 Appendix A  PREVIOUS CEQA DOCUMENTATION

The following Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study (IS) documentation was prepared to develop the decision to prepare an Environmental Impact Report and helped support and determine the scope of the Draft Environmental Impact Report. Public and Agency Comments received during the NOP/IS scoping process were taken into consideration and evaluated as necessary in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. Comments received during the review process are included in this Appendix.

A.1 NOTICE OF PREPARATION, EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT (JUNE 2015)

A.2 INITIAL STUDY, EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT

A.3 SCOPING COMMENTS RECEIVED
A.1 NOTICE OF PREPARATION, EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT (JUNE 2015)
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) staff will hold a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) scoping meeting to seek comments on the scope and content of the environmental information that should be included in the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project (Project).

The purpose of the Project is to replace a 3-mile section of water supply ditch with a buried pipeline which would convey raw water while reducing water leakage and losses, and improving the quality of water entering the Reservoir 1 Water Treatment Plant. Three potential alignments have been identified at the time of the Notice of Preparation, which are currently being analyzed by EID to determine construction feasibility, and operation and maintenance costs prior to selecting a preferred alignment. It is possible that further analysis of site specific conditions may necessitate revisions to these alignments that will be carried forward for further analysis in the draft EIR. Construction is anticipated to begin in the fall of 2016.

As part of the CEQA review process, EID has prepared a Notice of Preparation/Initial Study to help determine the scope and content of the EIR. The Initial Study is available for public review from June 17, 2015 through July 16, 2015 at:

1. EID website at http://www.eid.org/regulatory/environmental-docs-ceqa-nepa-
2. Placerville Main Public Library, 345 Fair Lane, Placerville
3. Pollock Pines Public Library, 6210 Pony Express Trail, Pollock Pines
4. Pollock Pines – Camino Community Center, 2675 Sanders Drive, Pollock Pines
5. EID Customer Service Building, 2890 Mosquito Road, Placerville

EID is conducting a public meeting to provide a forum for the public to comment on the Project. These comments will assist EID staff in determining the scope and content of the draft EIR, including helping EID to identify the range of alternatives, mitigation measures, and any potentially significant effects associated with the proposed Project. We invite you to attend the meeting to learn more about this important project. If you would like to receive project updates that will be posted to the EID website, please sign up through our eNews at www.eid.org.

Comments on the Initial Study must be received by 5:00 p.m. on July 16, 2015. Requests for additional information and comments on the Initial Study can be sent to Kristin Schaeffer, Environmental Review Analyst, El Dorado Irrigation District at 2890 Mosquito Road, Placerville, CA 95667, or kschaef@eid.org.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and California law, it is the policy of EID to offer its public programs, services and meetings in a manner that is readily accessible to everyone, including individuals with disabilities. If you are a person with a disability and require information or materials in an appropriate alternative format; or if you require any other accommodation for this meeting, please contact the EID ADA coordinator at 530-642-4013 or e-mail at adacoordinator@eid.org at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Advance notification within this guideline will enable the District to make reasonable accommodations to ensure accessibility.
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I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The El Dorado Irrigation District (District) is proposing to implement the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project (Project). The purpose of the Project is to replace a 3-mile section of water supply ditch with a buried pipeline which would convey raw water while reducing water leakage and losses, and improving the quality of water entering the Reservoir 1 Water Treatment Plant (WTP).

The Upper Main Ditch (Main Ditch) conveys a maximum of 15,080 acre-feet annually of raw water from the El Dorado Forebay Reservoir to the WTP which is then treated and distributed throughout the District’s public drinking water system. Because most of the ditch is uncovered and unlined, a portion of the water is lost to seepage and evapotranspiration. Studies of flow loss measurements have shown that the ditch losses are up to 1,300 acre-feet per year, depending on flow rates and weather conditions. By implementing the Project reduction in conveyance losses would aid the District in its water conservation effort, especially during drought conditions, assist in meeting the State of California mandate of 20% water conservation by 2020, and protect District water rights from unreasonable use claims as defined by Article 10 of the California Constitution. Senate Bill X7-7, the Water Conservation Act of 2009, set an overall requirement of reducing per capita urban water use by 20% by December 31, 2020. As an urban retail water supplier, the District is subject to this legislation. As an interim benefit of the Project there is a potential for an increase in hydroelectric power generation revenue in normal years until the full 15,080 acre-feet is needed to meet demand. By reducing losses, more water can be left in Project 184 to generate hydroelectric power. The long term benefit, when the full 15,080 acre-feet is needed to meet demand, is reduced pumping out of Folsom Reservoir.

The Main Ditch is susceptible to contamination and failure, putting drinking water supplies at risk and resulting in erosion and water quality issues that increase the contaminate load that must be removed by the treatment process. The Main Ditch flows through a rural residential area adjacent to many homes and backyards and its bench provides a well-traveled, but unauthorized, access point for the public. Therefore, direct access to the ditch is available to humans and animals prior to the raw water reaching the WTP. Previous water quality analysis indicates increases in total coliform, E. Coli and turbidity as the water travels through the earthen ditch between Forebay Reservoir and the WTP. Coliform and E. Coli are used in water quality monitoring as an indicator of possible contamination from animal and human feces (USEPA 2015). These elevated levels could be originating from a variety of sources including: general storm runoff; runoff from upstream livestock pastures; animals swimming in the ditch, and adjacent septic systems. Turbidity is a measure of suspended material in water; in this case, primarily resulting from soil erosion in and upstream of the ditch. Sediments and contaminates entering the waterway must be removed through the treatment process at the WTP to produce potable drinking water for the District’s public drinking water system. Reducing turbidity provides an opportunity for the District to reduce chemical treatment and solids handling costs at the WTP, and potentially reduce the cost of future water treatment process improvements.
In summary the Project provides the following benefits:

- Improves existing supply reliability in all years and especially during dry years and extended, persistent drought;
- Removes the potential for contamination;
- Reduces operations and maintenance costs related to solids handling;
- Potentially delays and reduces the capital cost for future WTP improvements;
- Protects water rights from unreasonable use claims;
- Contributes to compliance with State mandated 20% water conservation by 2020.
- Reduces pumping costs at Folsom Reservoir; and
- On an interim basis increases hydroelectric power generation revenues.

1.1 Background

The Upper Main Ditch is a section of the El Dorado Ditch built by mining interests to convey water to the Placerville area in the late 1800s. The ditch and water rights were then sold to the Western States Gas and Electric Company in the early 1900s, primarily for hydroelectric power generation. A smaller portion of the ditch water was maintained for delivery to some agricultural users. Over time, after several name changes and through agreements, the District took over the rights and responsibilities for delivering the non-power generating water to irrigation and domestic water users. In 1997, the District took over all water rights and facilities along the original El Dorado Canal (FERC Project No. 184), which provides raw water to the Upper Main Ditch.

1.2 CEQA Review

The proposed Project is a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In accordance with Section 15051 of the CEQA Guidelines, “Criteria for Identifying the Lead Agency”, the District, as a public agency carrying out the proposed Project, is the lead agency. Therefore, the District has prepared this Initial Study to determine if the proposed Project may have a significant effect on the environment.

2.1 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

- Reduce water loss resulting from seepage and evapotranspiration and contribute to the District’s overall water conservation efforts and supply reliability
- Protect drinking water quality by eliminating the potential for intentional or unintentional contamination of the open ditch
- Reduce operations and maintenance costs that would result from increased treatment and pumping costs

3.0 PROJECT LOCATION

The Project is located in El Dorado County, California, within Pollock Pines, on the north side of U.S. Highway 50, in the Pollock Pines USGS Quadrangle map, Sections 25, 26, 35 and 36, T11N, R12E and R13E (Figure 1). The Project site is located on parcels of land owned either by the District or private landowners, and may occur within the public right-of-way of roadways. A short segment of pipeline work activities occurs within the FERC Project No. 184 boundary.
4.0 PROJECT ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVES

Three potential alignments were considered in the Upper Main Ditch Piping Basis of Design Report (D&A 2014). The District is currently analyzing these alignments to determine construction feasibility, and operation and maintenance costs prior to selecting a preferred alignment. Each of these alignment alternatives are depicted in Figure 2 through Figure 4 and summarized below. Although these figures depict the potential alignments as known at the time of the preparation of this Initial Study, it is possible that further analysis of site specific conditions may necessitate revisions to these alignments that would be carried forward for further analysis in the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

4.1 Alignment 1 – Existing Ditch Alignment

Alignment 1 would follow the existing ditch for approximately 15,400 feet with an air/vacuum release valve at the Forebay Reservoir Valve House. The ditch cross section would be filled with compacted borrow material prior to trenching for the pipeline. The new pipe would be placed in the excavated trench, and engineered fill and select backfill material would then be placed over the pipe. The pipeline alignment may deviate slightly from the existing ditch alignment where a larger radius is required to construct the pipe through a tight curve. Above the pipe, the finished cross slope grade would be a minimum of 2% towards the downslope. By filling in the ditch with an out sloped grade, the drainage flow path would be returned to historic, pre-ditch conditions.

4.2 Alignment 2 – South Fork Long Canyon Creek Cross Country Alignment

Alignment 2 would follow the existing ditch for approximately 11,500 feet. The cross country portion of the alignment is 1,750 feet across largely undeveloped land. The total length of this alignment is approximately 13,250 feet and approximately 3,900 feet of existing ditch would be abandoned. A blow off valve would be required at the low point in this alignment, which would be located near the South Fork Long Canyon Creek crossing, to drain the pipeline during routine maintenance or in the event of an emergency.

4.3 Alignment 3 – Existing Ditch and Blair Road Alignment

Alignment 3 would follow the existing ditch for approximately 6,100 feet. The Blair Road portion of the alignment is approximately 6,800 feet with a total length of approximately 12,900 feet. Approximately 9,300 feet of the existing ditch would be abandoned. This alignment would deviate from the existing ditch alignment at Pinewood Lane, where the pipeline would follow Pinewood Lane to Blair Road. The pipeline would remain within the existing public right-of-way to the point where Blair Road crosses the ditch alignment. Due to the narrow right-of-way along Blair Road with limited shoulder area this alignment would be within the paved roadway. The pipeline would then rejoin the existing ditch alignment at the Blair Road crossing of the Upper Main Ditch and continue to the WTP. A blow off valve would need to be located at each of the low points along the alignment within Blair Road in order to drain the pipeline during routine maintenance or in the event of an emergency.
Ditch Alignment and Cross Country

Figure 3. Alignment 2 - Existing
Alignment 2 - Cross Country

Access Roads

Project # 11032.01
5.1 PROJECT ELEMENTS

The Project construction details provided in this section were primarily obtained from the Upper Main Ditch Piping Basis of Design Report (D&A 2014). The Project is comprised of the installation of a pipeline, reestablishment of three existing raw water services, and the following ancillary elements:

- Obtaining construction access, staging, and temporary construction and permanent easements;
- Connecting the new pipeline with the Forebay Reservoir Valve House;
- Constructing a new WTP inlet structure, flow measurement vault, chemical mixing improvements, control instrumentation, and supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) integration at the WTP headworks;
- Potential storm water culvert replacement and/or other improvements.

5.1 Temporary and Permanent Easements

Temporary easements during construction would be necessary to provide staging areas, access to the project alignment, and space along the alignment for transport and installation of the Project pipeline and appurtenances. The staging areas would be utilized for placement of a construction trailer, storing equipment, fill material, and pipeline materials. For the Existing Ditch Alignment alternative, permanent easements for the changed use from an earthen ditch to a pipeline would be acquired to cover necessary District access along the pipeline for operation and maintenance purposes. New permanent pipeline easements would physically fall within the District’s current property rights for operations and maintenance of the ditch. No public access easements are proposed or planned as part of the Project because the District’s access rights do not authorize such use. For the South Fork Long Canyon Creek Cross Country and Existing Ditch and Blair Road alignments, new permanent easements would also be required.

5.2 Connecting Pipeline at Forebay Reservoir Valve House

As part of the El Dorado Forebay Dam Project (SCH#2013032036) the existing valve house will be relocated along the alignment of the Main Ditch, and a 36-inch steel pipe through the dam will be extended along the alignment of the Main Ditch. The proposed Project would extend this steel pipe to the end of a new concrete transition structure within the ditch, which would connect the 36-inch steel pipe to the new polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe. A combination air/vacuum release valve would be installed at this point of pipe connection. Depending on the sequence of this Project in relation to the El Dorado Forebay Dam Project, it is possible that the valve house relocation and associated improvements would instead be constructed as part of this Project.

5.3 Inlet Structure at Reservoir 1 Water Treatment Plant

A new structure at the inlet to the WTP would be installed to dissipate energy from the pipeline entering the treatment plant headworks. The proposed structure would be an enclosed concrete box approximately 15 feet long by 9 feet wide by 8 feet in height. There would appropriate openings in the structure for District access and cleaning. The Main Ditch PVC pipeline would transition to a steel pipe that connects to a throttling valve prior to entering the concrete structure. Due to anticipated daily fluctuations in the Forebay Reservoir water surface elevation, the throttling valve would be automated to regulate the flows to the WTP. The structure would house flash mixing
equipment and chemical injection piping. The District is also investigating alternative chemical mixing that would be installed within the same footprint. The structure would have a sump to collect any debris that may enter the system at the Forebay Reservoir intake. The level of debris would be monitored and cleaned by the District, as needed. Emergency overflow would continue into the Main Ditch downstream of the WTP as it does currently.

A new flow monitoring vault would also be constructed upstream of the inlet structure. The proposed structure would be approximately 4 feet long by 4 feet wide by 8 feet in height and would house a magnetic flow meter to measure the flow into the plant. The existing SCADA system that monitors flows in the Main Ditch would be expanded to provide real-time data on the flow and volume entering the plant. Monitoring this data would allow the District to make accurate and timely deliveries of water and reduce over-deliveries while also improving monitoring for potential leaks over existing conditions. Control instrumentation for mechanized and chemical feed equipment would be installed and integrated into the existing WTP SCADA system, as well.

5.4 Potential Storm Water Culvert Replacement

In addition to flows from Forebay Reservoir, the Main Ditch currently intercepts and conveys storm water runoff. The piping of the Main Ditch would direct storm water as sheet flow back to historic drainage patterns with some locations of concentrated flow. These potential areas of concentrated flows below the Main Ditch would occur in three areas along Blair Road. As part of the Project design these areas would be evaluated to determine if improvements are required. If it is determined that the existing culverts or drainage channels are not adequate to carry the runoff, new culverts of appropriate size and/or other improvements would be installed in coordination with El Dorado County.

6.0 CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

Depending upon the chosen pipeline alignment the Project could be completed during one year. Otherwise, Project construction activities may be implemented during the annual El Dorado Canal outage. The outage generally occurs from October through December each year, although during construction, the outage would likely be extended later into the winter season to ensure completion of Project activities. If the existing ditch alignment was chosen, the construction work would need to occur during two separate annual outages, and would therefore require two separate construction seasons since work would not be conducted during the ditch operation season as could occur for portions of the alignment under the other two alternatives.

6.1 Construction Equipment

Contractor equipment could include construction office and equipment trailers; warehousing and equipment maintenance facilities; and fuel pumps and fuel storage tanks. Mobile construction equipment utilized for the Project would depend on the selected contractor’s planned operations, but may include the following equipment;

- excavators
- scrapers
- bulldozers
- graders
- rollers
- concrete truck
• asphalt truck
• compactors
• conveyors
• water trucks
• highway trucks
• off-road hauling trucks
• vehicle maintenance truck
• front-end loaders
• cranes
• pickup trucks
• air compressors
• welding equipment
• pumps and piping
• generators
• back-up lighting systems
• communications and safety equipment
• timber harvesting equipment
• erosion control materials
• miscellaneous equipment customary to the mechanical and electrical crafts, and vehicles used to deliver equipment and materials

6.2 Access Roads and Staging Areas

Access to the Project site would be accomplished using established roads including, but not limited to, U.S. Highway 50, Sly Park Road, Pony Express Trail, Forebay Road, Blair Road, Gilmore Road, Patrick Lane, Pony Express Court, and Pinewood Lane, which are paved, all-weather roads suitable for the anticipated loads. Project activities would require the limited use of private property driveways from these roads which would be repaired to pre-construction conditions. Staging areas would be selected and developed by the Contractor within limits approved by the District and by separate agreement developed between the Contractor and landowners. Several potential staging areas have been identified and are depicted in Figure 5.

6.3 Construction-Related Traffic

Highway and local road truck trips would include mobilization, commercially quarried materials, construction materials, pipe, waste disposal, and tree removal. Engineered fill would be obtained from a commercial sand and gravel operation or other suitable and authorized sites. The on-site haul trips include the transport of borrow and excavated materials, construction materials, pipe, waste disposal, and tree removal. If the existing ditch and Blair Road alignment (Alignment 3) is chosen then work within Pinewood Lane and Blair Road would occur. Temporary one lane road restrictions or traffic detours within these roadways would be necessary.

6.4 Potential Borrow Site

The Piney Point Stockpile Site is a potential borrow site which has approximately 40,000 cubic yards of available material for the necessary Project backfill. The site is located approximately 6 miles east of the Sly Park Road and Highway 50 overcrossing on the north side of Highway 50. The material was stockpiled by Caltrans as a result of a previous landslide. Other potential borrow sites
include regional commercial quarries and a potential sand bedding source in South Lake Tahoe. It is anticipated that at least some material (e.g., pipe bedding) would need to be sourced from a quarry.

