic Folsom Station and Pollock Pines. Revise Route 50 to provide hourly service on Saturdays between Historic Folsom Station and Pollock Pines from 7:30 a.m. to 6:55 p.m.	2025-2035	\$1,877,000	
205	E-Transit Capital	El Dorado Transit	Transit	El Dorado Hills Park and Ride Improvements	Repave existing lot, construct transit passenger plaza, renew landscaping, striping, and signing, add new EV charging stations, improve bicycle and pedestrian connections, purchase and improve the lot to the east of the existing facility.	2025-2035	\$2,800,000	
206	E-Transit Capital	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Cambridge Rd Park and Ride Improvements	Add a bus loop with two additional bus loading bays, parking lot resurfacing, striping, and landscape improvements.	2025-2035	\$950,000	
NA	E-Transit Capital	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Placerville Station Improvements	Maintenance improvements including replacing the roof, power washing the facility, drywall repair, exterior painting, and new restroom amenities.	2025-2035	\$110,000	
NA	F - Transit Ops and Maintenance	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Microtransit Weekdays	Provide a weekday microtransit demonstration project from 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. at a service area TBD.	2025-2035	\$1,418,000	
NA	F - Transit Ops and Maintenance	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Microtransit on Saturdays	Provide a microtransit demonstration project on Saturdays from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. at a service area TBD.	2025-2035	\$201,000	
NA	F - Transit Ops and Maintenance	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Microtransit on Sundays	Provide a microtransit demonstration project on Sundays from 8:00 am to 5:00 p.m. at a service area TBD	2025-2035	\$134,000	
NA	E-Transit Capital	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Zero Emission Vehicles and Infrastructure (Phase 1)	Purchase Zero Emission Buses (ZEB) and construct supporting infrastructure.	2025-2035	\$8,280,000	
NA	E-Transit Capital	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Bus Parking Lot Rehabilitation	Remove and replace asphalt, move concrete curbs, install underground conduit for ZEB infrastructure, new striping, and other improvements.	2025-2035	\$891,436	
NA	E-Transit Capital	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Passenger Security Surveillance and Lighting (Bus Stops)	Replace current hardware and software to enhance safety and security for transit passengers and property.	2025-2035	\$300,000	
NA	E-Transit Capital	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Collision Avoidance System Upgrade	Upgrade systems with new technology.	2025-2035	\$358,500	
NA	D- Programs & Planning	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Coordination with schools and transit service	Include design review to provide children with transportation alternatives	2035-2045	NA	
NA	D- Programs & Planning	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Coordination with neighboring transit agencies	Ensure connections to neighboring transit agencies are as efficient and convenient as possible.	2035-2045	NA	
NA	D- Programs & Planning	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Other Potential Future Service Improvements	Skier service to Sierra-At-Tahoe Ski Area or service to South Lake Tahoe. Implementation of these additional improvements will be dependent upon obtaining additional financial resources.	2035-2045	NA	
NA	F - Transit Ops and Maintenance	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Transit Annual Operations	Projected twenty-year average annual operating costs to maintain transit services including local fixed-route, deviated fixed-route, Dial-a-Ride, and commuter service.	2025-2045	\$10,394,778	
NA	E-Transit Capital	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Regional Fueling Station	Develop a regional fueling station near the Sacramento/El Dorado County Line.	2025-2035	\$23,153,400	
NA	E-Transit Capital	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Vehicle Replacement	Replace two existing fleet vehicles with zero emission electric buses.	2025-2035	\$2,516,157	
NA	F - Transit Ops and Maintenance	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Operating Assistance for Intercity service from Sacramento to South Lake Tahoe	Intercity bus service between Sacramento and South Lake Tahoe	2025-2035	\$2,900,000	
NA	F - Transit Ops and Maintenance	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Operating Assistance for Rural Transit Services	Operating Assistance for rural transit services on the western slope of El Dorado County. Outside the Sacramento Urbanized area.	2025-2035	\$8,998,371	

Appendix 6A - El Dorado County Transportation Commission 2025-2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List								
Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Projects								
MapID Final	Category	Lead Agency	Class	Title	Description	Plan Year	Project Cost	Funded
NA	E - Transit Capital	El Dorado Transit	Transit	El Dorado County Transit Authority- Bus Replacement	Replace up to 5 minivans that have reached the end of their useful life.	2025-2035	\$500,000	
NEW	F - Transit Ops and Maintenance	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Transit Annual Operations - Short Range	Projected twenty-year average annual operating costs to maintain transit services including local fixed route, deviated fixed route, Dial- a-Ride, and commuter service. (Short Range)	2025-2035	\$103,947,780	
NEW	F - Transit Ops and Maintenance	El Dorado Transit	Transit	Transit Annual Operations - Long Range	Projected twenty-year average annual operating costs to maintain transit services including local fixed route, deviated fixed route, Dial- a-Ride, and commuter service. (Long Range)	2035-2045	\$103,947,780	

Sources: EDCTC, 2025.

3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

The following edits are made to page 3.1-14 of the DEIR.

Impact 3.1-2: Creation of new sources of light and glare (less than significant with mitigation)

There is a potential for RTP projects to create new sources of light and glare near sensitive receptors and/or habitat areas. There is a potential for RTP projects to create new sources of light and glare near sensitive receptors. Examples would include projects that require the new roadway lighting, lit signs, and/or construction lighting. The proposed RTP does not directly cause a light or glare impact. During the design process, the implementing agency would be required to ensure that each project is designed consistent with the relevant lighting standards (i.e., County or City). Consistency with the County and City standards would ensure that appropriate lighting is installed.

The following edits are made to page 3.1-14 of the DEIR.

The proposed project lighting would be installed consistent with the El Dorado County standards and specifications and would be required to incorporate design features to minimize the effects of light and glare. Compliance with the above noted standards would reduce potential lighting and glare impacts. The proposed project would also implement Mitigation Measure 3.1-3 related to lighting standards and minimization of light spillover onto sensitive uses and/or habitat areas. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.1-3, direct and indirect impacts related to light and glare would be ***less than significant***.

The following edits are made to page 3.1-15 of the DEIR, related to the text of Mitigation Measure 3.1-3.