### 7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND POTENTIAL PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS

District CEQA review, District project approvals, and applicable permits would be required before commencement of the proposed Project activities. The District completed a wetland delineation of the Upper Main Ditch area, which determined no wetlands or other waters were identified within the area, and requested an approved jurisdictional determination of the delineation. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) issued an approved jurisdictional determination to the District on January 24, 2014 verifying the Upper Main Ditch area is not currently regulated by the ACOE (ACOE 2014).

Tables 1 and 2 lists the anticipated agency reviews and permits that would be necessary to implement the Project activities. The permitting requirements identified below would depend upon the District’s chosen alignment, since two of the alignments would require work within regulated waters. Project activities may be subject to review by the Department of Water Resources Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD), since activities involve connecting to the El Dorado Forebay Dam which is a DSOD regulated facility.

**Table 1. Agency Review and Potential Permit Requirements for Alignment 1 – Existing Ditch Alignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Applicable Laws/Reviews/Approvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado Irrigation District (CEQA Lead Agency)</td>
<td>Section 21000 et seq. of Public Resources Code and Section 15000 et seq. of the CEQA Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)</td>
<td>Licensing action for work within El Dorado Hydroelectric Project, FERC Project No. 184 license boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Division of Safety of Dams</td>
<td>California Water Code, Division 3 California Code of Regulations, Title 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region</td>
<td>National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Construction Activities Storm Water General Permit (2009-0009-DWQ as amended by Order 2010-0014-DWQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Roadway Encroachment Permit (El Dorado County Code §15.14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Agency Review and Potential Permit Requirements for Alignments 2 and 3 – South Fork Long Canyon Creek Cross Country Alignment and Existing Ditch and Blair Road Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Applicable Laws/Reviews/Approvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado Irrigation District (CEQA Lead Agency)</td>
<td>Section 21000 et seq. of Public Resources Code and Section 15000 et seq. of the CEQA Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)</td>
<td>Licensing action for work within El Dorado Hydroelectric Project, FERC Project No. 184 license boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Division of Safety of Dams</td>
<td>California Water Code, Division 3 California Code of Regulations, Title 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Nationwide Permit Section 404 under Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Endangered Species Act, Section 7 Consultation, Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Office of Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Section 106 of National Historic Preservation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Fish and Wildlife, North Central Region</td>
<td>Fish and Game Code, Section 1600 et seq., Streambed Alteration Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region</td>
<td>Clean Water Act, Section 401, Water Quality Certification under Clean Water Act National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Construction Activities Storm Water General Permit (2009-0009-DWQ as amended by Order 2010-0014-DWQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Roadway Encroachment Permit (El Dorado County Code §15.14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1.1 OVERVIEW:

Project title: Upper Main Ditch Piping Project

Lead Agency name and address: El Dorado Irrigation District
2890 Mosquito Road
Placerville, CA 95667

Contact person and phone number: Kristin Schaeffer
Environmental Review Analyst
(530) 642-4006

Project location: Pollock Pines Quadrangle, Sections 25, 26, 35 and 36,
Township 11N, Range 12 E and 13E, MDB&M

Project sponsor’s name and address: El Dorado Irrigation District
2890 Mosquito Road
Placerville, CA 95667

Land designation: Private lands owned by the El Dorado Irrigation District, pipeline easements on private property, public rights-of-way, and a portion of Project activities occur within the El Dorado Hydroelectric Project-FERC Project No. 184 license boundary
2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this proposed Project, involving at least one impact that is a "Less-than-Significant" or "Less-than-Significant with Mitigation" as indicated by the accompanying environmental checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Agriculture and Forestry</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Geology/Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population/Housing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Utilities/Service Systems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The degree of change from existing conditions caused by the Project is compared to the impact evaluation criteria to determine if the change is significant. Where it is determined that one or more significant impacts could result from implementation of the Project, mitigation measures would be developed to reduce or eliminate the significant impacts. Existing conditions serve as a baseline for evaluating the impacts of the Project.

The following terminology is used in this document to describe the various levels of environmental impacts associated with the Project:

- A finding of **no impact** is identified if the analysis concludes that the proposed Project would not affect a particular environmental topical area in any way.
- An impact is considered **less than significant** if the analysis concludes that the proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the environment.
- An impact is considered **less than significant with mitigation** if the analysis concludes that the proposed Project has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the environment, but the proposed Project includes measures to mitigate the potential impact to a less than significant level.
- An impact would be considered a **potentially significant impact** if the analysis concludes that the proposed Project could cause a significant environmental effect. Proposed Projects that potentially produce a significant impact(s) warrant the greater level of analysis and consideration provided by an EIR.
## 4.1 CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:

- Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista  
  - Yes  
  - No  
  - Mitigated

- Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway  
  - Yes  
  - No  
  - Mitigated

- Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  
  - Yes  
  - No  
  - Mitigated

- Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?  
  - Yes  
  - No  
  - Mitigated

### Environmental Setting

The region is characterized by mountainous terrain with steep river canyons and mixed conifer-hardwood forests. The elevation of the Project site ranges from 3,770 to 3,820 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) and is approximately one mile south of the South Fork of the American River. The surrounding area overstory is characterized primarily by Douglas fir, Ponderosa pine, incense cedar and black oaks with an understory composed primarily of Pacific dogwood, bigleaf maple, California hazelnut, and Sierra coffeeberry. Blair Road, Forebay Road, and Gilmore Road are the primary roadways that provide access to the Project site and are also the access roads for a number of residents in the area. Surrounding uses include single-family residences, Forebay Reservoir day-use area on District-owned property, a church, tree farm, and undeveloped forested lands. North of the Upper Main Ditch, rural residential development gradually eases into more natural habitats. There are no scenic highways within the view-shed of the Project.

The Upper Main Ditch is approximately a three-mile section of the El Dorado Ditch and conveys a maximum of 15,080 acre-feet annually of raw water from the El Dorado Forebay Reservoir to the Reservoir 1 Water Treatment Plant (WTP) which is then treated and distributed throughout the District’s public drinking water system. Raw water flows continuously through the Upper Main Ditch except when flows cease during the District’s annual fall maintenance period which is typically conducted from October through mid-December. The ditch ranges from 14 to 20 feet wide and is an unlined earthen ditch with a short concrete-lined section near the WTP. There is a bench on the downslope side of the ditch approximately 7 to 12 feet wide that serves as an access point for District operation and maintenance crews. To access the ditch at the entrance point to the WTP
District crews must utilize a trail on the north side of the ditch, since the bench ends at the WTP perimeter fencing.

The District would prepare an analysis of the potential impacts to visual resources from implementation of the Project. The analysis would identify mitigation measures that would be employed during construction that the District anticipates would reduce impacts to the local visual character.

**Explanations**

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The Project site is not designated as a scenic vista under local planning or policy documents. Additionally, the Caltrans Scenic Route Program has not identified the Project site as a scenic route. Local views of the Project area may be obstructed during construction activities; however, this impact would be temporary.

b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The Project activities are not located on a state scenic highway. Tree removal is necessary within the Project area to allow for construction equipment access; however, this location is not observable from a state scenic highway.

c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Project activities would likely impact the surrounding viewshed, since the Project would convert from conveyance of raw water in the ditch system to an underground pipeline. Implementation of the Project would include removal of trees and grading activities. The Project activities would temporarily degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site. Once the Project has been completed, the District would revegetate the area in accordance with a site specific SWPPP. Hardwood (shrubs, trees, etc) would permanently be precluded from establishing over the pipeline alignment to protect the structural integrity of the pipeline. The District would prepare an analysis of the potential impacts to visual resources associated with constructed Project features and future operations.

d) **Less than Significant Impact.** Construction of the project would occur during the daylight hours unless nighttime work activities are required to meet the construction schedule. All hauling activities are anticipated to occur during daylight hours. Project activities would also include installation of new or replacement appurtenances near the Forebay dam and WTP which would be constructed with galvanized metal or painted with a non-reflective paint to reduce the potential for glare. Lighting may be added to these appurtenances which would be utilized only during the rare event that maintenance is required during the night.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?  
- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding uses include single-family residences, Forebay Reservoir day-use area on District-owned property, a church and preschool, tree farm, and undeveloped forested lands. Two parcels within the Project area are designated by the County of El Dorado as Timber Preserve Zones (TPZs) where the parcels are maintained for protecting and encouraging the production of timber and associated activities (EDC 2004).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) No Impact. The Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Department of Conservation (CDC), to non-agricultural use (CDC 2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) No Impact. The Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) No Impact. The Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Potentially Significant Impact. Implementation of the Project would require tree removal for construction access and installation of the new pipeline. Actual number of trees planned for removal would be determined during the project design phase which would be based on: 1) the proximity of the trees to the pipeline alignment selected; 2) construction equipment access; and 3) hazard trees identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For tree removal activities the District would follow the Forest Practice Act as enforced by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL Fire). The purpose of the Forest Practice Act is to ensure that logging is performed in a manner that preserves and protects fish, wildlife, forests, and streams. A Timber Conversion Permit or Exemption, and a Timber Harvest Plan (THP), as required by the Forest Practices Act to harvest timber on private or nonfederal lands, outline what timber would be harvested, and the steps that would be taken to prevent environmental damage. THPs must be prepared by a Registered
Professional Forester and after approval, timber harvest activities must be performed by a Licensed Timber Operator.

e) No Impact. The Project would not involve other changes in the existing environment, which could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

The proposed Project would take place within the Mountain Counties Air Basin (MCAB), and the Project site is within the jurisdiction of the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD). El Dorado County is designated as “serious non-attainment” for the federal ozone standard, and portions of the western slope of the County are designated as non-attainment for particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter (PM2.5). Under state authority (California Health and Safety Code Section 39608(a)), El Dorado County is designated non-attainment for the ozone standard and particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in diameter (PM10) (AQMD 2002).
The MCAB is designated either as attainment or unclassified for the remaining federal and state criteria pollutant standards for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfates, hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), lead, and visibility reducing particles (AQMD 2002). The El Dorado County AQMD specifies thresholds of significance for construction emissions. The AQMD recommends a significance threshold of 82 lbs/day (AQMD 2002) with respect to short-term and long-term emissions of nitrogen oxide (NOx) and reactive organic gases (ROG).

The District would prepare an air quality analysis of the potential impacts to air quality during implementation of the Project activities. The analysis would identify mitigation measures that the District would employ during construction to reduce equipment-generated impacts to air quality. Operation of the piped raw water system would not generate emissions that would impact air quality.

Explanations

a) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Implementation of the Project could potentially conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMD Air Quality Plan. In accordance with the El Dorado County AQMD, the District would complete an air quality analysis to estimate potential emissions produced by Project construction activities. Mitigation measures would be implemented during construction activities which would reduce impacts from potential exceedences in air quality emissions limits.

b) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Project construction activities have the potential to temporarily impact air quality as a result of emissions from the construction equipment utilized during implementation of the Project. Though the construction emissions would be temporary in duration, it is likely the Project activities would have the potential to exceed AQMD emissions limits for NOx, ROG, PM10 and PM2.5. In accordance with the El Dorado County AQMD, the District would complete an air quality analysis to estimate potential emissions produced by Project implementation. Mitigation measures would be implemented during construction activities which would reduce impacts from potential exceedences in air quality emissions limits.

c) Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project activities would be temporary and would not result in additional activities for operations and maintenance beyond existing conditions. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant to the air basin that would affect the long-term ambient air quality status for the federal and state ozone standards.

d) Less than Significant with Mitigation. The AQMD defines sensitive receptors in Rule 101, General Provisions and Definitions, to include areas, facilities, or groups that may be more heavily impacted by various activities, which create air pollutants, based on the nature of the contaminant. Examples of sensitive receptors include, but are not limited to, towns, campgrounds, hospitals, nursing homes, schools, airports, public events, shopping centers, mandatory Class I Federal areas, the elderly, the young, and people with respiratory difficulty.

The Upper Main Ditch is located in close proximity to single family homes. Pinewood Elementary School is located approximately 0.25 miles from the east end of the Upper Main Ditch, and is separated from the Project by hilly topography. In addition, a church and preschool are located near the west end of the Upper Main Ditch near the Reservoir 1 Water Treatment Plant. Potential impacts to the homeowners, schools, and church would
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be analyzed in the air quality analysis, and mitigation measures would be identified to reduce or eliminate any impacts to sensitive groups.

e) Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Project construction activities could create objectionable odors as defined under the El Dorado County AQMD rules for public nuisance odors. These odors would be temporary and would most likely be associated with diesel emissions limited to certain phases of construction. Mitigation measures would be implemented that the District anticipates would reduce impacts from objectionable odors to less than significant levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

The Upper Main Ditch is located just northwest of U.S. Highway 50 (Highway 50) within Pollock Pines in El Dorado County, California. The South Fork of the American River is located approximately one mile to the north. Elevations at the Project site range from 3,770 to 3,820 feet AMSL. Vegetation in the project area includes common vegetation types found in the Sierra Nevada foothills, including montane-hardwood conifer forest with a moderate canopy. North of the Upper Main Ditch, rural residential development gradually eases into more natural habitats. South of the Upper Main Ditch, residential development and commercial development are clustered along Pony Express Trail and Highway 50.

A floristic survey for special status plants and a habitat assessment for special status wildlife was completed for the Upper Main Ditch in May 2015 (AECOM 2015). Additionally, a wetland delineation was completed in October 2012 for the Upper Main Ditch which determined no wetlands or other waters were identified within the ditch area (EN2 2013). The District requested an approved jurisdictional determination of the delineation, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) issued an approved jurisdictional determination to the District on January 24, 2014 verifying the ditch is not currently regulated by the ACOE (ACOE 2014). Since the biological survey and wetland delineation was completed at the Upper Main Ditch, additional survey work would need to be completed by the District if the alternative pipeline chosen is one of the alignments outside of the ditch.

Vegetation of the montane hardwood-conifer habitat is best described as a Ponderosa pine-Douglas fir forest alliance according to the Manual of California Vegetation (Sawyer et al., 2009). Ponderosa pine (Pinus ponderosa) and Douglas fir (Pseudotsuga menziesii) are codominant in the tree canopy. Other tree species present include incense cedar (Calocedrus decurrens), Jeffrey pine (Pinus jeffreyi), sugar pine (Pinus lambertiana), black oak (Quercus kelloggii), canyon live oak (Quercus chrysolepis), and big-leaf maple (Acer macrophyllum). Associate shrub species in the Project site include mountain dogwood (Cornus nuttallii), American hazelnut (Corylus cornuta), thimbleberry (Rubus parviflorus), deer brush (Ceanothus integerrimus), and Sierra coffeeberry (Frangula rubra). Mountain misery (Chamaebatia foliolosa) provides dense ground cover in some areas. The tree canopy of this community is dense and a thick layer of duff carpets the ground. The herbaceous layer
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is therefore poorly developed with sparse cover of grasses and forbs. Commonly observed herbaceous species include dogtail grass (*Cynosurus echinatus*), western bracken fern (*Pteridium aquilinum* var. *pubescens*), bur-chervil (*Anthiscus caucalis*), and feathery false lily of the valley (*Mainanthemum recemosum*). Along the Upper Main Ditch, occasional riparian wetland plants, including Baltic rush (*Juncus balticus*), slender rush (*Juncus tenuis*), Indian rhubarb (*Darmera peltata*), and tall flatsedge (*Cyperus eragrostis*) are present.

Wildlife species observed during the survey include western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*), Stellar’s jay (*Cyanocitta stelleri*), turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*), winter wren (*Troglodytes hiemalis*), Townsend’s warbler (*Setophaga townsendi*), American robin (*Turdus migratorius*), western tiger swallowtail (*Papilio rutulus*), spotted towhee (*Pipilo maculatus*), Western gray squirrel (*Sciurus griseus*), mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*), and northern flicker (*Coloptes auratus*).

Table 1 provides a list of special-status species with potential to occur in the Project site based on the pre-field investigation (database and literature review). The following criteria were applied to assess the potential for species occurrence at the Project site:

- **Present**: Species known to occur onsite, based on occurrence records, and/or was observed onsite during the field survey(s).

- **High**: Species is known to occur on or near the site or within the site (based on occurrence records within five miles, and/or based on professional expertise specific to the site or species) and suitable habitat is present onsite.

- **Low**: Species is known to occur in the vicinity of the site and there is marginal habitat onsite or species is not known to occur in the vicinity of the site; however there is suitable habitat onsite.

- **No**: Species is not known to occur on or in the vicinity of the site or there is no suitable habitat for the species onsite or species was surveyed for during the appropriate season with negative results.
### Table 3. Special-Status Species Potentially Occurring on the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special-Status Species</th>
<th>Regulatory Status (Federal; State; Local; CRPR)</th>
<th>Habitat Requirements</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence on Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownish beaked-rush</td>
<td>--;--; 2</td>
<td>Meadows, seeps, marshes, and swamps in montane coniferous forest. Elevation range 1,500 to 6,560 feet above MSL.</td>
<td>No; no suitable habitat is present on the Project site and this species was not found during the floristic survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rhynchospora capitellata</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup Lake draba</td>
<td>--;--;1B</td>
<td>Alpine boulder and rock fields in shade of granitic rocks in subalpine coniferous forest. Elevation range 8,202 to 9,235 feet above MSL.</td>
<td>No; the Project site is outside of the elevation range of this species and there is no suitable habitat present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Draba asterphora var. macrocarpa</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nissenan manzanita</td>
<td>--;--;1B</td>
<td>Open, rocky shale ridges in closed-cone coniferous forest and chaparral; 1,350 to 3,300 feet elevation above MSL. Known from El Dorado and Tuolumne counties.</td>
<td>No; the specific habitat types this species is found in are not present on the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Arctostaphylos nissenana</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry’s horkelia</td>
<td>--;--;1B</td>
<td>Openings on clay soils of the Ione Formation and other clay soils in chaparral or foothill woodland communities; 240 to 3,100 feet in elevation. Known from Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, and Mariposa counties.</td>
<td>No; this species was not found during the floristic survey. This species was present and in bloom at a reference site visited prior to the Project site surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Horkelia parryi</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Valley mariposa lily</td>
<td>--;--;1B</td>
<td>Open oak and pine forest habitats on Josephine silt loam and volcanic soils; 915 to 5,400 feet in elevation. Known from Amador, El Dorado and possibly Mariposa counties.</td>
<td>No; This species was not found during the floristic survey. This species was present and identifiable at a reference site visited prior to the Project site surveys. No <em>Calochortus</em> spp. were found on the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Calochortus clavatus var. avius</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special-Status Species</td>
<td>Regulatory Status (Federal; State; Local; CRPR)</td>
<td>Habitat Requirements</td>
<td>Potential for Occurrence on Project Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Hills soaproot</td>
<td>--;--; 1B</td>
<td>Chaparral and cismontane woodland; Lower montane coniferous forest typically on serpentinite and gabbroic soils and other rocky soils types. Elevation range 800 to 4,100 feet above MSL. Known primarily from western El Dorado County.</td>
<td>No; serpentinite and gabbroic soils are not found on the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chlorogalum grandiflorum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw-toothed lewisia</td>
<td>--;--;1B</td>
<td>North-facing, mostly shaded, moss-covered and metamorphic rock cliffs and ledges in steep gorges along relatively permanent streams; 2,700 to 4,300 feet in elevation. Known from El Dorado and Placer counties.</td>
<td>No; the specific habitat types this species is found in are not present on the Project site and this species was not found during the floristic survey conducted during its blooming period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lewisia serrata</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra blue grass</td>
<td>--;--;1B</td>
<td>Shady, moist, rocky slopes in lower montane coniferous forest; often on mossy rocks in canyons. Elevation range 1,200 to 5,250 feet above MSL.</td>
<td>No; the specific habitat types this species is found in are not present on the Project site and this species was not found during the floristic survey conducted during its blooming period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Poa sierrae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stebbins’ phacelia</td>
<td>--;--;1B</td>
<td>Shady, moss-covered metamorphic rock outcrops or meadows with rocky or gravelly soils; 1,800 to 6,000 feet in elevation. Known from El Dorado, Placer, and Nevada counties.</td>
<td>No; There is no suitable habitat present on the Project site and this species was not found during the floristic survey conducted during its confirmed blooming period. This species was present and in bloom at a reference site visited prior to the Project site surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Phacelia stebbinsii</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3. Special-Status Species Potentially Occurring on the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invertebrates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley elderberry</td>
<td>FT;--;--;--; Elderberry shrubs, typically in riparian habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>longhorn beetle</td>
<td>No; Project site is above known elevation range of the beetle. No elderberry shrubs observed on the Project site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Desmocerus californicus</em> dimorphus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amphibians/Reptiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California red-legged frog</td>
<td>FT; CSC;--;--; Typically requires a permanent water source and is typically found along quiet, slow-moving streams, ponds, or marsh communities with emergent vegetation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rana draytonii</em></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong>; No suitable aquatic breeding habitat is located on the Project site. The Forebay reservoir is stocked with trout, a predator of the CRLF. Marginal aquatic nonbreeding habitat for dispersal is present in the Main Ditch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill yellow-legged frog</td>
<td>USFS S; CSC;--;--; Shallow, flowing, small- to medium-sized streams with cobble substrate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rana boylii</em></td>
<td>No; Drainages and aquatic habitat occurs on the Project site, but do not provide appropriate cobble substrate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog</td>
<td>FE; USFS S; CT--;-- Prefers sunny riverbanks, meadow streams, isolated pools, and lake borders in high Sierra Nevada. Prefers sloping banks with rocks or vegetation to water’s edge. Seldom found more than few feet from water. Also occurs in ponds and low gradient streams with deep pools and undercut banks, generally above 4,500 to 12,000 feet in elevation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rana sierrae</em></td>
<td>No; Project site is outside the range for this species.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western pond turtle</td>
<td>USFS S; CSC;--;--; Still or slow-moving water with basking sites and suitable upland habitat for nesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emys marmorata</em></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong>; Drainages and aquatic habitat occurs on the Project site. The banks of the ditch near the Forebay provide basking habitat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special-Status Species</td>
<td>Regulatory Status (Federal; State; Local; CRPR)</td>
<td>Habitat Requirements</td>
<td>Potential for Occurrence on Project Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fish</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley steelhead</td>
<td>FT;--;--;--</td>
<td>Sacramento River and perennial tributaries.</td>
<td><strong>No;</strong> anadromous fish species in the American River drainage cannot move above Nimbus Dam or access the ditch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oncorhynchus mykiss</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta smelt</td>
<td>FT;CT;--;--</td>
<td>Concentrated in Sacramento River channel between Collinsville and Rio Vista.</td>
<td><strong>No;</strong> the Project site is not within the known range for this species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypomesus transpacificus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardhead</td>
<td>CSC;--;--</td>
<td>Deep pools with sand and gravel or boulder substrates in large streams at middle and high elevations, in undisturbed areas. Has been found within low elevation reservoirs.</td>
<td><strong>No;</strong> no suitable habitat occurs within the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mylopharadon conocephalus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American peregrine falcon</td>
<td>FD; BCC; CD;--;--</td>
<td>Nests in a wide variety of habitats including woodlands, dense coniferous forest, and coastal habitats near wetlands, lakes, or rivers on high cliffs, banks, dunes, or mounds.</td>
<td><strong>No;</strong> no suitable habitat present within the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Falco peregrinus anatum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Eagle</td>
<td>FD; USFS S; CE;CFP;--</td>
<td>Large trees close to lakes and large rivers.</td>
<td><strong>Low;</strong> suitable foraging habitat occurs on the Project site at the Forebay and surrounding forested habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California spotted owl</td>
<td>USFS S; CSC;--;--;--</td>
<td>Old-growth forest associated with multi-layered canopies; associated with montane-hardwood forest, redwood, and Douglas fir forest habitats.</td>
<td><strong>Low;</strong> no records of occurrences within 5 miles of the Project site, but potential foraging and nesting habitat occurs in the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Strix occidentalis occidentalis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Special-Status Species Potentially Occurring on the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special-Status Species</th>
<th>Regulatory Status (Federal; State; Local; CRPR)</th>
<th>Habitat Requirements</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence on Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great gray owl <em>Strix nebulosa</em></td>
<td>USFS S; CE;--;--</td>
<td>Nests in mature coniferous woods from approximately 4,500 to 7,500 feet above MSL. Generally known from Plumas County south to the Yosemite area and in far northeastern California.</td>
<td>No; no suitable habitat is present in or near the Project site, and no records of occurrences of this species within 5 miles of the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little willow flycatcher <em>Empidonax traillii brewsteri</em></td>
<td>BCC; CE;--;--</td>
<td>Nests in dense riparian vegetation such as willows and alders.</td>
<td>No; no suitable riparian habitat present within the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow warbler <em>Dendroica petechial brewsteri</em></td>
<td>BCC; CSC;--;--</td>
<td>Nests in dense riparian vegetation such as willows and alders.</td>
<td>No; no suitable riparian habitat present within the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive-sided flycatcher <em>Contopus cooperi</em></td>
<td>BCC; CSC;--;--</td>
<td>Nests in mixed coniferous, montane-hardwood, and Douglas-fir forests. Prefers tall trees overlooking meadows and other open areas.</td>
<td>Low; forested areas near clear-cut patches adjacent to the Upper Main Ditch provide potential nesting habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper’s hawk <em>Accipiter cooperii</em></td>
<td>WL;--;--</td>
<td>Nests in open woodlands and forest edges. Forages in riparian woodlands.</td>
<td>Low; forested areas near clear-cut patches adjacent to the Upper Main Ditch provide potential nesting and foraging habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp-shinned hawk <em>Accipiter striatus</em></td>
<td>WL;--</td>
<td>Nests in a variety of communities such as riparian deciduous and montane-hardwood forest in dense, even-aged forests near water. Forages along forest edge.</td>
<td>Low; dense patches of montane-hardwood forest adjacent to the Upper Main Ditch provide potential nesting and foraging habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern goshawk <em>Accipiter gentilis</em></td>
<td>USFS S; CSC;--;--</td>
<td>Mixed coniferous and deciduous forests with dense canopy.</td>
<td>Low; dense patches of montane-hardwood forest adjacent to the Upper Main Ditch provide potential nesting and foraging habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special-Status Species</td>
<td>Regulatory Status (Federal; State; Local; CRPR)</td>
<td>Habitat Requirements</td>
<td>Potential for Occurrence on Project Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mammals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher -West Coast DPS</td>
<td>FC; USFS S; SC; CSC;--;--</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No</strong>; site is not located within a known current population. No records of occurrences within five miles of the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pekania pennanti</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Nevada mountain beaver</td>
<td>CSC;--;--</td>
<td>Occurs in dense growth of small deciduous trees and shrubs in wet soil for burrowing. Requires dense understory and proximity to water.</td>
<td><strong>No</strong>; no suitable habitat is present within Project site. Tends to occur above 4,500 feet in elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aplodontia rufa californica</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallid bat</td>
<td>USFS S; CSC;--;--</td>
<td>A wide variety of low-elevation habitats such as grasslands, shrublands, and woodlands. Roosts in caves, mines, tunnels, or other man-made structures.</td>
<td><strong>Low</strong>; may forage within Project site, but suitable roosting sites are limited. The valve house and shed along the Upper Main Ditch close to the Forebay could provide potential roost sites, but would be highly exposed to human foot traffic and noise adjacent to the Forebay. Evidence of bats was not observed during the reconnaissance level survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Special-Status Species Potentially Occurring on the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project Site
### Table 3. Special-Status Species Potentially Occurring on the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special-Status Species</th>
<th>Regulatory Status (Federal; State; Local; CRPR)</th>
<th>Habitat Requirements</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence on Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Townsend’s big-eared bat</strong>&lt;br&gt; <em>Corynorhinus townsendii</em></td>
<td>USFS S; SC, CSC;</td>
<td>Variety of habitats throughout California, including coniferous forests. Requires caves, mines, tunnels, or other man-made structures.</td>
<td>Low; may forage within study area, but suitable roosting sites are limited. The valve house and shed along the Upper Main Ditch close to the Forebay could provide potential roost sites, but would be highly exposed to human foot traffic and noise adjacent to the Forebay. Evidence of bats was not observed during the reconnaissance level survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sierra Nevada red fox</strong>&lt;br&gt; <em>Vulpes vulpes necator</em></td>
<td>USFWS S; CT;--;--</td>
<td>Coniferous forests above 7,000 feet elevation with open meadows. Prefers meadow complexes interspersed with a variety of forest types for optimum hunting and foraging opportunities. The availability of prey items such as rabbits and rodents limit populations. Fire exclusion is thought to have resulted in dense forests adjacent to meadows.</td>
<td>No; site is not located within known elevation range of this species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western red bat</strong>&lt;br&gt; <em>Lasiurus blossevillii</em></td>
<td>CSC;--;--</td>
<td>Roosts in trees in edge habitats near fields or streams.</td>
<td>Low; Trees along the canal may provide potential roosting sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Federally Listed Species:**
- FE = federal endangered
- FC = candidate
- FT = federal threatened
- PT = proposed threatened

**US Forest Service Sensitive Species:**
- USFS S = US Forest Service Sensitive
- FPD = proposed for delisting
- DPS = Distinct Population Segment
- FD = delisted

**California State Listed Species:**
- CE = California state endangered
- CT = California state threatened
- CR = California state rare
- CSC = California Species of Special Concern
- CFP = California fully protected
- SC = State candidate for listing
- CD= delisted
- WL = CDFW watch list

**California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) Categories:**
- 1A = plants presumed extinct in California
- 1B = plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere
- 2 = plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but common elsewhere
- 3 = plants about which we need more information
- 4 = plants of limited distribution
In the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project, a low potential exists for certain wildlife species. Eleven special-status species have a low potential to occur within or near the Project site. These include a California red-legged frog (Rana draytonii) and a western pond turtle (Emys marmorata). Additionally, several raptors such as the bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus), northern goshawk (Accipiter gentilis), California spotted owl (Strix occidentalis occidentalis), Cooper’s hawk (Accipiter cooperii), and sharp-shinned hawk (Accipiter striatus) are present. Other species include raptors such as the olive-sided flycatcher (Contopus cooperi). Mammals with a low potential include three species of bats: pallid bat (Antrozous pallidus), Townsend’s big-eared bat (Corynorhinus townsendii), and western red bat (Lasiurus blossevillii). Potential species also include several raptors such as the bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus), northern goshawk (Accipiter gentilis), California spotted owl (Strix occidentalis occidentalis), Cooper’s hawk (Accipiter cooperii), and sharp-shinned hawk (Accipiter striatus). These species are not likely to nest within the Project site due to the small patch size of suitable habitat and proximity to human establishment and activity. The Project site and adjacent areas provide forest edge foraging habitat for several of these species and the Forebay provides foraging habitat for bald eagles. Additionally, one passerine species, the olive-sided flycatcher (Contopus cooperi), has potential to occur and nest on or adjacent to the project site. This species could nest in tall trees on the edge of the clear cuts, some of which may be used for staging areas.

Potential species also include several raptors such as the bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus), northern goshawk (Accipiter gentilis), California spotted owl (Strix occidentalis occidentalis), Cooper’s hawk (Accipiter cooperii), and sharp-shinned hawk (Accipiter striatus). These species are not likely to nest within the Project site due to the small patch size of suitable habitat and proximity to human establishment and activity. The Project site and adjacent areas provide forest edge foraging habitat for several of these species and the Forebay provides foraging habitat for bald eagles. Additionally, one passerine species, the olive-sided flycatcher (Contopus cooperi), has potential to occur and nest on or adjacent to the project site. This species could nest in tall trees on the edge of the clear cuts, some of which may be used for staging areas.

Mammals that have low potential to occur on site include three species of bats: (pallid bat [Antrozous pallidus], Townsend’s big-eared bat [Corynorhinus townsendii], and western red bat [Lasiurus blossevillii]). Two of the three bat species (pallid bat and Townsend’s big-eared bat) potentially occurring in or near the Project site could use features such as the valve house and shed for roosting, though evidence of bats was not observed during the reconnaissance level survey. Western red bats are tree roosters, and could potentially use trees in or near the Project site as roost sites. Mitigation measures would be implemented during construction activities which would reduce impacts sensitive biological resources.

b) Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Project would replace a three mile section of water supply ditch with a buried pipeline. The number of trees requiring removal would depend upon the pipeline alternative chosen and upon the proximity of the tree to the new pipeline alignment. If either of the two pipeline alignments with portions located outside of the Upper Main Ditch are chosen, then the District would acquire a Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) per Fish and Game Code, Section 1600 et. seq., and acquire a Clean Water Act, Section 404 permit from the ACOE which would comply with U.S. Fish and Wildlife regulations, and Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The District would implement specific best management practices (BMPs) and mitigation measures identified in the SAA, 404 and 401 permits. The District would also install BMPs (geotextile fabric or other erosion control measures appropriate for the conditions) to ensure soil stabilization and encourage the natural revegetation of the stream banks. As discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality Section of this Initial Study, mitigation measures would be implemented that the District anticipates would reduce potential impacts to water quality.

c) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Jurisdictional waters of the U.S. include jurisdictional wetlands as well as all other waters of the U.S. such as creeks, ponds, and intermittent drainages. Wetlands are defined as “those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support and under
normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions” (ACOE 1987). The majority of jurisdictional wetlands in the United States meet three wetland assessment criteria: hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology. Jurisdictional waters of the U.S. can also be defined by exhibiting a defined bed and bank and an ordinary high water mark (OHWM).

A wetland delineation was completed in October 2012 for the Upper Main Ditch which determined no wetlands or other waters were identified within the ditch area (EN2 2013). The District received an approved jurisdictional determination from the ACOE on January 24, 2014 verifying the ditch is not currently regulated by the ACOE (ACOE 2014). However, an additional wetland delineation would need to be completed by the District if the alternative pipeline chosen is one of the alignments with portions located outside of the ditch due to the locations of potentially jurisdictional crossings. If necessary, mitigation measures would be implemented that the District anticipates would reduce impacts to regulated wetlands and other waters of the U.S. to less than significant levels.

d) Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Upper Main Ditch conveys raw water which is treated at the WTP. During the El Dorado Canal outage each fall the ditch is out of service for approximately three months each year. The ongoing maintenance of the ditch system does not support a fishery, and therefore no impacts to migrating fish species would occur. However, there is potential for fish species to be impacted if the alternative pipeline chosen is the alignment crossing South Fork of Long Canyon Creek. If this alignment is chosen, then the District would conduct additional analysis to determine the potential impacts. Mitigation measures would be implemented that the District anticipates would reduce potential impacts to fish species to less-than-significant levels.