- *Exterior lighting features shall be directed downward and shielded in order to confine light to the boundaries of the subject project. Where more intense lighting is necessary for safety purposes, the design shall include landscaping to block light from sensitive land uses, such as residences.*
- *In order to provide additional protection to biological resources from light spillover, the following measures shall apply:*
 1. *All luminaries will be shielded and directed away from adjacent habitat and open space areas; and*
 2. *Exterior lighting will utilize warm-light light emitting diode (LED) fixtures or equivalent, with a correlated color temperature of 3,000 Kelvin or lower, in order to minimize blue light emissions, while maintaining safety and functionality for project users.*

3.2 AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES

No changes were made to Section 3.2 of the DEIR.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

The following edits are made to page 3.3-15 in Section 3.3 of the DEIR.

~~Omnibus Low-NOx Rule~~

~~CARB approved the Omnibus Low-NOx Rule on August 28, 2020, which will require engine NOx emissions to be cut to approximately 75 percent below current standards beginning in 2024, and 90 percent below current standards in 2027. The rule also places nine additional regulatory requirements on new heavy-duty trucks and engines. Those additional requirements include a 50% reduction in particulate matter emissions, stringent new low-load and idle standards, a new in-use testing protocol, extended deterioration requirements, a new California-only credit program, and extended mandatory warranty requirements. The regulatory requirements in the Omnibus Low-NOx Rule will first become effective in 2024, at the same time as the Advanced Clean Trucks regulations that CARB approved that require manufacturers to convert increasing percentages of their heavy-duty trucks sold in California to zero-emission vehicles.~~

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The following edits are made to page 3.4-3 in Section 3.4 of the DEIR.

Salmon and Trout Fisheries

Salmon and steelhead trout are anadromous fish species that are present in the Bay Delta and San Joaquin and Sacramento River Basins. Anadromous fish are born in freshwater rivers and streams, and then migrate to the Pacific Ocean to grow and mature before returning to their place of origin to spawn. The San Joaquin and Sacramento River system produces most of the Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) and a large percentage of the steelhead trout in California.

The following edits are made to page 3.4-8 in Section 3.4 of the DEIR.

Native Plant Protection Act (Fish and Game Code Sections 1900 through 1913)

CFGF Sections 1900 through 1913 were developed to preserve, protect, and enhance Rare and Endangered plants in the State of California. The Native Plant Protection Act requires all State agencies to use their authority to carry out programs to conserve Endangered and Rare native plants listed under that Act. Provisions of the Native Plant Protection Act prohibit the taking of listed plants listed under that Act from the wild and require notification ~~to~~ of the CDFW at least ten days in advance of any change in land use which would adversely impact listed plants. This allows CDFW to salvage listed plant species that would otherwise be destroyed.

The following edits are made to page 3.4-8 in Section 3.4 of the DEIR.

Fish and Game Code Section 1602 applies to all perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral rivers, streams, and lakes in the State. CDFW's regulatory authority extends to include riparian habitat (including wetlands) supported by a river, stream, or lake regardless of the presence or absence of hydric soils and saturated soil conditions. Generally, the CDFW takes jurisdiction to the top of bank of the stream or to the outer limit of the adjacent riparian vegetation (outer drip line), whichever is greater. However, the topography and individual site conditions may affect how project activities impact rivers, streams, and lakes and which activities are then subject to Fish and Game Code Section 1602. Notification is generally required for any project that would take place in or in the vicinity of a river, stream, lake, or their tributaries. This includes rivers or streams that flow at least periodically or permanently through a bed or channel with banks that support fish or other aquatic life and water sources having a surface or subsurface flow that support or have supported riparian vegetation.

3.5 CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES

The following edits are made to page 3.5-14 in Section 3.5 of the DEIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure 3.5-1: *During environmental review of individual RTP improvement projects, the implementing agencies shall retain a qualified architectural historian to inventory and evaluate architectural resources located in the project area using criteria for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources. In addition, the resources would be recorded by the architectural historian on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms, photographed, and mapped. The DPR forms shall be produced and forwarded to the Central California Information Center. If federal funding or approval is required, then the implementing agency shall comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.*

If architectural resources are deemed as potentially eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources or the National Register of Historic Places, the implementing agency shall consider avoidance through project redesign as feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, the implementing agencies shall ensure that the historic resource is formally documented through the use of large-format photography, measured drawings, written architectural descriptions, and historical narratives. The documentation shall be entered into the Library of Congress, and archived in the California Historical Resources Information System. In the event of building relocation, the implementing agency shall ensure that any alterations to significant buildings or structures conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.

3.6 GEOLOGY

No changes were made to Section 3.6 of the DEIR.

3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS, CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENERGY

No changes were made to Section 3.7 of the DEIR.

3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

No changes were made to Section 3.8 of the DEIR.

3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

No changes were made to Section 3.9 of the DEIR.

3.10 LAND USE PLANNING, POPULATION, AND HOUSING

No changes were made to Section 3.10 of the DEIR.

3.11 NOISE

No changes were made to Section 3.11 of the DEIR.

3.12 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

The following edits are made to page 3.12-31 in Section 3.12 of the DEIR.

Table 3.12-5 provides estimates of total daily VMT generated for El Dorado County in 2020 and the SACOG forecast for 2050. Daily VMT in 2020 was 3,635,476 miles, and the forecasted 2050 daily VMT is 3,835,808. This represents an increase in 200,400 VMT daily, or an increase of 5.5 percent (SACOG, 2025).

TABLE 3.12-5: TOTAL VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED PER SERVICE POPULATION – EL DORADO COUNTY

VARIABLE	BASELINE (2020)	2050	DIFFERENCE	PERCENT DIFFERENCE
Total VMT ¹	3,635,476	3,835,808	200,400	5.53%
Population	163,098	180,569	17,471	10.71%
Employment	45,867	57,032	11,165	24.34%
Service Population	208,965	237,601	28,636	13.70%
Total VMT per Service Population	17.39	16.14	-1.25	-7.18%

3.13 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

No changes were made to Section 3.13 of the DEIR.

3.14 WILDFIRE

No changes were made to Section 3.14 of the DEIR.

4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

No changes were made to Section 4.0 of the DEIR.

5.0 ALTERNATIVES

No changes were made to Section 5.0 of the DEIR.

6.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

No changes were made to Section 6.0 of the DEIR.

7.0 REPORT PREPARERS

No changes were made to Section 7.0 of the DEIR.

8.0 REFERENCES

No changes were made to Section 8.0 of the DEIR.

This page left intentionally blank.

This document is the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the 2045 El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) (Project). This MMRP has been prepared pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code, which requires public agencies to “adopt a reporting and monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.” A MMRP is required for the proposed Project because the EIR has identified significant adverse impacts, and measures have been identified to mitigate those impacts.

The numbering of the individual mitigation measures follows the numbering sequence as found in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

4.1 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The MMRP, as outlined in Table 4.0-1, *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program*, describes mitigation timing, monitoring responsibilities, and compliance verification responsibility for all mitigation measures identified in this Final EIR.

The El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) will be the primary agency responsible for implementing the mitigation measures and will continue to monitor mitigation measures that are required to be implemented during the operation of the proposed Project.

The MMRP is presented in tabular form on the following pages. The components of the MMRP are described briefly below:

- **Environmental Impact:** The environmental impacts in the Draft EIR which require mitigation to reduce impacts are listed.
- **Mitigation Measures:** The mitigation measures are taken from the Draft EIR in the same order they appear in that document.
- **Mitigation Timing:** Identifies at which stage of the project mitigation must be completed.
- **Monitoring Responsibility:** Identifies the agency that is responsible for mitigation monitoring.
- **Compliance Verification:** This is a space that is available for the monitor to date and initial when the monitoring or mitigation implementation took place.

TABLE 4.0-1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
AESTHETICS				
<p>Impact 3.1-1: Substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas, or substantial degradation of visual character of public views of the site and surrounding area.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.1-1: The implementing agency shall, to the extent feasible, implement the following measures in the design of RTP projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design transportation systems in a manner where the surrounding landscape dominates. • Design transportation systems to be compatible with the surrounding environment (e.g., colors and materials of construction material). • Design transportation systems such that landscape vegetation blends in and complements the natural landscape. • Design transportation systems such that trees are maintained intact, or if removal is necessary, incorporate new trees into the design. • Design grades to blend with the adjacent landforms and topography. <p>Mitigation Measure 3.1.2: Prior to the design approval of RTP projects, the implementing agency shall assess whether the project would remove any significant visual resources in the project area, which may include trees, rock outcroppings, and historical buildings, and shall also assess whether the project would significantly obstruct views of scenic vistas or scenic resources including historic buildings, trees, rocks, or scenic water features.</p> <p>If it is determined that the RTP project would remove significant visual resources, the implementing agency shall consider alternative designs that seek to avoid and/or minimize impacts from removal of significant visual resources to the extent feasible. Project-specific design measures may include revisions to the plans to retain trees, rocks, and historic buildings, or replanting of trees, and/or the relocation of scenic features.</p> <p>If it is determined that the RTP project would significantly obstruct scenic views, the implementing agency shall consider alternative designs that seek to avoid and/or minimize obstruction of scenic views to the extent feasible. Project-specific design measures may include reduction in height of improvements or width of improvements to reduce obstruction of views, or relocation of improvements to reduce obstruction of views.</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p>	<p>Prior to project design and approval</p>	

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
<p>Impact 3.1-2: Creation of new sources of light and glare.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.1-3: The RTP projects shall be designed to meet minimum safety and security standards and to avoid spillover lighting to sensitive uses. Design measures shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Luminaries will be cutoff-type fixtures that cast low-angle illumination to minimize incidental spillover of light onto adjacent private properties and undeveloped open space. Fixtures that project light upward or horizontally will not be used. • Luminaries will be directed away from habitat and open space areas adjacent to the project site. • Luminaries will provide good color rendering and natural light qualities. Low-pressure sodium and high-pressure sodium fixtures that are not color corrected will not be used. Light intensity at roadway intersections and crosswalks will be at approximately ‘low average maintained illumination,’ as classified by the Recommended Practices for Roadway Lighting of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North American (IESNA). Low average maintained illumination is 1.8 foot-candle for major/major roadways, 1.5 foot-candle at major/collector roadways, 1.3 foot-candle at major/local roadways, 1.2 foot-candle at collector/collector roadways, 1.0 foot-candle at collector/local roadways, and 0.8 foot-candle at local/local roadways. • Luminary mountings will be downcast and the height of the poles minimized to reduce potential for back scatter into the nighttime sky and incidental spillover of light onto adjacent private properties and undeveloped open space. Luminary mountings will have non-glare finishes. • Exterior lighting features shall be directed downward and shielded to confine light to the boundaries of the subject project. Where more intense lighting is necessary for safety purposes, the design shall include landscaping to block light from sensitive land uses, such as residences. • To provide additional protection to biological resources from light spillover, the following measures shall apply: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All luminaries will be shielded and directed away from 	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p>	<p>Prior to project design and approval</p>	

4.0

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
	adjacent habitat and open space areas; and 2. Exterior lighting will utilize warm-light light emitting diode (LED) fixtures or equivalent, with a correlated color temperature of 3,000 Kelvin or lower, to minimize blue light emissions, while maintaining safety and functionality for project users.			
AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES				
Impact 3.2-1: Conversion of farmlands, including prime farmland, unique farmland, and farmland of statewide importance, to non-agricultural uses, or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.	Mitigation Measure 3.2-1: Prior to the design approval of individual RTP improvement projects, the implementing agency shall assess the potential for agricultural impacts. For federally funded projects, the implementing agency shall complete form AD-1006 to determine the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. The AD-1006 shall be submitted to the NRCS for approval. For non-federally funded projects, the implementing agency shall assess the project for the presence of important farmlands (prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide importance). If significant agricultural resources are identified within the limits of an individual RTP improvement project, the implementing agency shall consider alternative designs that seek to avoid and/or minimize impacts to the agricultural resources. Design measures may include, but are not limited to, reducing the proposed roadway width or relocating/realigning the improvement to avoid important and significant farmlands to the extent feasible. If the improvement cannot be designed without complete avoidance of important or significant farmlands, the implementing agency shall compensate for unavoidable conversion impacts at a 1:1 ratio.	Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable	Prior to project design and approval	
Impact 3.2-2: Potential to conflict with forest or timber zoning or result in the conversion of forest lands or timber lands.	Mitigation Measure 3.2-2: Prior to the design approval of individual RTP improvement projects that could impact forest or timber resources, the implementing agency shall retain a qualified arborist, forester, and/or biologist to assess the potential impacts of tree removal and encroachment activities and provide recommendations to the implementing agency.	Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable	Prior to project design and approval	