CDFW is concerned with the protection of deer migration corridors where urban expansion may pose a threat. Critical habitat is defined by CDFW as habitat that is essential to the long-term productivity of the herd. The deer in the vicinity of the Project are considered to be part of the Pacific Deer Herd (Hinz 1981). The Pacific Deer Herd is migratory and occurs west of the Sierra Nevada crest. The herd is defined by the Rubicon River on the north, the SFAR on the south, and roughly a north-south line above 2,500 feet elevation, paralleling Highway 49 between Placerville and Georgetown. The Project site is outside of the defined herd boundaries, and therefore no mitigation for migrating deer is required during the proposed construction activities.

e) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Only trees would be removed to gain access and construct the Project, and this would result in some loss of forest land. The District would follow the Forest Practice Act as enforced by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL Fire) to ensure that logging is performed in a manner that preserves and protects fish, wildlife, forests, and streams. Only those trees removed during construction activities along the pipeline alignment would be prevented from regeneration; trees removed for construction access would be allowed to regenerate.

El Dorado County has developed an Oak Woodland Management Plan (OWMP) (EDC 2008). The Project would require the removal of oak trees from the Project site. The removal of oaks would be evaluated in the context of the OWMP to determine required mitigation measures.
f) No Impact. The Project is not within an area that has an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

The Project is located in the Sierra foothills region of El Dorado County. The Project site occupies a section of the Sierra Nevada that is ethnographically associated with three distinct Native American groups: the Nisenan (Southern Maidu), the Northern Sierra Miwok, and the Washoe. While the exact geographic borders of each group’s territory remains unclear, it is commonly accepted that their territories overlap in the area west of Lake Tahoe and east of present-day Camino (ASM 2013). Villages or permanent habitation sites were typically situated on high ground located as close as possible to a water source. Ethnogeography sources for the Nisenan, Northern Sierra Miwok, and Washoe do not identify any ancestral villages or other named ethnographic sites in the Project site or vicinity (ASM 2013).

The discovery of gold at Sutter’s Mill in Coloma in 1848 caused a dramatic alteration of life in California. As the news of the discovery of gold spread, the population of California and particularly the Motherlode expanded rapidly as more and more people traveled to the area to search for gold. Consequently, additional roads were constructed along and near current U.S. Highway 50 to facilitate travel and transportation of goods.

As the towns and their population grew along and near the current U.S. Highway 50 route, other infrastructure was needed which included roads and water supply systems. Consequently, to meet
the growing domestic needs, existing ditch systems supplying water to mining operations were converted to domestic uses, and new water supply systems were constructed. Some of these water supply systems, including the El Dorado Canal and the Forebay Reservoir, were not only used for supplying water for irrigation, commercial and domestic use, but were also developed into hydroelectric power generation systems.

Explanations

a)-b) Less than Significant with Mitigation. A short segment of the upstream portion of the Upper Main Ditch is located within the Project 184 FERC boundary which is part of the Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) and has been completely surveyed for cultural resources (FW 2003). The District consulted with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to determine if the features of Project 184 (including the features associated with Forebay Dam) were eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). On August 11, 2008, the SHPO concurred with the District’s determination that the only eligible resources for Project 184 are the Lake Aloha Dam Complex and the El Dorado Rock Wall Discontinuous District. The Project would not adversely affect these eligible resources.

In 2012 a cultural resource investigation for the entire Upper Main Ditch was completed by Cardno ENTRIX which included archival research, correspondence with Native Americans, and field inventories and evaluations to determine if the Project would have adverse effects to cultural or archaeological resources (Cardno 2012). Cardno ENTRIX requested a sacred lands search and a list of Native American contacts for the Project from the Native American Heritage commission (NAHC). The sacred lands search was completed by the NAHC on November 20, 2012 and did not identify any sensitive Native American cultural resources either within or near the Project Area of Potential Effect (APE). Letters were sent requesting information regarding the Project area to all the groups and individuals identified by NAHC as part of the sacred lands search. None of the Native American groups and individuals contacted regarding the Project has responded to the request for information.

The cultural resources investigation concluded no NRHP or California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) eligible properties or resources were identified within the Project work area and the proposed Project would not adversely affect any pre-historic or historic properties. Construction would require ground disturbing activities that could potentially unearth previously unidentified, subsurface cultural resources. If previously unidentified cultural resources were located, the District would require the contractor to implement mitigation measures during proposed construction activities to minimize the potential impacts.

If the alternative pipeline chosen is one of the alignments with portions located outside of the ditch, then the District would complete an additional cultural resource investigation of the chosen pipeline alignment.

c) No Impact. No geologic strata that would contain paleontological resources exist at the site.

d) Less than Significant with Mitigation. During ground disturbing activities, there is a potential to unearth previously unidentified human remains. In the event that human remains are discovered, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and the County Coroner must be notified in accordance with Section 7050.5 of California’s Health and
Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the NAHC would be notified and procedures outlined in the CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5(e) would be followed. Also, the District would immediately notify an on-call archaeologist in regard to compliance with the federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the state geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 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?</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Setting

The Project site varies in elevations from 3,770 to 3,820 feet AMSL and is approximately one mile south of the South Fork of the American River. The Project site is located in the geomorphic province of the Sierra Nevada. The Sierra Nevada province is a northwest trending mountain range 400 miles long and 40 to 100 miles wide. It is bounded on the west by the Great Valley province, on the north by the Cascade Range, and on the east by the Basin Range province. Bedrock varies from Paleozoic Age metamorphic to Holocene Age sedimentary and volcanic rock.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Survey indicates that five soil series are within the Project site (NRCS 2015). The soil series map units are Cohasset loam, 8% to 15% and 15% to 30% slopes, Josephine gravelly loam, 15% to 30% slopes, Josephine very rocky loam, 15% to 50% slopes, Mariposa-Josephine very rocky loams, 15% to 50% slopes, and McCarthy cobbly loam, 9% to 50% slopes. None of these soil types are listed as a hydric soil by the National Soil Information System (NASIS) on the National List of Hydric Soils (EN2 2013).

**Cohasset loam, 8% to 15% slopes (CmC) and 15% to 30% slopes (CmD).** The Cohasset map unit consists of well-drained soils that are underlain by weathered andesitic conglomerate at a depth of more than 40 inches. These soils are gently sloping to strongly sloping on smooth ridges or are moderately steep to steep on sides of ridges. Surface runoff is slow to medium, and the erosion hazard is slight to moderate.

**Josephine gravelly loam, 15% to 30% (JrC).** The Josephine map unit consists of well-drained soils, underlain by tilted schists, slates, and contact metamorphic rocks. These soils occur on gently rolling to very steep mountainous uplands. Runoff is medium to rapid, and erosion hazard is moderate to high.

**Josephine very rocky loam, 15% to 50% slopes (JsE).** The Josephine map unit consists of well-drained soils, underlain by tilted schists, slates, and contact metamorphic rocks. These soils occur on gently rolling to very steep mountainous uplands. Runoff is medium to rapid, and erosion hazard is moderate to high.

**Mariposa-Josephine very rocky loams, 15% to 50% slopes (McE).** The Mariposa-Josephine map unit consists of well-drained, very rocky loam soils underlain by vertically tilted schists and slate and contact metamorphic rock. These soils occur on hilly to steep mountainous uplands. Mariposa very rocky loam makes up about 60% of the complex and occurs on...
ridges, sharp breaks, and most south- and west-facing slopes. Josephine very rocky silt loam makes up about 35% of the complex and occurs on concave slopes and most of the north- and east-facing slopes. Inclusions of very rocky loam make up about 5% of the complex. Runoff is medium to rapid, and erosion hazard is moderate to high.

**McCarthy cobbly loam, 9% to 50% slopes (MhE).** The McCarthy map unit consists of well-drained soils underlain by volcanic conglomerate and breccia. This soil occurs on side slopes of andesitic ridges. The texture is cobbly to very cobbly loam. Runoff is medium to rapid, and erosion hazard is moderate to high.

**Explanations**

a) No Impact. The Project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic related ground failure including liquefaction, and landslides.

   i) California Geological Survey does not list the County of El Dorado as a county affected by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. There are no known active or capable faults at or adjacent to the El Dorado Forebay Dam site. The Project site is located within the western Sierra Nevada and is potentially affected by seismic sources located within the Sierra Nevada Mountains, the Sierra Nevada Foothills Fault System to the west, and the Sierra Nevada Frontal Fault System to the east. The nearest fault zoned under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake map is in Alpine county, approximately 40 miles east of the Project site.

   ii) The Project would not expose people or structures to seismic ground shaking, and does not occur in an area of active seismicity. Additionally, the Project does not involve the construction of above ground structures.

   iii) The Project would not create ground failure or liquefaction.

   iv) No recent landslides have been reported along the margins of the Forebay Reservoir. Based on previous investigations, there has been no evidence of sinkhole activity near the reservoir area, and the local geology is not conducive to sinkhole formation (GEI 2011).

b) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Construction unavoidably increases the potential for runoff from disturbed areas. Temporary erosion/runoff BMPs would be implemented during construction to minimize storm water pollution resulting from erosion and sediment migration from the construction activities and equipment use of staging areas. These temporary control measures would include implementing construction staging in a manner that minimizes the amount of area disturbed at any one time; secondary containment for storage of fuel and oil; and the management of stockpiles and disturbed areas by means of earth berms, diversion ditches, straw wattles, straw bales, silt fences, gravel filters, mulching, revegetation, and temporary covers as appropriate. Erosion and storm water pollution control measures would be consistent with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges...
Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities requirements, and would be included in a site specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

After completion of construction activities, the temporary facilities would be demobilized and site restoration measures would be implemented to minimize soil erosion. Site restoration measures for areas disturbed by construction activities may include regrading, reseeding, construction of permanent diversion ditches, use of straw wattles and bales, application of straw mulch, and other measures deemed appropriate to meet all applicable erosion control requirements.

c) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Based on the NRCS Web Soil Survey for El Dorado County, the majority of the soils found along the ditch alignment are classified as Hydrologic Soil Group B (D&A 2014). Group B soils have moderate infiltration rates when thoroughly wetted, and consist chiefly of moderately deep to deep, and moderately well to well drained soils, with moderately fine to moderately coarse textures. These soils have a moderate rate of water transmission (0.15-0.30 inches per hour). The soil survey lists the depth to water table as greater than 6.5 feet. Due to the minimal depth of pipe installation, groundwater is not anticipated under most conditions that could lead to the potential of a landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse during construction or the subsequent operation of the pipeline.

However, during construction it would be necessary to confirm the geologic conditions at the Project site are consistent with the engineering design objectives. Confirmation the Project site is consistent with the design requirements outlined in the construction drawings would ensure the Project is built on a stable geologic unit.

d) No Impact. The Project site is located on residual soils, primarily consisting of stiff silt of low plasticity.

e) No Impact. The Project consists of piping a raw water conveyance ditch. The Project would not introduce septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems that require soil infiltration.
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

Greenhouse Gases (GHGs) are present in the atmosphere naturally, are released by natural and anthropogenic (human-caused) sources, and are formed from secondary reactions taking place in the atmosphere. The following are GHGs that are widely accepted as the principal contributors to human-induced global climate change:

- Carbon dioxide (CO₂)
- Methane (CH₄)
- Nitrous oxide (N₂O)
- Hydrofluorocarbons
- Perfluorocarbons
- Sulfur hexafluoride

Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) established legislation in September 2006 for the State of California to combat human-induced GHGs and promote the development and use of energy-efficient technologies. In addition, AB 32 established a comprehensive program of regulatory and market mechanisms to achieve real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gas emissions. The law requires a reduction of carbon emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020. CARB is the primary state agency designated to implement the requirements outlined in AB 32. The El Dorado County AQMD currently does not have any regulations addressing GHG emissions.

a) Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Project would generate temporary construction-related GHG emissions, with most of the emissions generated by off-road construction equipment, hauling of construction materials, and construction worker trips. However, the Project would not generate long-term operation GHGs, nor would it increase water conveyance, which could lead indirectly to increased GHGs through water procurement, transport, treatment, and use. Mitigation measures would be implemented during construction activities which would reduce impacts from GHG emissions.
b) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Project construction activities would be temporary, and could have potentially significant effects on AB 32 greenhouse gas emission reduction goals. El Dorado County has not developed a GHG reduction plan or established emissions limits for construction-related GHG emissions. Mitigation measures would be implemented during construction activities which would ensure the Project follows regional and statewide GHGs emissions reduction goals.

For Project operations, long-term maintenance activities would require minimal vehicle miles traveled, since the proposed Project maintenance would be incorporated into the existing District’s operations and maintenance schedule. Therefore, Project operations would not impact long-term planning efforts for reducing GHGs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanations

a) Less than Significant. The Project would not require the routine transfer or disposal of hazardous materials. Though, during construction activities, materials such as fuel would be transported and stored at the Project site along with oil and lubricants. The District would minimize the hazards of using these materials by employing storm water BMPs as described in the Hydrology and Water Quality Section of this Initial Study. Additionally, all materials being disposed of by the District would be evaluated for appropriate State and Federal hazardous waste criteria. Therefore, the District anticipates that less than significant impacts regarding use of hazardous materials would occur during implementation of the Project. In addition, long-term operations of the piped raw water system would not require the transport or disposal of hazardous materials.

b) Less than Significant. A potential hazard associated with the Project would be the possibility of an accidental release of a hazardous substance such as fuel, oil, or lubricants from construction equipment during utilization and transport of equipment and materials to the site. The District would minimize the potential for hazardous materials release by employing storm water BMPs as described in the Hydrology and Water Quality Section of this Initial Study, and therefore the District anticipates that less than significant impacts regarding potential release of hazardous materials would occur during implementation of the Project.

c) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Pinewood Elementary School is located approximately 0.25 miles from the portion of the Upper Main Ditch that connects with the Forebay Reservoir, and there is a preschool located near the west end of the Upper Main Ditch.
Ditch near the WTP. Mitigation measures would be in place that would reduce impacts from hazardous materials utilized during construction to the near-by schools.

d) No Impact. The Project site is not included on any list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

e) No Impact. There is no airport located in the Project vicinity.

f) No Impact. There are not airstrips located in the Project vicinity.

g) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Potential delays from construction traffic could have the potential to interfere with implementation of emergency response or emergency evacuation plans. However, the District would follow the measures required by El Dorado County during implementation of the construction activities to ensure all safety measures are in place in the event an emergency occurs. Therefore, the District anticipates that less-than-significant impacts regarding interference in response to an emergency would occur during implementation of the Project.

h) Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Project site is within a wildland urban interface area and these wildland areas adjacent to the Project could catch fire if an errant spark or heat from construction equipment provides ignition. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL Fire) has indicated the Project site is within a very high fuel rank (CAL Fire 2015). Additionally, short-term lane closures or detours during construction activities could potentially interfere with implementation of emergency response or emergency evacuation plans.

The District would adhere to all fire prevention and protection requirements and regulations of El Dorado County including the El Dorado County Fire Hazard Ordinance and the Uniform Fire Code, as applicable. Pertinent measures include, but are not limited to, the use of equipment with spark arrestors and non-sparking tools during Project activities. In addition, a Fire Prevention Plan would be developed by the District contractor and approved by the District which would be implemented throughout the duration of construction activities. Therefore, the District anticipates that less than significant impacts would occur for exposure of people or structures to a wildfire risk during implementation of the Project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Setting**

The Project site lies within the Sierra Nevada ranging in elevations of 3,770 to 3,820 feet AMSL. The climate is generally Mediterranean, with cool, wet winters and hot, dry summers. Precipitation occurs primarily in winter, generally between November and April, with no appreciable precipitation during summer except for occasional thundershower storms. The National Weather Service cooperative weather station closest to the study area is the Pacific House station in Pacific House, California, approximately five miles east of the Project site and at an approximate elevation of 3,440 feet AMSL. The average annual precipitation at Pacific House is 51.66 inches, with 60.7 inches of snowfall (Western Regional Climate Center 2015).

The study area is located within the 840-square-mile South Fork American River (SFAR) watershed (Hydrologic Unit Code #18020129) (EID 2009). The SFAR is a tributary to the American River, the lower part of which is a traditionally navigable waterway (TNW).

The three-mile long section of the Upper Main Ditch traverses the contour of the canyon on the south slope from the Forebay, an off-stream reservoir, to the Reservoir 1 Water Treatment Plant on Gilmore Road. The Forebay receives water from the El Dorado Canal, which originates at the El Dorado Diversion Dam on the South Fork American River at Kyburz. EID controls the flow of water diverted into the El Dorado Canal. The water flows through a series of man-made conveyances, including lined canals, flumes, tunnels, and siphons, for 22 miles to the Forebay. A portion of the water delivered to Forebay is distributed to the Upper Main Ditch for drinking water use, and the remainder is sent through a penstock to the El Dorado Powerhouse, which generates renewable hydroelectric power that is delivered to a Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) transmission system at the powerhouse. Outflow from the powerhouse is discharged to the SFAR through the piping and valving system of the hydroelectric generation system.
Explanations

a) Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Project would replace a three mile section of water supply ditch with a buried pipeline which would convey raw water, reduce water leakage and losses, and improve the quality of water entering the WTP. During implementation of the construction activities, there is a potential for the release of chemicals, including fuels, oils, and solvents that could enter into the drainages through surface runoff or by subsurface absorption through soils. Construction-related water quality effects could be significant. Additionally, a short-term increase of sediment discharge may occur during construction and could also be considered a potentially significant impact that requires mitigation. During construction, stockpiling of soils and earthmoving activities would remove soil cover, disturb soil particles, and alter site drainage patterns, creating conditions conducive to wind and water erosion. Erosion and sedimentation above natural levels could affect the drainage. Erosion and storm water pollution control measures would be implemented consistent with the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities requirements, and would be included in a site specific SWPPP. If the alternative pipeline chosen is one of the alignments with portions located outside of the ditch, then the District would acquire necessary regulatory permits for construction activities occurring at the South Fork of Long Canyon Creek to reduce impacts to the drainage.

b) Potentially Significant Impact. Depending on the pipeline alignment chosen, implementation of construction activities may require the temporary removal of limited amounts of groundwater from the Project site. Piping of the ditch would eliminate seepage from the ditch, which could interfere with groundwater recharge such that there could be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. The South Fork Long Canyon Creek, located in the proximity of the Upper Main Ditch, would continue to contribute toward groundwater recharge after completion of construction of the Project.

The District has completed an initial inventory of domestic water wells adjacent to the Upper Main Ditch which identified 8 wells are developed on parcels adjoining the Project site (Westmark 2013). Further analysis is required to determine the level of potential impact the Project may have to the groundwater supplies supporting these existing domestic water wells.

c) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Depending on the alternative pipeline alignment chosen, a portion or the entire pipeline would be placed within the Upper Main Ditch, and engineered fill and select backfill material would then be placed over the pipe. Above the portion of pipe within the ditch, the finished cross slope grade would be a minimum of 2% towards the downslope. By filling in the ditch with an out sloped grade, the drainage flow path would be returned to historic, pre-ditch conditions.

In addition to flows from Forebay Reservoir, the Upper Main Ditch currently intercepts and conveys storm water runoff. The piping of the Upper Main Ditch would direct storm water as sheet flow back to historic drainage patterns including some locations of concentrated flow associated with natural drainage patterns and road development. These potential areas of concentrated flows would occur at three crossings along Blair Road. As part of the Project design the Blair Road crossings would be evaluated to determine if larger culverts or other improvements are required. If it is determined that the existing culverts are not
adequate to carry the runoff, new culverts of appropriate size and/or other improvements would be installed in coordination with the County.

Construction activities would require a site specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be completed in accordance with regulatory requirements by the contractor and submitted to the District for review and approval prior to the start of Project activities. Implementation of the SWPPP would reduce impacts from drainage alterations and the potential for erosion and siltation to occur on- or off-site. In addition, the District would be in compliance with all water discharge limits identified in the regulatory permits obtained for the proposed Project.

d) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Refer to sections a) and c) above.

e) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Refer to sections a) and c) above.

f) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Refer to sections a) and c) above.

g) No Impact. The Project does not include housing development.

h) No Impact. The Project activities would not include construction of any housing or other structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.

i) No Impact. The Project would not increase the exposure of people or structures to flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

j) No Impact. The Project does not impact any water bodies that could result in seiche, tsunami, or mudflow events.
**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING:** Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Setting**

The Upper Main Ditch is approximately three miles and conveys raw water from the El Dorado Forebay Reservoir to the WTP which is then treated and distributed throughout the District’s public drinking water system. The Project site is located within public and District rights-of-way, private and District-owned property. Surrounding land uses include single-family residences located on low and medium density residential land uses and undeveloped forested lands.

**Explanations**

a) No Impact. The Project would replace a three mile section of water supply ditch with a buried pipeline which would convey raw water, reduce water leakage and losses, and improve the quality of water entering the WTP. The Project construction activities would occur on existing or acquired easements and rights-of-way, and therefore division of a community would not occur as a result of the Project activities.

b) No Impact. As discussed in section a), the Project would replace a three mile section of water supply ditch with a buried pipeline which would convey raw water, reduce water leakage and losses, and improve the quality of water entering the WTP. The Project would not require a change in zoning of the Project site, and would therefore not conflict with the El Dorado County General Plan (EDC 2004).

c) No Impact. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans for the area.
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

Commercially available mineral resources are not known to exist on or immediately adjacent to the Project site. The Project site is not identified on the Mineral Resource (-MR) overlay of the El Dorado County General Plan Land Use Map (EDC 2004).

Explanations

a) No Impact. Because mineral resources are not known to exist on or immediately adjacent to the Project site, the Project would not affect known mineral resources that could be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

b) No Impact. Because mineral resources are not known to exist on or immediately adjacent to the Project site, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XII. NOISE:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Setting**

Surrounding uses include single-family rural residences, Forebay Reservoir day-use area on District-owned property, a church and preschool, tree farm, and undeveloped forested lands. The noise environment of the Project area is dominated by natural sounds, and traffic produced by use of Forebay and Blair Roads. The District would prepare an acoustical analysis of the potential noise impacts during implementation of the Project activities. The analysis would identify mitigation measures that the District would employ during construction to reduce the impacts from noise generated from equipment use.
Explanations

a) Potentially Significant Impact. The Project involves trenching and installing the pipeline, and backfilling and compacting the fill over the new pipeline, and constructing associated ancillary facilities. Project-generated noise impacts would be temporary, produced by the operation of construction equipment implementing the proposed improvements. The primary land uses are residential dwellings in the vicinity of the Project area.

El Dorado County has established guidelines in the 2004 General Plan for acceptable levels of noise. Policy 6.5.1.11 establishes that construction noise between the hours of 7am and 7pm within rural regions and land use designations consistent with the Project shall not exceed 65 dBA or a maximum of 75 dBA (EDC 2004). As construction at a facility for the transmission of water for treatment purposes, the Project is exempt from local land use regulation, including the El Dorado County General Plan, under Government Code sections 53090 and 53091. However, General Plan Policy 6.5.1.11 establishes an appropriate threshold for assessing the significance of Project-related noise impacts. Project activities would most likely generate temporary noise levels in excess of the above mentioned noise guidelines. As part of the acoustical analysis, appropriate measures would be identified to assist with mitigating noise impacts generated from Project construction activities.

b) Potentially Significant Impact. Heavy equipment would be utilized during Project construction activities which could expose people to generated groundborne vibration and to groundborne noise levels. As part of the acoustical analysis, appropriate safety measures would be identified to assist with mitigating any impacts from groundborne vibration and groundborne noise levels.

c) No Impact. The Project activities are temporary and would not cause permanent increases in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity.

d) Potentially Significant Impact. During construction activities, there would be temporary noise increases from the use of equipment. The District would require the contractor to comply with all applicable noise and occupational safety standards as defined in the construction specifications, and to protect workers and other persons from the health effects of increased noise levels from the use of construction equipment. As part of the acoustical analysis, appropriate measures would be identified to assist with mitigating any noise impacts generated from Project construction activities.

e) No Impact. There are no public airports within two miles of the Project.

f) No Impact. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the Project.
### Environmental Setting

The Project site is located within public and District rights-of-way, private and District-owned property. The Project would not alter the number or type of residential units that exist, nor would it introduce land use or changes that would attract new residents creating a need for additional housing.

### Explanations

a) No Impact. The Project would replace a three mile section of water supply ditch with a buried pipeline which would convey raw water, reduce water leakage and losses, and improve the quality of water entering the WTP. The Project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth in the area.

b) No Impact. The Project would not result in displacing or replacing existing housing.

c) No Impact. The Project would not result in the displacement of any people, necessitating the construction or replacement of housing anywhere.
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Service</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Setting

The Project site is located within an unincorporated area of El Dorado County, and is within the jurisdiction of the El Dorado County’s Sheriff’s Department and Fire Protection District. The Project site is located in Pollock Pines, CA, which is within the Pollock Pines Elementary School District and El Dorado Union High School District.

The District would prepare a traffic analysis of the potential impacts to traffic circulation during implementation of the Project activities. The analysis would identify mitigation measures that the District would employ during construction to reduce any potential impacts to public response times and performance objectives for the identified public services.
Explanations

**Fire Protection:** Less than Significant with Mitigation. Potential delays from construction traffic could have the potential to interfere with implementation of emergency response or emergency evacuation plans. However, the District would follow the measures required by El Dorado County during implementation of the construction activities to ensure all safety measures are in place in the event an emergency occurs. The District would analyze potential impacts to emergency response times in a traffic study which would then provide measures the District anticipates would mitigate impacts to fire protection access routes. Completion of the Project would not contribute to an increased need for fire protection services, since the proposed activity would be temporary and not contribute to population growth or other long-term land use modifications.

**Police Protection:** Less than Significant with Mitigation. Potential delays from construction traffic could have the potential to interfere with implementation of emergency response or emergency evacuation plans. However, the District would follow the measures required by El Dorado County during implementation of the construction activities to ensure all safety measures are in place in the event an emergency occurs. The District would analyze potential impacts to emergency response times in a traffic study which would then provide measures the District anticipates would mitigate impacts to police protection access routes. Completion of the Project would not contribute to an increased need for police services, since the proposed activity would be temporary and not contribute to population growth or other long-term land use modifications.

**Schools:** Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Project would not impact existing school facilities, nor would it contribute to any change in population, or other land use modifications that would impact the local school districts. Pinewood Elementary School is accessed directly from Pony Express Trail, and the school bus routes utilize Blair and Forebay Roads which could be impacted due to potential delays from construction traffic. If the pipeline alignment within Blair Road is chosen then road closures would occur at different phases of pipeline installation. The District would analyze potential impacts to school bus circulation in a traffic study which would then provide measures the District anticipates would mitigate impacts to school bus routes.

**Parks:** No Impact. The Project would not impact existing parks, nor would it contribute to any change in population, traffic circulation, or other land use modifications that would impact local parks.

**Other Public Facilities:** No Impact. The Project would not impact other public facilities, nor would it contribute to any change in population, traffic circulation, or other land use modifications that would impact the local public facilities. Completion of the Project would not contribute to an increased need for other government facilities, since the proposed activity would be temporary and not contribute to population growth or other long-term land use modifications.
XV. RECREATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? □ □ ✗ □

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? □ □ □ ✗

Environmental Setting

The Forebay Reservoir supplies the Upper Main Ditch with raw water and is located at the eastern access point of the Project site. The Forebay Reservoir is owned and operated by the District which provides fishing opportunities and a picnic area. Boating and body contact (e.g. swimming) are not allowed at this facility pursuant to California State Water Resources Control Board – Division of Drinking Water requirements, since the reservoir supplies public drinking water. The reservoir is stocked with fish by the CDFW and parking is available to the public utilizing this day-use area. There is an additional day-use recreational area owned by the County of El Dorado across the street from the Forebay Reservoir which has a little league field and a multi-purpose community building.

The Main Ditch runs through a rural residential area adjacent to many homes and backyards and its bench provides a well-traveled, but unauthorized, access point by the public. Since the Project activity would pipe the water that currently runs through the ditch this may become less of a desirable location for the public to walk. Since the District does not have the right to grant public access, upon completion of the Project the District would not authorize nor preclude the public from walking along the ditch bench as currently occurs.

Explanations

a) Less than Significant Impact. Construction activities would occur adjacent to the Forebay Reservoir which provides a day-use facility for public access. The proposed Project activities would require the need for construction equipment to access the day-use facility parking area in order to access the Upper Main Ditch for staging of construction equipment. It is possible public access to the day-use facility would be temporarily impacted by the Project construction activities. However, the County owned day-use facility would not be utilized as part of this Project, and therefore the public could utilize this facility while the temporary closure is in place at the Forebay Reservoir.
b) No Impact. The Proposed Project does not include any new recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. No modifications to the existing recreational facilities are expected to occur as a result of the Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Setting

Personnel, equipment, and construction materials (such as engineered fill, concrete, pipe, etc.) would reach the site via U.S. Highway 50, Sly Park Road, Pony Express Road, Forebay Road, Blair Road, Gilmore Road, Patrick Lane, Pinewood Lane, and Pony Express Court. These roads are paved, all-weather roads suitable for the anticipated loads.

The County General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element established LOS standards for county roads and highways (EDC 2004). Policy TC-Xd establishes a minimum LOS D for roads in rural areas. Pony Express Trail and Forebay currently meets the County’s standard. The District would prepare a traffic analysis of the potential impacts to traffic circulation during implementation of the Project activities. The analysis would identify mitigation measures that the District would employ during construction to reduce the impacts to traffic.

Explanations

a) and b) Potentially Significant Impact. Implementation of Project activities could conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of a local traffic circulation system. Project equipment would be staged at the Project site, and therefore reducing the number of equipment accessing the site on a daily basis. It is anticipated the greatest impacts to local traffic would occur during the transport of earth-fill materials, delivery of concrete or other construction materials from outside sources, and removal of trees from the Project area. As part of the traffic analysis, appropriate safety measures would be identified to assist with mitigating any impacts to local traffic circulation.

c) No Impact. The Project would not affect air traffic patterns. The nearest airport is the Placerville Airport which is approximately 20 miles southwest of the Project site.

d) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Construction activities would include the staging of large equipment at the Project site, the use of selected private driveways and private roadways, and trucks hauling materials daily to and from the Project. Traffic ingress and egress to the Project site would not be designed with hazardous features to traffic circulation. As part of the traffic analysis, appropriate measures would be identified that the District anticipates would mitigate any temporary incompatible uses from accessing the area around the Project site.

e) Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Project could result in impacts to emergency access to the surrounding areas, and construction-related traffic could delay or obstruct the movement of emergency vehicles or evacuation routes in the event of a wildfire or other emergency needs. As part of the traffic analysis, appropriate measures would be identified that the District anticipates would mitigate any impacts to emergency access to the area surrounding the Project site.

f) Less than Significant with Mitigation. The El Dorado County Transit Authority (EDCTA) provides transit services at two locations near the Project site, which are the Safeway Plaza on Pony Express Trail, and the Pollock Pines Post Office located on Sanders Drive off of Pony Express Trail. In addition, the Pollock Pines Elementary School District, El Dorado Union High School District, and El Dorado County Office of Education provide student bus programs in the Project area. As part of the traffic analysis, appropriate measures
would be identified that the District anticipates would assist with mitigating any temporary impacts to public transportation services and student busing in the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Setting

The District is the drinking water and wastewater service provider for the Pollock Pines community in which the proposed Project takes place. A small portion of this community south of Highway 50 is also served by a common wastewater treatment facility, however, most residences and businesses in the area are served by individual and privately owned wastewater treatment systems (e.g. septic systems).

The District owns and operates the Forebay Reservoir which supplies up to 26 million gallons per day (mgd) of raw water to the Reservoir 1 WTP located off of Gilmore Road in Pollock Pines. In the event that the Forebay Reservoir supply is not available water can be delivered to the Reservoir 1 WTP service area from Reservoir A WTP (near Jenkinson Lake) via the Moosehall Pump Station.

PG&E is the electricity supplier for the area and would supply any additional electricity needs to the Project site during construction activities. There are currently three customers receiving raw water along the Project reach prior to the Reservoir 1 WTP. Continuation of service to these customers would be required.

The existing SCADA system that monitors flows in the Main Ditch would be expanded to provide real-time data on the flow and volume of water to the WTP. Accessing this data would allow the District to make accurate and timely deliveries of water and reduce over-deliveries.

Explanations

a) Less than Significant Impact. During Project construction, portable toilets would be provided at the construction site and wastewater generated from construction employees would be pumped out on a regular schedule and would be disposed of at a wastewater treatment plant. The Project would comply with all County requirements related to the disposal of sewage, and daily wastewater generated at the construction site would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements. Additionally, the Project would not result in any changes to the Forebay Recreation Area operations after the Project is complete, and therefore would not result in the generation of additional wastewater.

b) Less than Significant Impact. During construction, water would be utilized from the Forebay Reservoir and/or the District’s public water system and used for dust control and other construction related activities. This water would not be used for drinking water, and therefore would place no or deminimus demand on any water treatment facility.

Project activities would require construction crews to have access to potable water. The additional temporary demand would vary depending on the construction activity and the number of workers. Since the use of potable water would serve a temporary working crew, the demand would not require the construction of new water treatment facilities.

As mentioned above in Section A, the Project activities would not impact wastewater generation or treatment capacity of wastewater systems, since Project construction is temporary and portable toilets would be provided at the construction site.

c) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Project construction activities could result in a change to the runoff pattern into the existing drainage systems by returning to historical flow patterns. However, as identified under the Hydrology and Water Quality Section, a
SWPPP would be prepared and the identified BMPs implemented for construction activities to control runoff into drainages during construction would reduce potential impacts from storm water releases.