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
AIR QUALITY				
<p>Impact 3.3-2: Short-term - conflict with, or obstruct, the applicable air quality plan, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant in a non-attainment area.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-1: The implementing agency for any construction activities, including dismantling/ demolition of structures, processing/moving materials (sand, gravel, rock, dirt, etc.), or operation of machines/equipment, shall prepare a dust control plan in accordance with AQMD Rule 223 (Fugitive Dust). The dust control plan shall use reasonable precautions to prevent dust emissions, which may include: cessation of operations at times, cleanup, sweeping, sprinkling, compacting, enclosure, chemical or asphalt sealing, or other recommended actions by the AQMD.</p>	<p>El Dorado County Air Quality Management District, Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p>	<p>Prior to construction permitting</p>	
<p>Impact 3.3-3: Occasional localized carbon monoxide concentrations from traffic conditions at some individual locations.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-2: The implementing agency shall screen individual RTP projects at the time of design for localized CO hotspot concentrations and, if necessary, incorporate project-specific measures into the project design to reduce or alleviate CO hotspot concentrations.</p>	<p>El Dorado County Air Quality Management District Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p>	<p>During project design</p>	
<p>Impact 3.3-5: Potential to release asbestos from earth movement or structural asbestos from demolition/ renovation of existing structures.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-3: Prior to construction of RTP projects, the implementing agency should assess the site for the presence of asbestos including asbestos from structures such as road base, bridges, and other structures. If asbestos is present, the implementing agency should comply with applicable state and local regulations regarding asbestos, including ARB’s asbestos airborne toxic control measure (ATCM) (Title 17, CCR § 93105 and 93106), and El Dorado AQMD Rule 223-2, to ensure that exposure to construction workers and the public is reduced to an acceptable level. This may include the preparation of an Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan to be implemented during construction activities, or other recommended actions by the AQMD.</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p>	<p>Prior to construction permitting</p>	
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				

4.0

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
<p>Impact 3.4-1: Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-1: Prior to final design approval of individual projects, the implementing agency shall have a qualified biologist conduct a field reconnaissance of the environmental limits of the project to identify any biological constraints for the project, including special status plants, animals, and their habitats, as well as protected natural communities including wetland and terrestrial communities. If the biologist identifies protected biological resources within the limits of the project, the implementing agency shall first prepare alternative designs that seek to avoid and/or minimize impacts to the biological resources. If the project cannot be designed without complete avoidance, the implementing agency shall coordinate with the appropriate regulatory agency (i.e., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) to obtain regulatory permits and implement project-specific mitigation prior to any construction activities.</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p> <p>Qualified Biologist</p>	<p>Prior to final design approval</p>	
<p>Impact 3.4-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service, or on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2: Prior to approval of RTP projects, the implementing agency shall retain a qualified biologist to perform an assessment of the project area to identify wetlands, riparian, and other sensitive aquatic environments. If wetlands are present the qualified biologist shall perform a wetland delineation following the 1987 Army Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. The wetland delineation shall be submitted to the Army Corp of Engineers for verification.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-3: If wetlands, riparian, or other sensitive aquatic environments are found within the project area, the implementing agency shall design or modify the project to avoid direct and indirect impacts on these habitats, if feasible. Additionally, the implementing agency shall minimize the loss of riparian vegetation by trimming rather than removal where feasible.</p> <p>Prior to construction, the implementing agency shall install orange construction barrier fencing to identify environmentally sensitive areas around the wetland (20 feet from edge), riparian area (100 feet from edge), and other aquatic habitats (250 feet from edge of vernal pool). The location of the fencing shall be marked in the field with stakes and flagging and shown on the construction drawings. The fencing will be installed before construction activities are initiated and will be maintained throughout the construction</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p> <p>Qualified Biologist</p>	<p>Prior to design approval, prior to construction</p>	

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
	<p>period. The following paragraph will be included in the construction specifications.</p> <p>“The Contractor’s attention is directed to the areas designated as “environmentally sensitive areas.” These areas are protected, and no entry by the Contractor for any purpose will be allowed unless specifically authorized in writing by the implementing agency. The Contractor will take measures to ensure that Contractor’s forces do not enter or disturb these areas, including giving written notice to employees and subcontractors.”</p> <p>Temporary fences around the environmentally sensitive areas will be installed as the first order of work. Temporary fences will be furnished, constructed, maintained, and removed as shown on the plans, as specified in the special provisions, and as directed by the project engineer. The fencing will be commercial-quality woven polypropylene, orange in color, and at least four feet high (Tensor Polygrid or equivalent). The fencing will be tightly strung on posts with a maximum 10-foot spacing.</p> <p>Immediately upon completion of construction activities the contractor shall stabilize exposed soil/slopes. On highly erodible soils/slopes, use a nonvegetative material that binds the soil initially and breaks down within a few years. If more aggressive erosion control treatments are needed, geotextile mats, excelsior blankets, or other soil stabilization products will be used. All stabilization efforts should include habitat restoration efforts.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-4: If wetlands or riparian habitat are disturbed as part of the individual RTP project, the implementing agency shall compensate for the disturbance to ensure no net loss of habitat functions and values. Compensation ratios shall be based on site-specific information and determined through coordination with state, federal, and local agencies as part of the permitting process for the project. Compensation may comprise onsite restoration/creation, off-site restoration, preservation, or mitigation credits (or a combination of these elements). The implementing agency shall develop and implement a restoration and monitoring plan that describes how the habitat shall be created and monitored over a minimum period of time.</p>			

4.0

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
<p>Impact 3.4-3: Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-5: Prior to design approval of RTP projects that contain movement habitat, the implementing agency shall incorporate economically viable design measures, as applicable and necessary, to allow wildlife or fish to move through the transportation corridor, both during construction activities and post construction, consistent with El Dorado County requirements, including those as provided in the El Dorado County General Plan. 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. If the project cannot be designed with these design measures (i.e. due to traffic safety, etc.) the implementing agency shall coordinate with the appropriate regulatory agency (i.e., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) to obtain regulatory permits and implement alternative project-specific mitigation prior to any construction activities, consistent with El Dorado County requirements.</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p> <p>Qualified Biologist</p>	<p>Prior to design approval</p>	
<p>Impact 3.4-4: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, or with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-6: If a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) has been adopted, prior to design approval of individual projects, the implementing agency shall coordinate with El Dorado County (or the designated agency responsible for implementing the HCP or NCCP) to determine the appropriate coverage, permits, compensatory mitigation or fees, and project specific avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p> <p>Qualified Biologist</p>	<p>Prior to design approval</p>	
CULTURAL RESOURCES AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
<p>Impact 3.5-1: Potential to cause a substantial adverse change to a significant historical resource, as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-1: During environmental review of individual RTP improvement projects, the implementing agencies shall retain a qualified architectural historian to inventory and evaluate architectural resources located in project area using criteria for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources. In addition, the resources would be recorded by the architectural historian on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms, photographed, and mapped. The DPR forms shall</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p> <p>Qualified</p>	<p>During environmental review</p>	

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
	<p>be produced and forwarded to the Central California Information Center. If federal funding or approval is required, then the implementing agency shall comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.</p> <p>If architectural resources are deemed as potentially eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources or the National Register of Historic Places, the implementing shall consider avoidance through project redesign as feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, the implementing agencies shall ensure that the historic resource is formally documented through the use of large-format photography, measured drawings, written architectural descriptions, and historical narratives. The documentation shall be entered into the Library of Congress, and archived in the California Historical Resources Information System. In the event of building relocation, the implementing agency shall ensure that any alterations to significant buildings or structures conform to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.</p>	Archaeologist		
<p>Impact 3.5-2: Potential to cause a substantial adverse change to a significant archaeological resource, as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5, or a significant tribal cultural resource, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-2: During environmental review of individual RTP improvement projects, the implementing agencies shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult with relevant Native American Tribes known to have been located within each individual improvement project area to determine whether a project could affect cultural resources that may be of importance to tribes. Provide each relevant tribe within the specific project area with copies of any archaeological reports, environmental documents, and mitigation measures that are prepared for a project. Consult with the tribes to determine if tribal monitors are needed for field surveys on individual projects. • Consult with the Native American Heritage Commission to determine whether known sacred sites are in the project area, and identify the Native American(s) to contact to obtain information about the project area. • Conduct a records search at the Central California Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System to determine whether the project area has been previously surveyed and whether resources were identified. 	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p> <p>Qualified Archaeologist</p>	<p>During environmental review and/or during project grading and construction activities</p>	

4.0

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
	<p>In the event the records indicate that no previous survey has been conducted, the Central California Information Center will make a recommendation on whether a survey is warranted based on the archaeological sensitivity of the project area. If recommended, a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to conduct archaeological surveys. The significance of any resources that are determined to be in the project area shall be assessed according to the applicable local, state, and federal significance criteria. Implementing agencies shall devise treatment measures to ameliorate “substantial adverse changes” to significant archaeological resources, in consultation with qualified archaeologists and other concerned parties. Such treatment measures may include avoidance through project redesign, data recovery excavation, and public interpretation of the resource.</p> <p>Implementing agencies and the contractors performing the improvements shall adhere to the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If an improvement project is in an area rich with cultural materials, the implementing agency shall retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor any subsurface operations, including but not limited to grading, excavation, trenching, or removal of existing features of the subject property. • If, during the course of construction cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, and isolated artifacts and features) are discovered work shall be halted immediately within 50 meters (165 feet) of the discovery, the implementing agency shall be notified, and a qualified archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. • The implementing agency shall consider mitigation recommendations presented by a professional archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology for any unanticipated discoveries and shall carry out the measures deemed feasible and appropriate. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. The project proponent shall be required to implement any mitigation necessary for the protection of cultural resources. 			

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
<p>Impact 3.5-3: Potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-3: Implement Stop-Work and Consultation Procedures Mandated by Public Resources Code 5097. In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during construction or excavation activities associated with an RTP project, the implementing agency shall cease further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the following steps are taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The El Dorado County Coroner has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required. • If the remains are of Native American origin, either of the following steps will be taken: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission to ascertain the proper descendants from the deceased individual. The coroner will make a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods, which may include obtaining a qualified archaeologist or team of archaeologists to properly excavate the human remains. ○ The implementing agency or its authorized representative will retain a Native American monitor, and an archaeologist, if recommended by the Native American monitor, and rebury the Native American human remains and any associated grave goods, with appropriate dignity, on the property and in a location that is not subject to further subsurface disturbance when any of the following conditions occurs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a descendent. ▪ The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation. ▪ The implementing agency or its authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner. 	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p> <p>Qualified Archaeologist</p>	<p>During project grading and construction activities</p>	
GREENHOUSE GASES, CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENERGY				
<p>Impact 3.6-1: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-1: The EDCTC shall work with regional, state, and federal partners to explore the feasibility of a transportation pricing policy for the transit system and selected portions of the road network to encourage</p>	<p>El Dorado County Air Quality Management</p>	<p>During project design</p>	

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
<p>have a significant impact on the environment.</p>	<p>people to drive less and increase use of transit, walking and bicycling modes. The EDCTC shall continue to participate and host programs that are deemed feasible by the EDCTC for the region to incentivize alternative transportation modes.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-2: The EDCTC shall work with El Dorado County and City of Placerville partners to consider incorporating a complete streets policy with a strong focus on identifying opportunities to create more active transportation within the region (i.e. bike and pedestrian facilities).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-3: Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the agencies implementing RTP projects shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote measures to reduce wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction, operation, maintenance, and/or removal. As the individual RTP projects are designed there should be an explanation as to why certain measures were incorporated in the RTP project and why other measures were dismissed. • Site, orient, and design projects to minimize energy consumption, increase water conservation and reduce solid-waste. • Promote efforts to reduce peak energy demand in the design and operation of RTP projects. • Promote the use of alternate fuels (particularly renewable ones) or energy systems for RTP projects. • Promote efforts to recycle materials used in the construction (including demolition phase) of RTP projects. <p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-4: The EDCTC shall coordinate with SACOG as the MPO for the region, as well as with local and regional agencies to assist in efforts to develop local and regional CAPs (Climate Action Plans) and/or General Plan policy that address climate change and greenhouse gas emissions. Local and regional CAPs should include the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline inventory of GHG emissions from community and municipal sources. • A target reduction goal consistent with AB 32 and SB 32. • Policies and measures to reduce GHG emissions. • Quantification of the effectiveness of the proposed policies and measures. 	<p>District</p> <p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A monitoring program to track the effectiveness and implementation of the CAP(s). <p>EDCTC’s role in the development of local and regional CAPs should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistance in seeking and securing funding for the development of local and regional CAPs. • Collaboration with local and regional agencies throughout their respective planning processes. <p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-5: EDCTC shall consider the feasibility of developing and implementing an Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) and Infrastructure Policy in the future and assist local agencies with the development of an Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) and Infrastructure Policy if determined feasible. In developing an AFV policy, EDCTC should consider the studies prepared by California Energy Commission (i.e. TakeCharge II: Infrastructure Roadmap). The policy could include provisions that address best practices, and standards related to saving energy and reducing GHG emissions through AFV use, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A procurement policy for using AFV by franchisees of these cities, such as trash haulers, green waste haulers, street sweepers, and curbside recyclable haulers. Such AFVs should have GHG emissions that are lower than comparable gasoline- or diesel- powered vehicles. • To the extent that it is deemed economically feasible for the local agency, a fleet purchase policy to increase the number of AFVs (i.e., vehicles not powered strictly by gasoline or diesel fuel) for municipally owned fleets. • A public education policy to encourage the use of alternative fuel vehicles and development of supporting infrastructure. 			
GEOLOGY, SOILS AND SEISMICITY				
<p>Impact 3.7-1: Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault or strong seismic ground</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.7-1: Conduct project-level seismic hazard evaluations and design those project facilities according to the seismic design requirements for roads and bridges. Implementing agencies shall ensure evaluations of seismic ground shaking hazards for all individual improvement projects at the project level. Based on these evaluations, the implementing agencies shall ensure that design and construction of all new facilities are</p>	<p>EDCTC and/or the appropriate implementing agency</p>	<p>During project design</p>	