The Main Ditch currently conveys not only raw water flows from Forebay Reservoir to the WTP, but also storm water runoff into the ditch. When the water from the ditch is piped storm water runoff could be directed differently with some locations of concentrated flow occurring due to existing topography. Additional storm drain facilities would likely be required to divert excess rain and groundwater below the Main Ditch. During design of the Project a hydraulic analysis with a topographic survey will be completed to determine any impacts from the increase of flow rates and the required storm water drainage facilities to mitigate these impacts.

d) Less than Significant Impact. The Project would improve the safety of the drinking water quality to District customers and reduce water loss resulting from seepage and evapotranspiration. The Project would not increase the District’s diversion capacity, water rights, or hydropower generation capacity. Therefore, the Project would not increase water supply demand or require new or expanded water supply entitlements. There are currently three customers receiving raw water along the Project reach prior to the Reservoir 1 WTP. Continuation of service to these customers would be required.

e) No Impact. As mentioned above in Section A, the Project activities would not impact wastewater generation or treatment capacity of wastewater systems, since Project construction is temporary and portable toilets would be provided at the construction site. In addition, the Project would not cause a population increase that would impact the capacity of the local wastewater treatment facility.

f) Less than Significant Impact. Implementation of the Project would produce solid waste associated with construction materials and construction workers. Solid waste generated from the construction activities including debris from structure demolition would be transported to a permitted solid waste facility. The generated waste would most likely be minimal, and would therefore not cause the solid waste facility to exceed the maximum daily disposal limits. In addition, Project operations would not generate new solid waste.

g) No Impact. The Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.
### XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanations

a) The proposed Project would include construction best management practices (BMPs) to minimize environmental effects. For the resource areas of agriculture and forestry, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and hazardous materials, there is a potential for significant effects. However, the District would prepare analyses for the applicable resource areas to specifically identify the mitigation measures, and whether significant impacts would remain after the implemented mitigation measures.

The impacts areas are summarized in the following list:

**Agriculture and Forest Resources:** Tree removal is necessary for construction access and installation of the new pipeline. Actual number of trees planned for removal would be determined during the project design phase which would be based on: 1) the proximity of the trees to the pipeline alignment selected; 2) construction equipment access; and 3)
hazard trees identified. For tree removal activities the District would follow the Forest Practice Act as enforced by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL Fire). The purpose of the Forest Practice Act is to ensure that logging is performed in a manner that preserves and protects fish, wildlife, forests, and streams. A Timber Conversion Permit or Exemption, and a Timber Harvest Plan (THP), as required by the Forest Practices Act to harvest timber on private or nonfederal lands, outline what timber would be harvested, and the steps that would be taken to prevent environmental damage. THPs must be prepared by a Registered Professional Forester and after approval, timber harvest activities must be performed by a Licensed Timber Operator.

**Biological Resources:** The Project activities could potentially impact sensitive species within the Project area, and have the potential to impact riparian and wetland areas. The District would prepare a Biological Assessment of the Project area to determine the presence of and potential habitat for rare plants, and special status aquatic and terrestrial wildlife species. To mitigate potentially significant impacts to sensitive species and their habitats, the District would implement mitigation measures and comply with all applicable regulatory requirements.

**Cultural Resources:** No NRHP or CRHR eligible historic properties or resources were identified within and adjacent to the Upper Main Ditch. If the alternative pipeline chosen is one of the alignments with portions located outside of the ditch, then the District would complete an additional cultural resource investigation of the chosen pipeline alignment.

Construction would require ground disturbing activities that could potentially unearth previously unidentified, subsurface cultural resources. If previously unidentified cultural resources were located, the District would require the contractor to implement mitigation measures during proposed construction activities to minimize the potential impacts.

**Geology and Soils:** During construction it would be necessary to confirm the geologic conditions at the Project site are consistent with the engineering design objectives. Confirmation the Project site is consistent with the design requirements outlined in the construction drawings would ensure the Project is built on a stable geologic unit. Construction unavoidably increases the potential for runoff from disturbed areas. Erosion and storm water pollution control measures would be consistent with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities requirements, and would be included in a site specific SWPPP.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials:** All materials being disposed of by the District would be evaluated for appropriate State and Federal hazardous waste criteria. Additionally, the District would adhere to all fire prevention and protection requirements and regulations of El Dorado County including the El Dorado County Fire Hazard Ordinance and the Uniform Fire Code, as applicable, and follow safety measures identified by El Dorado County.

**Hydrology and Water Quality:** To minimize the potential of the proposed Project to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, construction activities would require a site specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be completed in accordance with regulatory requirements by the contractor and submitted to the District for review and approval prior to the start of Project activities. In addition, the
District would be in compliance with all water discharge limits identified in the regulatory permits obtained for the proposed Project.

b) The District is planning to implement the El Dorado Forebay Dam Modification Project, which could occur during or near the same time period as the proposed Project. Additionally, in fall of 2016 the El Dorado County Department of Transportation plans to implement the Blair Road Bridge Replacement Project which would replace the bridge crossing at the Main Ditch. Implementation of the proposed Project could have cumulatively considerable environmental impacts when considered in combination with these other potential projects. Additional analysis of the potential for cumulative impacts will be addressed in the draft Environmental Impact Report.

c) The Project would replace a 3-mile section of water supply ditch with a buried pipeline which would convey raw water, reduce water leakage and losses, and improve the quality of water entering the Reservoir 1 Water Treatment Plant. For the resource areas of aesthetics, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, noise, public services, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems there is a potential for significant effects. The District would prepare analyses to applicable resource areas to specifically identify the mitigation measures, and whether significant impacts would remain after the implemented mitigation measures.

The impacts areas are summarized in the following list:

**Aesthetics:** Project activities would likely impact the surrounding viewshed, since the Project would convert from conveyance of raw water in the ditch system to an underground pipeline. Implementation of the Project would include removal of trees and grading activities. Once the Project has been completed, the District would revegetate the area in accordance with a site specific SWPPP. Hard wood (shrubs, trees, etc) would be permanently precluded from establishing over the pipeline alignment to protect the structural integrity of the pipeline. The District would prepare an analysis of the potential impacts to visual resources associated with constructed Project features and future operations.

**Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** Project construction activities have the potential for exceeding air quality emissions standards and releasing greenhouse gases during construction activities. The District would prepare an air quality analysis of the potential impacts to air quality and impacts to sensitive groups during implementation of the Project activities. The analysis would identify mitigation measures that the District would employ during construction to reduce equipment generated impacts to air quality and sensitive groups.

**Hydrology/Groundwater:** Piping of the ditch would eliminate seepage from the ditch, which could interfere with groundwater recharge such that there could be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. The South Fork Long Canyon Creek, located in the proximity of the Upper Main Ditch, would continue to contribute toward groundwater recharge after completion of construction of the Project. Further analysis is required to determine the level of potential impact the Project may have to the groundwater supplies supporting these existing domestic water wells.
**Noise:** Project generated noise impacts would be temporary, produced by the operation of construction equipment implementing the proposed improvements. Heavy equipment utilized during Project construction activities could expose people to generated groundborne vibration and to groundborne noise levels. The District would prepare an acoustical analysis of the potential noise impacts during implementation of the Project activities. The analysis would identify mitigation measures that would be employed during construction to reduce noise generated impacts from equipment use.

**Public Services:** The District would prepare a traffic analysis of the potential impacts to traffic circulation during implementation of the Project activities. The analysis would identify mitigation measures that the District would employ during construction to reduce any potential impacts to public response times and performance objectives for fire and police protection services and school bus circulation.

**Transportation and Traffic:** Implementation of Project activities could conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of a local traffic circulation system. The District would prepare a traffic analysis of the potential impacts to traffic circulation, the possible incompatible uses from equipment accessing the Project site, emergency access to the surrounding areas, and public transit services and school busing programs during implementation of the Project activities. The analysis would identify mitigation measures that the District would employ during construction to reduce the impacts to traffic.

**Utilities and Service Systems:** The Main Ditch currently conveys not only raw water flows from Forebay Reservoir to the WTP, but also storm water runoff into the ditch. When the water from the ditch is piped storm water runoff could be directed differently with some locations of concentrated flow occurring due to existing topography. Additional or modified storm drain facilities may be required to divert excess rain and groundwater below the Main Ditch. During design of the Project a hydraulic analysis with a topographic survey will be completed to determine any impacts from the increase of flow rates and the required storm water drainage facilities to mitigate these impacts. There are currently three customers receiving raw water along the Project reach prior to the Reservoir 1 WTP. Continuation of service to these customers would be required.
III. DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

Dr find that the proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

Dr find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the proposed Project have been made by or agreed to by the proposed Project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

C8]I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Dr find that the proposed Project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

Dr find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed Project, nothing further is required.

Kristin Schaeffer, Environmental Review Analyst
El Dorado Irrigation District

Date: June 14, 2015
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V. ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Assembly Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOE</td>
<td>Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQMD</td>
<td>Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP</td>
<td>best management practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFW</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNDDB</td>
<td>California Natural Diversity Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNPS</td>
<td>California Native Plant Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>carbon monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRHR</td>
<td>California Register of Historic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRLF</td>
<td>California red-legged frog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>cubic yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENF</td>
<td>Eldorado National Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERC</td>
<td>Federal Energy Regulatory Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYLF</td>
<td>Foothill yellow-legged frog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHGs</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2S</td>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPMP</td>
<td>Historic Properties Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Initial Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCAB</td>
<td>Mountain Counties Air Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MND</td>
<td>Mitigated Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHC</td>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO2</td>
<td>nitrogen dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>oxides of nitrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAGPRA</td>
<td>Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWMP</td>
<td>Oak Woodland Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5</td>
<td>particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>reactive organic gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB</td>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAA</td>
<td>Streambed Alteration Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>special concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFAR</td>
<td>South Fork American River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>sulfur dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THP</td>
<td>Timber Harvest Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.3 SCOPING COMMENTS RECEIVED
Upper Main Ditch Piping Project

California Environmental Quality Act
Notice of Preparation / Initial Study
Public Comments Received
July 8, 2015

Regulatory Division >PK-2013-00049<

El Dorado Irrigation District  
Attn: Ms. Kristin Schaeffer  
2890 Mosquito Road  
Placerville, California 95667

Dear Ms. Schaeffer:

We are responding to your June 29, 2015, request for comments on the Main Ditch - Forebay to Reservoir 1 Project. The Department of the Army project identification number is SPK-2013-00049. The project is located near Forebay Reservoir, in Section 35, Township 11 North, Range 12 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, Latitude 38.7583°, Longitude -120.60435°, Pollock Pines, El Dorado County, California.

The Corps of Engineers' jurisdiction within the study area is under the authority of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. Waters of the United States include, but are not limited to, rivers, perennial or intermittent streams, lakes, ponds, wetlands, vernal pools, marshes, wet meadows, and seeps. Project features that result in the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States will require Department of the Army authorization prior to starting work.

To ascertain the extent of waters on the project site, the applicant should prepare a wetland delineation, in accordance with the "Minimum Standards for Acceptance of Preliminary Wetland Delineations" and "Final Map and Drawing Standards for the South Pacific Division Regulatory Program" under "Jurisdiction" on our website at the address below, and submit it to this office for verification. A list of consultants that prepare wetland delineations and permit application documents is also available on our website at the same location.

The range of alternatives considered for this project should include alternatives that avoid impacts to wetlands or other waters of the United States. Every effort should be made to avoid project features which require the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. In the event it can be clearly demonstrated there are no practicable alternatives to filling waters of the United States, mitigation plans should be developed to compensate for the unavoidable losses resulting from project implementation.
Please refer to identification number SPK-2013-00049 in any correspondence concerning this project. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Peck Ha at California North Branch Office, Regulatory Division, Sacramento District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1325 J Street, Room 1350, Sacramento, California 95814-2922, by email at Peck.Ha@usace.army.mil, or telephone at 916-557-6617. For more information regarding our program, please visit our website at www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory.aspx.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Peck Ha
Regulatory Project Manager
California North Branch
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

9 July 2015

Kristin Schaeffer.
El Dorado Irrigation District
.2890 Mosquito Road
Placerville, CA 95667

CERTIFIED MAIL
7014 2870 0000 7535 4227

COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, UPPER MAIN DITCH PIPING PROJECT, SCH# 2015062049, - EL DORADO COUNTY

Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse’s 17 June 2015 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water-Board) has reviewed the Request for Review for the Draft Environment Impact Report for the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project, located in El Dorado County.

Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.

Construction Storm Water General Permit

Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing; disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:
Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits

The Phase I and II MS4 permits require the Permittees to reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new development and redevelopment using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MS4 Permittees have their own development standards, also known as Low Impact Development (LID)/post-construction standards that include a hydromodification component. The I/VS4 permits also require specific design concepts for LID/post-construction BMPs in the early stages of a project during the entitlement and CEQA process and the development plan review process.

For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/central_valley/water_issues/storm_water/municipal_permits/.

For more information on the Phase II MS4 permit and who it applies to, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/phase_ii_municipal.shtml

Industrial Storm Water General Permit

Storm water discharges associated with industrial sites must comply with the regulations contained in the Industrial Storm Water General Permit Order No. 97-03-DWQ.

For more information on the Industrial Storm Water General Permit, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/industrial_general_permits/index.shtml.

Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit

If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACOE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements.

If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACOE at (916) 557-5250

---

1 Municipal Permits = The Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Water System (MS4) Permit covers medium sized Municipalities (serving between 100,000 and 250,000 people) and large sized municipalities (serving over 250,000 people). The Phase II MS4 provides coverage for small municipalities, including non-traditional Small MS4s, which include military bases, public campuses, prisons and hospitals.
Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit - Water Quality Certification

If an USACOE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 9 from the United States Cost Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications.

Waste Discharge Requirements

If USACOE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., "non-federal" waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project will require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation.

For more information on the Water Quality Certification and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

Regulatory Compliance for Commercially Irrigated Agriculture

If the property will be used for commercial irrigated agriculture, the discharger will be required to obtain regulatory coverage under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. There are two options to comply:

1. Obtain Coverage Under a Coalition Group. Join the local Coalition Group that supports land owners with the implementation of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. The Coalition Group conducts water quality monitoring and reporting to the Central Valley Water Board on behalf of its growers. The Coalition Groups charge an annual membership fee, which varies by Coalition Group. To find the Coalition Group in your area, visit the Central Valley Water Board's website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/app_approval/index.shtml; or contact water board staff at (916) 464-4611 or via email at IrrLands@waterboards.ca.gov.

2. Obtain Coverage Under the General Waste Discharge Requirements for Individual Growers, General Order RS-2013-0100. Dischargers not participating in a third-party group (Coalition) are regulated individually. Depending on the specific site conditions, growers may be required to monitor runoff from their property, install monitoring wells, and submit a notice of intent, farm plan, and other action plans regarding their actions to comply with their General Order. Yearly costs would include State administrative fees (for example, annual fees for farm sizes from 10-100 acres are currently $1,084 + $6.70/Acre); the cost to prepare annual monitoring reports; and water quality monitoring costs. To enroll as an Individual Discharger under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program...
Program, call the Central Valley Water Board phone line at (916) 464-4611 or e-mail board staff at IrrLands@waterboards.ca.gov.

**Low or Limited Threat General NPOES Permit**

If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Dewatering and Other Low Threat Discharges to Surface Waters* (Low Threat General Order) or the General Order for *Limited Threat Discharges of Treated/Untreated Groundwater from Cleanup Sites, Wastewater from Superchlorination Projects, and Other Limited Threat Wastewaters to Surface Water* (Limited Threat General Order). A complete application must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under these General NPDES permits.

For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:


For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:


If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4684 or tcleck@waterboards.ca.gov.

Trevor Cleak
Environmental Scientist

cc: State Clearinghouse unit(Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Sacramento)
Memorandum

To: Keith Larkin, Chief
    Northern Region
    Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

Attention: Environmental Coordinator
    Amador-El Dorado Unit

Date: June 22, 2015

From: Chris Browder, Deputy Chief
    Environmental Protection

Subject: Environmental Document Review

Project Name: Upper Main Ditch Piping Project
SCH #: 2015062049
Document Type: Notice of Preparation (NOP)

Potential Area(s) of Concern: Fire Protection; Timberland Conversion
Other:
MANDATED DUE DATE 7/16/2015

The above referenced environmental document was submitted to State Headquarters, Environmental Protection for review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The proposed project, located within your Unit/Program Area, may have an impact upon the Department's fire protection and/or natural resource protection and management responsibilities or require the Department's permits or approval. Your determination of the appropriate level of CAL FIRE involvement with this project is needed. Please review the attached document and address your comments, if any, to the lead agency prior to the due date. Your input at this time can be of great value in shaping the project. If your Unit's Environmental Coordinator is not available, please pass on to another staff member in order to meet the mandated deadline.

Please submit comments directly to the lead agency before the mandated due date with copy to the State Clearinghouse (P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044).

No Comment - explain briefly on the lines below.

Name and Title of Reviewer: 
Phone: 
Email: 

Note: Please complete this form and return it, with a copy of fcmu comments, for CAL FIRE's records to: Ken Nehoda or Chris Browder, Deputy Chief, Environmental Protection, P.O. Box 944246, Sacramento CA 94244-2460.
June 26, 2015

Kristin Schaeffer  
Environmental Review Analyst  
El Dorado Irrigation District  
2890 Mosquito Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

Reference: Upper Main Ditch Piping Project, SCH# 2015062049

Dear Kristin Schaeffer,

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) appreciates the opportunity to review and provide the following input on this proposed project. The proposed project may have an impact upon our department's resource management responsibilities and our authority to issue the appropriate timber harvesting permit.

The properties (public/private) are located on forest land as defined by the California Forest Practice Act. Be advised that if trees are removed as part of the project, the landowner may be required to apply for a Timberland Conversion Permit or Exemption and file a Timber Harvest Plan (THP) with CAL FIRE. These documents may require a Registered Professional Forester (RPF) to prepare, and when approved, tree removal must be done by a Licensed Timber Operator (LTO). The landowner should contact the local CAL FIRE area forester at the address and telephone number indicated above for specific information as to what may be required for this project.