4.0

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
shaking.	constructed in accordance with the most appropriate building standards to minimize the potential impacts to new facilities.			
Impact 3.7-2: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	Implement Mitigation Measures 3.9-1 and 3.9-2 , as presented under Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality.	Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable	Prior to project construction	
Impact 3.7-3: Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, and landslides; or be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.	Mitigation Measure 3.7-2: Conduct site-specific geotechnical investigations for liquefaction, slope stability, lateral spreading, settlement, and subsidence. Implementing agencies shall ensure that site-specific geotechnical investigations are conducted before or during the preliminary and/or final design stages of the individual RTP improvement projects to identify and characterize areas that may be susceptible to these geological conditions. These site-specific investigations may range from limited screening investigations to identify obvious hazards, to very detailed subsurface investigations. The findings of these site-specific investigations shall serve as the basis for the final design of the proposed projects and ensure that appropriate geotechnical methods are used to avoid or minimize the potential for damage to project-related facilities.	Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable	During project design	
Impact 3.7-4: Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.	Mitigation Measure 3.7-3: Conduct site-specific geotechnical investigations for expansive soils and implement appropriate, proven geotechnical methods. Implementing agencies shall conduct site-specific geotechnical investigations before or during the preliminary and/or final design stages of the individual RTP improvement projects to identify areas with expansive soils. The findings of these site-specific investigations shall serve as the basis for the final design of the proposed projects and ensure that appropriate, proven geotechnical methods are used to avoid or minimize the potential for expansive soils and sediments to damage project-related structures. The exact methods that would be used to address potential expansive soil issues may include the selective placement of expansive fill materials; the use of imported, non-	Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable	During project design	

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
	expansive fill materials; or other methods of ground improvement.			
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
<p>Impact 3.8-4: Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.8-1: Prior to approval of individual RTP improvement projects, the implementing agency shall perform a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment that includes a review of all known databases for contaminated sites. If it is determined that a project is located on or near a contaminated site a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment shall be performed to sample the soils/groundwater and further investigate the extent of the contamination. Based on the results of the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, the implementing agency shall devise a remediation plan or avoid disturbance of contaminated areas, in compliance with appropriate regulatory agency requirements. All work shall be conducted under a work plan approved by the regulatory oversight agency and should be conducted by a registered environmental assessor (pursuant to 22 CCR 69200).</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p> <p>Registered environmental assessor</p>	<p>During project design</p>	
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
<p>Impact 3.9-1: Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality, or conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.9-1: Comply with NPDES General Construction Permit requirements. To reduce or eliminate construction-related water quality effects, the implementing agency shall ensure that transportation improvement projects comply with the requirements of the NPDES General Construction Permit. Project implementation agencies are required to obtain coverage under the General Construction Permit before the onset of any construction activities, where the disturbed area is 1 acre or greater in size.</p> <p>A SWPPP shall be developed by a qualified engineer or erosion control specialist in accordance with the NPDES General Construction Permit requirements. The SWPPP shall be implemented prior to the issuance of any grading permit before construction. The SWPPP shall be kept on site during construction activity and will be made available upon request to representatives of the RWQCB.</p> <p>Compliance and coverage under the NPDES General Construction Permit will require controls of pollutant discharges that utilize BMPs and technology to</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p>	<p>During project design</p> <p>Prior to project construction</p>	

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
	<p>reduce erosion and sediments to meet water quality standards. BMPs may consist of a wide variety of measures taken to reduce pollutants in stormwater runoff from the construction site. Measures may include, temporary erosion control measures (such as silt fences, staked straw bales/wattles, silt/sediment basins and traps, check dams, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary revegetation or other ground cover) will be employed to control erosion from disturbed areas.</p> <p>Final selection of BMPs will be subject to approval by the implementing agency. The implementing agency will verify that an NOI has been filed with the SWRCB, and a SWPPP has been developed before allowing construction to begin.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.9-2: Implement a Spill Prevention and Control Program. As part of requiring compliance with the NPDES General Construction Permit, the implementing agency and its agents shall develop and implement a spill prevention and control program to minimize the potential for, and effects from, spills of hazardous, toxic, or petroleum substances during all construction activities. The program shall be completed before any construction activities begin.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.9-3: Implement measures to maintain water quality after construction. The project implementing agencies shall implement source and treatment control measures according to the El Dorado County Stormwater Management Program. General site design control measures are required to minimize the volume and rate of stormwater runoff discharge from the project site. General site design control measures incorporated into the project design can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • conserving natural areas; • protecting slopes and channels; • minimizing impervious areas; • storm drain identification, and appropriate messaging and signing; and • minimizing effective imperviousness using turf buffers and/or grass-lined channels, if feasible. <p>In addition, projects must include treatment control measures, if possible and</p>			

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
	<p>when feasible, to remove pollutants from stormwater runoff prior to discharge to the storm drain system or receiving water. Treatment control measures may include, but not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetated buffer strip • Vegetated swale • Extended detention basin • Wet pond • Constructed wetland • Detention basin/sand filter • Porous pavement detention • Porous landscape detention • Infiltration basin • Infiltration trench • Media filter • Retention/irrigation • Proprietary control device <p>Selection and implementation of these measures shall be based on a project-by-project basis, depending on project size and stormwater treatment needs.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.9-4: Comply with provisions for dewatering. Before discharging any dewatered effluent to surface water, the implementing agency will obtain an NPDES permit and Waste Discharge Requirement from the Central Valley RWQCB and/or the Lahontan RWQCB, as appropriate. Depending on the volume and characteristics of the discharge, coverage under the NPDES General Construction Permit may be permissible. If coverage under the General Construction Permit is not allowed, the project will conform to requirements of the General Dewatering Permit, issued by the RWQCB and/or other applicable agencies. The project implementation agencies will design and implement measures as necessary so that the discharge limits identified in the relevant permit are met.</p>			
<p>Impact 3.9-3: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.9-5: Conduct project-level drainage studies. As part of the infrastructure plan, the project implementing agencies and/or their contractors will conduct a drainage study. This study will address the following</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where</p>	<p>During project design</p>	

4.0

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
<p>the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect flood flows.</p>	<p>topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A calculation of pre-development runoff conditions and post-development runoff scenarios using appropriate engineering methods. This analysis will evaluate potential changes to runoff through specific design criteria, and account for increased surface runoff. • An assessment of existing drainage facilities within the project area, and an inventory of necessary upgrades, replacements, redesigns, and/or rehabilitation, including the sizing of on-site stormwater detention features and pump stations. • A description of the proposed maintenance program for the onsite drainage system. • Standards for drainage systems to be installed on a project/parcel-specific basis. • Proposed design measures to ensure structures are not located within 100-year floodplain areas. <p>Drainage systems shall be designed in accordance with the County's, Flood Control Agency's, and other applicable flood control design criteria. As a performance standard, measures to be implemented from those studies will provide for no net increase in peak stormwater discharge relative to current conditions, ensure that 100-year flooding and its potential impacts are maintained at or below current levels, and that people and structures are not exposed to additional flood risk.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.9-6: Avoid restriction of flood flows. Proposed projects requiring federal approval or funding shall comply with Executive Order 11988 for floodplain management. Projects shall avoid incompatible floodplain development designs, they will restore and preserve the natural and beneficial floodplain values, and they will maintain consistency with the standards and criteria of the National Flood Insurance Program. In addition, a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) shall be prepared and submitted to FEMA where unavoidable construction would occur within 100-year floodplains. The LOMR shall include revised local base flood elevations for projects constructed within flood prone areas. Potential impacts due to flooding because of RTP projects are assumed</p>	<p>applicable</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p>to be alleviated through the FEMA LOMR approval process.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.9-7: Avoid project dewatering. Project designs that require continual de-watering activities for the life of the projects shall be avoided if possible. Due to the potential for flooding and destabilizing conditions, project implementation agencies will choose project designs that do not require continual dewatering, if suitable project alternatives exist. Project alternatives may include construction of overpasses, as opposed to below-grade underpasses, which would avoid interception with groundwater.</p>			
LAND USE AND POPULATION				
<p>Impact 3.10-1: Physical division of an established community.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.10-1: Prior to approval of RTP projects, the implementing agency shall consult with local planning staff to ensure that the project will not physically divide the community. The consultation should include a more detailed project-level analysis of land uses adjacent to proposed improvements to identify specific impacts. The analysis should consider new road widths and specific project locations in relation to existing roads. If it is determined that a project could physically divide a community, the implementing agency shall redesign the project to avoid the impact, if feasible. The measures could include realignment of the improvements to avoid the affected community. Where avoidance is not feasible, the implementing agency shall incorporate minimization measures to reduce the impact. The measures could include: alignment modifications, right-of-way reductions, provisions for bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicle facilities, and enhanced landscaping and architecture.</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p>	<p>Prior to project approval</p>	
NOISE				
<p>Impact 3.11-1: Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures 3.11-1: Prior to approval of RTP projects, the implementing agency shall perform a project-level noise evaluation. For projects adjacent to noise-sensitive uses, implementing agencies shall consider the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct vegetative earth berms with mature trees and landscaping to attenuate roadway noise on adjacent residences or other sensitive use, 	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p>	<p>Prior to approval of individual projects</p>	