Based on our conversation via telephone on Friday June 26, 2015 which included a discussion of three potential alignments still being considered and my initial review of the proposed project it appears the use of the Public Agency, Public and Private Utility- Right of Way Exemption pursuant to 14 CCR (California Code of Regulations) 1104.1(c) maybe appropriate. When El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) has made a final decision on the preferred alignment for the proposed project please contact area forester Robert Little or me to discuss further. Enclosed please find a Public Agency, Public and Private Utility- Right of Way Exemption.

Thomas J. iy  
CAL FIRE Amador El Dorado Unit Forester

CONSERVATION IS WISE-KEEP CALIFORNIA GREEN AND GOLDEN  
PLEASE REMEMBER TO CONSERVE ENERGY. FOR TIPS AND INFORMATION, VISIT "FLEX YOUR POWER" AT WWW.CA.GOV.
PUBLIC AGENCY, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UTILITY
RIGHT OF WAY EXEMPTION
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
NOTICE OF TIMBER OPERATIONS THAT ARE EXEMPT FROM
CONVERSION AND TIMBER HARVESTING PLAN REQUIREMENTS
RM-73 (1104. bc) (2/08)
VALID FOR ONE YEAR FROM DATE OF RECEIPT BY CAL FIRE

The Director of the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) is hereby notified of timber operations under the requirements of 14 CCR § 1104. 1(b) or (c): Harvesting of trees in order to construct or maintain a right of way by a public agency, public or private utility that is exempt from the requirements to obtain a Timberland Conversion Permit or a Timber Harvesting Plan. This notice is not required nor should it be submitted if timber is not sold, bartered or traded for commercial purposes by the timber owner. The timber owner shall complete Items 1 through 5 of this notice and sign below.

1. TIMBER OWNER(S) OF RECORD: Name______________

Address

City_________________________ State____ Zip_________ Phone__________________

TAX EXEMPTION: Timber owners owe timber yield tax when they harvest trees unless the harvest is exempt (Revenue and Taxation Code sec. 381.1). Some small or low value harvests may be exempt from timber yield tax: timber removed from an operation whose value does not exceed $3,000 with a quarter, according to BOE Harvest Value schedules, Rule 1224. If you believe your harvest may qualify for this exemption, please complete Items A, B, C, and D. For timber yield tax information or for further assistance with these questions call 1-800-400-7115, or write: Timber Tax Section, MC: 60, State Board of Equalization, P.O. Box 942879, Sacramento, California 94279-0060; or contact the BOE Web Page on the Internet at http://www.boe.ca.gov.

A. Circle the option that most closely estimates the total volume for this harvest, in thousands of board feet (mbf - Net Cubic Short Bg):

Under 8mbf 8-15mbf 16-25mbf Over 25mbf

B. Estimate what percentage of timber will be removed during this harvest

Redwood_______%; Ponderosa/Sugar pine_______%; Douglas-fir_______%; Fir_______%;

Port-Orford Cedar_______%; Cedar (IC, WRC)_______%; Other conifer_______%; Other hardwood_______%.

C. Fuelwood over 150 cords? Yes No D. Christmas trees over 3,000 linear feet? Yes____ No____

2. TIMBERLAND OWNER(S) OF RECORD: Name__________________

Address

City_________________________ State____ Zip_________ Phone__________________

3. LICENSED TIMBER OPERATOR(S): Name__________________ uc. No.

Address

City_________________________ State____ Zip_________ Phone__________________

4. PUBLIC AGENCY, PUBLIC OR PRIVATE UTILITY REMOVING TREES:

Name__________________ Contact Person__________________

Address

City_________________________ State____ Zip_________ Phone__________________

NOTE: This form has two pages. Continue on and complete page two. Read instructions on page two before attempting to complete.
5. Designate the legal land description of the location of the timberland conversion and the timber operation. Attach a map showing the location of the timberland conversion and the timber operation. Map shall be a 7 1/2 minute quadrangle or equivalent. In addition, smaller scale maps designating the length of rights of way are acceptable. It is helpful to describe the access route to the timber operation so that it can be easily located, and/or include an assessor’s parcel map for small areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section(s)</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Base &amp; Meridian</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Logging Area</th>
<th>Acreage (Estimated)</th>
<th>Assessors Parcel# (Optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 4628 and California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 14 Section 1104.1(b) exempt public agencies from the requirement to file an application for timberland conversion (TLC) or a timber harvesting plan (THP) when they construct or maintain rights of way on their own property or that of another public agency. This exemption extends to easements over lands owned in fee by private parties. This exemption is not available for rights of way granted from one private landowner to another.

If the harvested trees are sold, bartered or traded for commercial purposes a timber operation has occurred per PRC Section 4527, and a notice of exemption is required to be filed by the timber owner. This is true if the timber is owned by the public agency, sold or given by the agency to another party, or the timber is owned by a private landowner subject to a public agency easement. A licensed timber operator is required in order to remove the harvested trees from the property. If the harvested trees are not sold, bartered or traded for commercial purposes, a notice of exemption is not required. The timber owner is responsible to pay all yield taxes for timber harvested. Timber yield tax information can be obtained from the State Board of Equalization, P.O. Box 94979, Sacramento, California 94279-0001.

14 CCR § 1104.1(c) exempts public and private utilities from the TLC and the THP requirements for construction and maintenance of gas, water, sewer, oil, electric and communications rights of way. 14 CCR § 1104.1(d), (e), (f), and (g) contain specifications of allowable right of way widths and supplemental clearances. If the harvest is a timber operation per PRC § 4527, a notice of exemption is required to be filed by the timber owner. A licensed timber operator is required in order to remove the harvested trees from the property. If the harvested trees are not sold, bartered or traded for commercial purposes, a notice of exemption is not required. The timber owner is responsible to pay all yield taxes for timber harvested.

14 CCR § 1104.1 requires that all timber operations conducted according to exemptions granted under this section abide by all operating regulations pertaining to a timber harvesting plan. There are special requirements for timber operations conducted in Coastal Commission Special Treatment Areas, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency area, and in counties with special rules adopted by the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection. These rules should be reviewed prior to submitting this notice to CAL FIRE.

The following suggestions may help ensure your compliance with the Forest Practice Rules.

1. Timber owners, timberland owners and timber operators should obtain and review copies of the Forest Practice Rules pertaining to the Notice of Exemption. Copies may be obtained from BARCLAYS LAW PUBLISHERS, P.O. BOX 3066, SO. SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94080. or from CAL FIRE, Forest Practice Section, P.O. BOX 944246, Sacramento, CA 94244-2460; or from CAL FIRE’s Web Page on the Internet at http://www.fire.ca.gov.

2. Contact the CAL FIRE office listed below for questions regarding the use of this notice.

FILE THIS NOTICE WITH THE NEAREST CAL FIRE OFFICE BELOW FOR THE COUNTY IN WHICH THE OPERATION WILL OCCUR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Office Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda, Colusa, Contra Costa, Del Norte Humboldt, Lake, Marin, Mendocino, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Sonoma, western Trinity and Yolo Counties.</td>
<td>=&gt; Forest Practice Program Manager 135 Ridgway Avenue Santa Rosa, CA 95401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte, Glenn, Lassen, Modoc, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, eastern Trinity and Yuba Counties.</td>
<td>=&gt; Forest Practice Program Manager 6100 Altport Road Redding, CA 96002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, BDonoro, Fresno, Imperial, Inyo, Kern, Los Angeles, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, Mono, Monterey, Orange, Riverside, San Benito, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Stanislaus, Tuolumne, Tulare, Ventura Counties.</td>
<td>=&gt; Forest Practice Program Manager 234 East Shaw Avenue Fresno, CA 93710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIGNATURE OF THE TIMBER OWNER OR AGENT THEREOF: ________________

Printed Name: ___________________________________ Title: __________________ Date: ________________

Address __________________________ City __________ State __________ Zip __________ Phone __________
July 16, 2015

Ms. Kristin Schaeffer
El Dorado Irrigation District
2890 Mosquito Road
Placerville, CA 95667

Upper Main Ditch Piping Project - Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (NOPEIR)

Dear Ms. Schaeffer:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the project referenced above. The purpose of the Project is to replace a 3-mile section of water supply ditch with a buried pipeline which would convey raw water while reducing water leakage and losses, and improve the quality of water entering the Reservoir 1 Water Treatment Plant. The project is located in Pollock Pines and runs parallel to United States Highway (US) 50. The closest access point is approximately 0.75 miles from the US 50/Ridgeway Drive Interchange. Caltrans' new mission; vision, and goals signal a modernization of our approach to California's transportation system. We review this local development's TIS and improvements draft plans for impacts to the State Highway System in keeping with our mission, vision and goals for sustainability / livability / economy, and safety / health. We provide these comments consistent with the State's smart mobility goals that support a vibrant economy, and build communities, not sprawl. The following comments are based on the NOP.

Construction Impacts

Construction activity may result in temporary traffic impacts. The EIR should identify the number of construction related truck trips anticipated at the US 50/Sly Park Interchange, or other access points to US 50. The BIR should also indicate the anticipated hours of construction and how long construction activities will last. Any traffic detours anticipated to impact US 50, which includes signage placement, will require an encroachment permit.
Encroachment Permit

Please be advised that any work or traffic control that would encroach onto the State Right of Way (ROW) requires an encroachment permit that is issued by Caltrans. To apply, a completed encroachment permit application, environmental documentation, and five sets of plans clearly indicating State ROW must be submitted to Charles Laughlin, California Department of Transportation, District 3 Office of Permits, 703 B Street, Marysville, CA 95901.

Traffic-related mitigation measures should be incorporated into the construction plans prior to the encroachment permit process. See the website link below for more information:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/pennits/.

Please provide our office with copies of any further actions regarding this project.

If you have any questions regarding these comments or require additional information, please contact me at (916) 274-0635 or by email at eric.fredericks@dot.ca.gov.

ERIC FREDERICKS, Chief
Office of Transportation Planning - South

c: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse

"Provide a safe, reliable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"
We object to piping the EID ditch because it goes by our property. I'm sure your equipment will do damage to the property. It also will lower the value of our property. Many people enjoy walking the ditch every day. Also what will happen to the wildlife that we enjoy.

When we moved here over 30 years ago we were told by the neighbors that the ditch had been declared historical because it was dug by Chinese Coolies over 100 years ago. One of those neighbors was Margaret Smith who used to be treasurer of EID. She owned property down the road and on the other side of the ditch.

- Robert and Amy Lou Rath
2231 Pinewood Lane
Pollock Pines
Kristin,

I would like to make a request that when the main ditch project takes place the work on Roberts Christmas Tree Farm above reservoir 1 not be done during our selling season (Thanksgiving through Christmas.)

Thanks for the informative scoping meeting.

Jim Roberts
644-2831
Piping the Eldorado Canal Questions from Cleve Hart 6/29/2015

The Historical Eldorado Canal as built by Chinese laborers in support of the gold mining support about 1870 over 145 years ago.

Engineers estimated that a significant volume of water, up to 1.300 acre feet/year is lost from evaporation and seepage along the 3 mile section of the "Main Ditch". The upper main ditch is the section of the El Dorado Canal from Forebay reservoir to the Reservoir 1 Water Treatment Plan near Cedar Grove. The estimated maximum volume conveyed by the canal is about 15,000 square feet. Thus the maximum losses are about 9%

This is a maximum what are the average losses?

What was the basis of the estimated losses?

Can the losses be measured?

Health and Recreation
It is my understanding that this section of the El Dorado Canal has been selected by the Parks and Trails Master Plan for a section of the trail from Placerville to Lake Tahoe. How does piping the Eldorado Canal affect this master plan?

Characteristics of the trail
flat = good for elderly people
Moving water = peace and tranquility = good for mental health

People
Sacramento walking group
Placerville walking group
Stanislaus county

Have you measured traffic on the trail?

Canal Width 14 to 20 feet hardly a beautiful walking trail when piped.
Dear Ms. Schaeffer:

I own property (Assessor Parcel #101-141-01) that borders/contains the proposed piping project. I am opposed to this project, and am denying access to my property for any construction staging and use.

Environmentally, it will severely impact the flora and fauna that depend on this water source. Aside from that, it's aesthetically pleasing for the community to walk the trail that runs along the ditch to the reservoir, plus, it will affect the monetary value of my property.

The fact that the ditch has been in its current state prior to my purchase of the property over 25 years ago, I have a grandfathered right that it remain as is.

Sincerely,

Patrick Leahy
805-870-4797
July 13, 2015

Upper Main Ditch Piping Project

Kritsin Schaeffer, Environmental Review Analyst
El Dorado Irrigation District (EID)

To Whom This Concerns:

We recently attended the public meeting at the Pollock Pines Community Center on June 29, 2015 regarding the piping of the main ditch. We are one of the 48 homeowners whose homes directly align with the main ditch and have lived here for approximately 32 years.

First, please know we understand the District’s objectives and the value to the State and the District particularly at time when California continues to endure a drought. On the other hand, as a homeowner, we are concerned with the impact to our property, neighborhood and the recreational use of the open ditch area. Not only are we concerned with the piping of the ditch, but the outcomes to other areas; for example, the staging area near our home or the removal of the one-lane bridge on Blair Road.

As shared by other homeowners at the meeting, we purchased this property for its rural location and aesthetics; the one-lane bridge, open ditch and pathway, dense forest, acreage; a great place to raise our family. In fact, about 2 years ago we spent approximately $30,000 enhancing our property adding boulders, plants, retaining walls and building stairs up to the ditch (see attached photos). Had we known that piping the ditch was in our near future, we would not have hired a contractor and landscaped to this extent. Now that we have decided to sell our house, we will need to disclose the District’s plan and deal with the potential impact to the sale of our home.

At the meeting, the three proposed approaches to realign the main ditch were reviewed and we shared the following concerns:

- The obvious loss of the waterway and benefits to humans, animals and plants.
- Concern about piping the ditch and its affect on property values.
- If the existing ditch is piped, will it be covered completely allowing homeowners to use the land?
- Since the ditch is on a slope, how will potential runoff be handled?
- If EID does not pipe the existing ditch in favor of one of the other options, will the ditch be abandoned as was what was done with the El Dorado Canal? Considering the amount of debris, the dry ditch would soon fill and be a considerable fire hazard.
Again, thank you for the opportunity to attend the meeting and hear EID’s presentation. We hope that an open dialogue will continue and that EID will carefully consider property owners concerns and do what is right not only for the State and District, but for the 48 homeowners as well.

Sincerely,

Diane and Rick Hernandez
2281 Blair Road
Pollock Pines, CA 95726
Stephen & Lizet Fotenos (residents)
Jason & Corinne Fotenos
2190 Pinewood Lane
Pollock Pines, California

Dear Ms. Schaeffer:

I would like to express my opposition to the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project due to the following significant adverse impacts:

Our property is right on the ditch. We have 2 acres that have the ditch dividing it. This ditch adds value to our property. It is also divides our house from the walking path. We often have people walking, riding bikes, walking dogs off leashes. If you cover up the ditch these people will be all over my property and their dogs will be coming on our side too. I have grandchildren that come to play freely and without fear of strangers and dogs - this would change if the ditch is closed.

This is a major undertaking at the cost of Pollock Pines residents as we will be the ones paying the price with loss in property value and also security. You expose us to dangers we do not have now - the ditch serves as a protection in many ways.

I don't even know how to put a price on the losses we will have because of this project.

I am opposing this project and ask that you not follow thru with this project. Our neighbors submitted the following opposition and we would like that to be a part of our statement of opposition.

I know we are in a drought and we have been in droughts before. It will rain again. I would suggest building another reservoir if you are so concerned about water conservation.

1) Loss of property values: When we bought our house/property, which borders approximately 450 feet of the ditch, this was a feature that added a great deal of value to the property. It was our understanding that this was protected as a historical feature. Piping the ditch will lower our property value.

2) Increased fire risk: Due to EID’s insufficient infrastructure in our neighborhood we do not have fire hydrants and it is my understanding that we cannot add them since we don’t have an 8” water main. The ditch therefore is the primary source of water to fight home fires and wildland-urban interface fires since there are no hydrants. The ditch...
also serves to protect us from fire as a "wet-line" along our home from the most likely exposure to an on-coming wildfire. Piping the ditch will increase our fire risk and that of the entire surrounding community.

3) Loss of recreational opportunities: The ditch provides the town with one of the most used recreational opportunities. The proximity of my home to this feature adds additional value to the resource. Piping it will diminish the limited recreational infrastructure in the area.

4) Loss of wildlife habitat: A rich community of wildlife relies on the ditch and the riparian zones along it. The animals that use it directly and indirectly include countless bird species (including listed species), river otters, bobcats, mountain lions to name a few. Piping the ditch will destroy precious riparian habitat – one of the most productive and protected wildland environments.

5) Construction of the pipe will directly impact my property: The ditch and construction impacts will not be restricted to EID property. Therefore construction/installation will require the use and destruction of private property. The construction phase will certainly cause severe disruption and damage to our property, including but not limited to noise, dust, traffic, and the use/abuse of our private road with heavy equipment that it was not designed to carry. Many trees and plants will be killed during the construction phase.

6) There will be lasting property value loss due to construction damage and loss of the water resource: The destruction of private property will not be limited to the construction phase. The root systems of trees will be disturbed leading to increased long-term mortality. Many of the trees along the ditch that survive the construction phase are riparian species that will not survive in the long term when the riparian habitat is destroyed. Also, trees that are not riparian species still have root systems that are oriented and adapted to the ditch as a water resource and they will suffer increased mortality, resulting in the loss of another precious resource and the further diminishment to our property values. Who will pay for the long-term costs associated with the removal of dead/dying trees on my property? The piping of the ditch will result in enormous direct costs to neighboring property owners for many years.