4.0

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
applicable standards of other agencies	and/or sound walls or other similar sound-attenuating buffers, as appropriate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Properly zone, buffer, and restrict development to ensure that future development is compatible with transportation facilities. • Design projects to maximize the distance between noise-sensitive land uses and new roadway lanes, roadways, transit centers, park-and-ride lots, and other new noise generating facilities. • Improve the acoustical insulation of residential units where setbacks and sound barriers do not sufficiently reduce noise. 			
Impact 3.11-2: Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels	Mitigation Measure 3.11-2: Subsequent projects under the RTP shall be designed and implemented to reduce adverse construction noise and vibration impacts to sensitive receptors, as feasible. Measures to reduce noise and vibration effects may include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit noise-generating construction activities to the least noise-sensitive daytime hours, which is generally 6am to 9pm. • Construction of temporary sound barriers to shield noise-sensitive land uses. • Location of noise-generating stationary equipment (e.g., power generators, compressors, etc.) at the furthest practical distance from nearby noise-sensitive land uses. • Phase demolition, earth-moving and ground-impacting operations so as not to occur in the same time period. • Use of equipment noise-reduction devices (e.g., mufflers, intake silencers, and engine shrouds) in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. • Substituting noise/vibration-generating equipment with equipment or procedures that would generate lower levels of noise/vibration. For instance, in comparison to impact piles, drilled piles or the use of a sonic or vibratory pile driver are preferred alternatives where geological conditions would permit their use. • Other specific measures as they are deemed appropriate by the implementing agency to maintain consistency with adopted policies and regulations regarding noise. 	Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable	During project design	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comply with all local noise control and noise rules, regulations, and ordinances. 			
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION				
<p>Impact 3.12-2: Substantially interfere with achievement of the VMT reductions set forth in CARB’s Scoping Plan</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.12-1: EDCTC shall work collaboratively with SACOG, El Dorado County, and City of Placerville to support implementation of regional and local-level strategies and measures to achieve further VMT reductions. Implementing agencies (i.e., El Dorado County and City of Placerville) shall implement the following strategies to reduce VMT.</p> <p><u>Local-Level:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementing agencies shall require implementation of VMT reduction strategies through transportation demand management (TDM) programs, impact fee programs, mitigation banks or exchange programs, in-lieu fee programs, or other land use project conditions that reduce VMT. Programs should be designed to reduce VMT from existing land uses, where feasible, and from new discretionary residential or employment land use projects. The following strategies from Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measure, CAPCOA, August 2010 were identified in the El Dorado County and City of Placerville SB 743 Implementation Plan, July 2019, as strategies most suited to El Dorado County and the City of Placerville given the rural and suburban land use context: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Increase diversity of land uses</u> – This strategy focuses on the inclusion of mixed uses within projects or in consideration of the surrounding area to minimize vehicle travel in terms of both the number of trips and the length of those trips. <u>Provide pedestrian network improvements</u> – This strategy focuses on creating a pedestrian network within the project and connecting to nearby destinations. Projects in El Dorado County tend to be smaller, so the emphasis of this strategy would likely be the construction of network improvements that connect the project site directly to nearby destinations. Alternatively, implementation could occur through an impact fee program or benefit/assessment district 	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p>	<p>During project design Ongoing</p>	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p>based on local or regional plans such as the Active Transportation Plan.</p> <p>3. <u>Provide traffic calming measures and low-stress bicycle network improvements</u> – This strategy combines the CAPCOA research focused on traffic calming with new research on providing a low-stress bicycle network. Traffic calming creates networks with low vehicle speeds and volumes that are more conducive to walking and bicycling. Building a low-stress bicycle network produces a similar outcome. Implementation options are similar to strategy 2 above. One potential change in this strategy over time is that e- bikes (and e-scooters) could extend the effective range of travel on the bicycle network, which could enhance the effectiveness of this strategy.</p> <p>4. <u>Implement car-sharing program</u> – This strategy reduces the need to own a vehicle or reduces the number of vehicles owned by a household by making it convenient to access a shared vehicle for those trips where vehicle use is essential. Note that implementation of this strategy would require regional or local agency implementation and coordination and would not likely be applicable for individual development projects.</p> <p>5. <u>Increase transit service frequency and speed</u> – This strategy focuses on improving transit service convenience and travel time competitiveness with driving. Given land use density in El Dorado County, this strategy may be limited to traditional commuter transit where trips can be pooled at the start and end locations or require new forms of demand-responsive transit service. The demand-responsive service could be provided as subsidized trips by contracting to private TNCs or Taxi companies. Alternatively, a public transit operator could provide the subsidized service but would need to improve on traditional cost effectiveness by relying on TNC ride-hailing technology, using smaller vehicles sized to demand, and flexible driver employment terms where drivers are paid by trip versus by hour. Note that implementation of this strategy would require regional or local agency implementation, substantial changes to current transit practices, and would not likely be applicable for</p>			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p>individual development projects.</p> <p>6. <u>Encourage telecommuting and alternative work schedules</u> – This strategy relies on effective internet access and speeds to individual project sites/buildings to provide the opportunity for telecommuting. The effectiveness of the strategy depends on the ultimate building tenants and this should be a factor in considering the potential VMT reduction.</p> <p>7. <u>Provide ride-sharing programs</u> – This strategy focuses on encouraging carpooling and vanpooling by project site/building tenants and has similar limitations as strategy 6 above.</p> <p><u>Regional:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementing agencies shall consider project modifications during the project design and environmental review stage of project development to reduce VMT. For roadway capacity expansion projects, this would include but is not limited to demand management through transportation systems management and operations (TSMO) including the use of pricing. Implementing agencies shall participate in SACOG’s MTP/SCS programs that are intended to provide infill incentives and support for transit and innovative mobility as key elements of filling that VMT gap. 			
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS				
<p>Impact 3.13-1: Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.13-1: The implementing agencies and/or Caltrans shall be required to provide CEQA review for all projects that may require additional water treatment upgrades. Projects shall be analyzed on a case-by-case basis to determine if construction or expansion of water treatment facilities, and or infrastructure upgrades of existing and new facilities would cause significant environmental effects.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.13-2: The implementing agencies and/or Caltrans shall be required to provide CEQA review for all projects that require additional wastewater infrastructure upgrades. Projects shall be analyzed on a case-by-case basis to determine if construction or expansion of wastewater treatment</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p>	<p>During project design</p>	

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
	<p>and collection facilities, and or infrastructure upgrades of existing and new facilities would cause significant environmental effects. Implementing agencies shall determine appropriate mitigation measures that are project specific.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.13-3: The implementing agencies and/or Caltrans shall require projects to direct stormwater run-off and other surface drainage into an adequate on-site system or into a municipal system with capacity to accept the project drainage. This should be demonstrated by requiring consistency with local stormwater drainage master plans and include a project-specific drainage analysis satisfactory to the jurisdiction's engineer.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.13-4: The implementing agencies and/or Caltrans shall be required to provide CEQA review for all projects that require electric power, natural gas, and/or telecommunications infrastructure upgrades. Projects shall be analyzed on a case-by-case basis to determine if construction or expansion of electric power, natural gas, and/or telecommunications infrastructure facilities, and or infrastructure upgrades of existing and new facilities would cause significant environmental effects. Implementing agencies shall determine appropriate mitigation measures that are project specific.</p>			
<p>Impact 3.13-2: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.13-5: Prior to construction of facilities that would require water service for potable consumption and landscaping purposes, the implementing agency shall secure adequate water supplies to serve the proposed project and undertake project-level review as necessary to provide CEQA compliance. Wherever feasible, facilities shall implement water conservation practices including but not limited to: the use of reclaimed water instead of potable water for landscaping purposes, low flow fixtures, and water efficient landscape design.</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p>	<p>Prior to project construction</p>	
<p>Impact 3.13-3: Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.13-6: Prior to construction of facilities that would require wastewater treatment services, the implementing agency shall secure adequate wastewater treatment capacity and undertake project-level review as necessary to provide CEQA compliance.</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable</p>	<p>Prior to project construction</p>	

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>TIMING</i>	<i>VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)</i>
commitments.				
<p>Impact 3.13-4: Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals, or comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.13-7: Prior to construction of transportation improvements and facilities that generate solid waste or require solid waste services; the implementing agency shall ensure receiving landfills have adequate solid waste capacity to serve additional project waste volumes. Additionally, the implementing agency shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require the construction contractor to work with the County Recycling Coordinator to ensure that source reduction techniques and recycling measures are incorporated into project construction. • Require the amount of solid waste generated during construction to be estimated prior to construction, and appropriate disposal sites will be identified and utilized. <p>For individual projects that include facilities that produce ongoing waste streams (including trash receptacles) the implementing agency shall, where feasible: Require waste reduction strategies including but not limited to: convenient recycling stations (onsite recycling receptacles) at all solid waste collection (trash receptacle) locations. Waste reduction strategies shall be coordinated with the County Recycling Coordinator.</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or EDCTC where applicable El Dorado County Recycling Coordinator</p>	<p>Prior to project construction</p>	

This page left intentionally blank.