7) The resulting increase in tree mortality will threaten my home and our safety: Dead, dying and diseased trees, and those with compromised root systems are not as stable as healthy trees thereby increasing the possibility of a tree or large limb falling on my house, destroying my property and threatening the lives of my family.

8) The resulting tree mortality will further increase the threat of the most damaging types of wildfires: Standing dead trees lead to crown fires, which are the most dangerous and difficult to control. The piping of the ditch will result in long-term increased risk to my property and the surrounding community.

9) The security of my property will be diminished: The trail along the ditch is heavily used. The expanse of open water between the trail and my home limits the access to my property. Loss of that barrier will increase the likelihood of trespass and theft if the trail remains along the pipe.

My home was carefully chosen with consideration of the values, both direct and indirect, associated with the ditch. Piping the ditch will result in many significant, adverse impacts to the people of Pollock Pines, local property owners and the environment.
The attached file is my comments about the proposed piping project. Also pasted below in case that is easier.

Thanks

Jeff Leddy

Jeffrey Leddy, Lisa Richmond: Residents
2241 Pinewood Lane
Pollock Pines CA 95726

I would like to express my opposition to the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project due to the following significant adverse impacts:

1) Loss of property values: When we bought our house/property, which borders approximately 450 feet of the ditch, this was a feature that added a great deal of value to the property. It was our understanding that this was protected as a historical feature. Piping the ditch will lower our property value.

2) Increased fire risk: Due to EID's insufficient infrastructure in our neighborhood we do not have fire hydrants and it is my understanding that we cannot add them since we don't have an 8" water main. The ditch therefore is the primary source of water to fight home fires and wildland-urban interface fires since there are no hydrants. The ditch also serves to protect us from fire as a "wet-line" along our home from the most likely exposure to an on-coming wildfire. Piping the ditch will increase our fire risk and that of the entire surrounding community.

3) Loss of recreational opportunities: The ditch provides the town with one of the most used recreational opportunities. The proximity of my home to this feature adds additional value to the resource. Piping it will diminish the limited recreational infrastructure in the area.

4) Loss of wildlife habitat: A rich community of wildlife relies on the ditch and the riparian zones along it. The animals that use it directly and indirectly include countless bird species (including listed species), river otters, bobcats, mountain lions to name a few. Piping the ditch will destroy precious riparian habitat - one of the most productive and protected wildland environments.

5) Construction of the pipe will directly impact my property: The ditch and construction impacts will not be restricted to EID property. Therefore construction/installation will require the use and destruction of private property. The construction phase will certainly cause severe disruption and damage to our property, including but not limited to noise, dust, traffic, and the use/abuse of our private road with heavy equipment that it was not designed to carry. Many trees and plants will be killed during the construction phase.

6) There will be lasting property value loss due to construction damage and loss of the water resource: The destruction of private property will not be limited to the construction phase. The root systems of trees will be disturbed leading to increased long term mortality. Many of the trees along the ditch that survive the construction phase are riparian species that will not survive in the long term when the
riparian habitat is destroyed. Also, trees that are not riparian species still have root systems that are oriented and adapted to the ditch as a water resource and they will suffer increased mortality, resulting in the loss of another precious resource and the further diminishment to our property values. Who will pay for the long term costs associated with the removal of dead/dying trees on my property? The piping of the ditch will result in enormous direct costs to neighboring property owners for many years.

7) The resulting increase in tree mortality will threaten my home and our safety: Dead, dying and diseased trees, and those with compromised root systems are not as stable as healthy trees thereby increasing the possibility of a tree or large limb falling on my house, destroying my property and threatening the lives of my family.

8) The resulting tree mortality will further increase the threat of the most damaging types of wildfires: Standing dead trees lead to crown fires, which are the most dangerous and difficult to control. The piping of the ditch will result in long term increased risk to my property and the surrounding community.

9) The security of my property will be diminished: The trail along the ditch is heavily used. The expanse of open water between the trail and my home limits the access to my property. Loss of that barrier will increase the likelihood of trespass and theft if the trail remains along the pipe.

My home was carefully chosen with consideration of the values, both direct and indirect, associated with the ditch. Piping the ditch will result in many significant, adverse impacts to the people of Pollock Pines, local property owners and the environment.
Peggy Allen, Resident  
2200 Pinewood Ct.  
Pollock Pines, Ca

Dear Ms. Schaeffer,

I was in hopes of attending the community meeting regarding the "upper ditch" that crosses our road, Pinewood Lane, in Pollock Pines, but the flu prevented me from doing so. I am not as articulate in expressing my displeasure at the thought of turning our "ditch" into a buried pipeline as our neighbors Jeff and Lisa were so capable of stating. However, I wish to say there is a resounding AMEN to everything they presented in their correspondence to you regarding the project. Its is of major concern to us the impact that burying our ditch would be to not only us as homeowners in the decrease in value of our homes, but the impact on our wildlife as well. I can only imagine how many folks who now think its okay to ride their dirt bikes on the narrow path would be elated to have a much wider spot to race their dirt bikes and (now quads would fit) up and down the path. What a disturbance to our way of life that brought many of us to this area.

I truly hope the board will consider and weigh out what we the Homeowners along this ditch have to say and feel about this project. There are so many folks from neighboring streets as well that walk the ditch. There is a peaceful calm that goes along with walking beside a flowing body of water, to that I would coin the commercial for Mastercard ...."Priceless"! Please, for the sake of saving evaporative water...Please do not take our source of calm in a chaotic world!

respectfully,

Peggy Allen  
peggy.allen@comcast.net
Hi,

Our cabin is our family love. There is a pretty creek that flows through it that was the big draw in our purchasing of the cabin. The Ditch project will ruin it and for very little purpose and lots of cost.

I would like to express my opposition to the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project due to the following significant adverse impacts:

Our property is right on the ditch. We have 2 acres that have the ditch dividing it. This ditch adds value to our property. It is also divides our house from the walking path. We often have people walking, riding bikes, walking dogs off leashes. If you cover up the ditch these people will be all over my property and their dogs will be coming on our side too. I have grandchildren that come to play freely and without fear of strangers and dogs - this would change if the ditch is closed.

This is a major undertaking at the cost of Pollock Pines residents as we will be the ones paying the price with loss in property value and also security. You expose us to dangers we do not have now - the ditch serves as a protection in many ways.

I don't even know how to put a price on the losses we will have because of this project.

I am opposing this project and ask that you not follow thru with this project. Our neighbors submitted the following opposition and we would like that to be a part of our statement of opposition.

I know we are in a drought and we have been in droughts before. It will rain again. I would suggest building another reservoir if you are so concerned about water conservation.

1) Loss of property values: When we bought our house/property, which borders approximately 450 feet of the ditch, this was a feature that added a great deal of value to the property. It was our understanding that this was protected as a historical feature. Piping the ditch will lower our property value.

2) Increased fire risk: Due to EID's insufficient infrastructure in our neighborhood we do not have fire hydrants and it is my understanding that we cannot add them since we don't have an 8" water main. The ditch therefore is the primary source of water to fight home fires and wildland-urban interface fires since there are no hydrants. The ditch also serves to protect us from fire as a "wet-line" along our home from the most likely exposure to an on-coming wildfire. Piping the ditch will increase our fire risk and that of the entire surrounding community.

3) Loss of recreational opportunities: The ditch provides the town with one of the most used recreational opportunities. The proximity of my home to this feature adds additional value to the resource. Piping it will diminish the limited recreational infrastructure in the area.

4) Loss of wildlife habitat: A rich community of wildlife relies on the ditch and the riparian zones along
The animals that use it directly and indirectly include countless bird species (including listed species), river otters, bobcats, mountain lions to name a few. Piping the ditch will destroy precious riparian habitat – one of the most productive and protected wildland environments.

5) Construction of the pipe will directly impact my property: The ditch and construction impacts will not be restricted to EID property. Therefore construction/installation will require the use and destruction of private property. The construction phase will certainly cause severe disruption and damage to our property, including but not limited to noise, dust, traffic, and the use/abuse of our private road with heavy equipment that it was not designed to carry. Many trees and plants will be killed during the construction phase.

6) There will be lasting property value loss due to construction damage and loss of the water resource: The destruction of private property will not be limited to the construction phase. The root systems of trees will be disturbed leading to increased long term mortality. Many of the trees along the ditch that survive the construction phase are riparian species that will not survive in the long term when the riparian habitat is destroyed. Also, trees that are not riparian species still have root systems that are oriented and adapted to the ditch as a water resource and they will suffer increased mortality, resulting in the loss of another precious resource and the further diminishment to our property values. Who will pay for the long term costs associated with the removal of dead/dying trees on my property? The piping of the ditch will result in enormous direct costs to neighboring property owners for many years.

7) The resulting increase in tree mortality will threaten my home and our safety: Dead, dying and diseased trees, and those with compromised root systems are not as stable as healthy trees thereby increasing the possibility of a tree or large limb falling on my house, destroying my property and threatening the lives of my family.

8) The resulting tree mortality will further increase the threat of the most damaging types of wildfires: Standing dead trees lead to crown fires, which are the most dangerous and difficult to control. The piping of the ditch will result in long term increased risk to my property and the surrounding community.

9) The security of my property will be diminished: The trail along the ditch is heavily used. The expanse of open water between the trail and my home limits the access to my property. Loss of that barrier will increase the likelihood of trespass and theft if the trail remains along the pipe.

My home was carefully chosen with consideration of the values, both direct and indirect, associated with the ditch. Piping the ditch will result in many significant, adverse impacts to the people of Pollock Pines, local property owners and the environment.

Jason Fotenos
jfotenos@sbcglobal.net
July 15, 2015

El Dorado Irrigation District
Attn: Kristin Schaeffer
2890 Mosquito Road
Placerville, CA  95667

RE:  UPPER MAIN DITCH PIPING PROJECT

Dear Ms. Schaeffer,

I agree with this letter of comments written by Jeff Leddy. As a home owner of the residence at 2281 Pinewood Lane; Pollock Pines, CA 95726, I am very concerned about the trees dying, affects on wildlife, historical feature, and loss of property value this project would have on the community. My aunt, Margaret C. Smith is well-known by EID and has fought and won this battle while she owned my house, as well as the property across the ditch. I am 100% on-board with preserving the ditch!

Being 2,000 miles away, I cannot attend any meetings, but do want my voice heard that I oppose piping the ditch!!

Please see the letter below.

Cathy Flynn
1321 E. Bennett Street
Springfield, MO  65804
(417)  831-9189

Jeffrey Leddy, Lisa Richmond: Residents
2241 Pinewood Lane
Pollock Pines CA 95726

I would like to express my opposition to the Upper Main Ditch Piping Project due to the following significant adverse impacts:
1) Loss of property values: When we bought our house/property, which borders approximately 450 feet of the ditch, this was a feature that added a great deal of value to the property. It was our understanding that this was protected as a historical feature. Piping the ditch will lower our property value.

2) Increased fire risk: Due to EID's insufficient infrastructure in our neighborhood we do not have fire hydrants and it is my understanding that we cannot add them since we don't have an 8" water main. The ditch therefore is the primary source of water to fight home fires and wildland-urban interface fires since there are no hydrants. The ditch also serves to protect us from fire as a "wet-line" along our home from the most likely exposure to an on-coming wildfire. Piping the ditch will increase our fire risk and that of the entire surrounding community.

3) Loss of recreational opportunities: The ditch provides the town with one of the most used recreational opportunities. The proximity of my home to this feature adds additional value to the resource. Piping it will diminish the limited recreational infrastructure in the area.

4) Loss of wildlife habitat: A rich community of wildlife relies on the ditch and the riparian zones along it. The animals that use it directly and indirectly include countless bird species (including listed species), river otters, bobcats, mountain lions to name a few. Piping the ditch will destroy precious riparian habitat – one of the most productive and protected wildland environments.

5) Construction of the pipe will directly impact my property: The ditch and construction impacts will not be restricted to EID property. Therefore construction/installation will require the use and destruction of private property. The construction phase will certainly cause severe disruption and damage to our property, including but not limited to noise, dust, traffic, and the use/abuse of our private road with heavy equipment that it was not designed to carry. Many trees and plants will be killed during the construction phase.

6) There will be lasting property value loss due to construction damage and loss of the water resource: The destruction of private property will not be limited to the construction phase. The root systems of trees will be disturbed leading to increased long term mortality. Many of the trees along the ditch that survive the construction phase are riparian species that will not survive in the long term when the riparian habitat is destroyed. Also, trees that are not riparian species still have root systems that are oriented and adapted to the ditch as a water resource and they will suffer increased mortality, resulting in the loss of another precious resource and the further diminishment to our property values. Who will pay for the long term costs associated with the removal of dead/dying trees on my property? The piping of the ditch will result in enormous direct costs to neighboring property owners for many years.

7) The resulting increase in tree mortality will threaten my home and our safety: Dead, dying and diseased trees, and those with compromised root systems are not as stable as healthy trees thereby increasing the possibility of a tree or large limb falling on my house, destroying my property and threatening the lives of my family.

8) The resulting tree mortality will further increase the threat of the most damaging types of wildfires: Standing dead trees lead to crown fires, which are the most dangerous and difficult to control. The piping of the ditch will result in long term increased risk to my property and the surrounding community.

9) The security of my property will be diminished: The trail along the ditch is heavily used. The expanse of open water between the trail and my home limits the access to my property. Loss of that barrier will increase the likelihood of trespass and theft if the trail remains along the pipe.

My home was carefully chosen with consideration of the values, both direct and indirect, associated with the ditch. Piping the ditch will result in many significant, adverse impacts to the people of Pollock Pines, local property owners and the environment.
Dear Kristen,

This email is to express our strong opposition to the Forebay upper ditch pipeline proposal. The following reasons are some of our concerns:

1. Fire safety concerns due to the fact we have no hydrants because our water main is not a minimum of 8 inches. Our community relies highly on the open ditch as a water source especially in light of last year's King Fire.

2. Installing an unsightly pipeline would severely affect the value of our property as a community. The pipeline may attract graffiti as well.

3. Our homeowners fire insurance would increase or be cancelled which is a major concern (due to fire issues/no hydrants). The insurance company factored in the water access from the open ditch in case of fire.

4. The loss of recreation, natural beauty, and historical value would be gone.

5. It is a fact that the trees and other flora would be severely impacted and much of it would die creating another fire hazard as well as the unsightliness.

6. The ditch also serves as a barrier to thieves.

These are a few of our grave concerns about the pipeline being approved. We know that although you may not hear from all neighbors who are affected, we know it's true that we speak for all of them. We learned of this yesterday and so we're certain that others may not have had the time to reply.

Thank you for your attention in this matter,
Terry and Yvonne Stephens
COMMENT FORM
Environmental Impact Report
Upper Main Ditch Piping Project
Project No.: 11032

To submit a written statement, please complete the following information and comment below. You may hand to an attendant at tonight's meeting, or submit to the address listed below by 5:00 p.m., July 16, 2015.

Please write legibly so that your comment can be included, thank you.

Name: Pamela Harris, Trustee
Organization: Harris Family Trust
Property Owner, or ☐ Resident

Address: 26460 Blair Rd, Pollock Pines CA 95726, Wagon Loop

Comment: As trustee for Trust that owns a large parcel affected by the ditch alignment, I favor the following:

1) Alternative 1 - follow existing ditch alignment.

This alternative preserves the property's potential affected with minimal changes and retains the historical pathway of the canal.

I however raise a concern for the health and preservation of a rare plant species, the "Western Yew," that has historically grown abundantly in the areas around the canal and other natural waterways in the area. I suspect seepage from the canal/drainage has allowed this tree to thrive.

Comments may be mailed, e-mailed or hand delivered to:
Kristin Schaeffer, Environmental Review Analyst, El Dorado Irrigation District
2890 Mosquito Road, Placerville, CA 95667, e-mail kschaeffer@eid.org.

Visit www.eid.org to sign-up to receive project updates via e-notification.

Comments must be received by 5:00 p.m., Thursday, July 16, 2015.
Kristin Schaeffer  
El Dorado Irrigation District  

Re: Upper Main Ditch Piping Project  

Dear Ms. Schaeffer/El Dorado Irrigation District  

My wife and I reside at 2221 Pinewood Court, Pollock Pines, CA 95726. We own the property (APN 101-330-057) adjacent to the parcel containing the upper main ditch piping project. As a Civil Engineer and property owner, I am in opposition to in-filling of the ditch with a pipe for the following reasons (also includes possible suggestions):  

1. Assuming the pipe would be bedded in the existing gradient of the ditch more or less; the elevation of the existing Pinewood lane Road would be elevated. This will make it very hard to travel over-especially with an R.V.,-Trailer, etc.  

2. The cover over the pipe would have to be enough to install an 8" Ductile Iron Pipe water main stub for a future fire hydrant to the south of Blair Road, or better yet, you can stub a 8" D.I.P. under the pipe now.  

3. The mound of dirt (or bare pipe sitting in the ditch) will degrade the property values of the adjoining parcels.  

4. The popular unsanctioned "Trail" adjacent to the attractive water ditch will now be a dirt berm or ugly pipe or just dirt.  

5. The loss to the wildlife habitat is irreplaceable. How can you mitigate this? How will you mitigate it?  

6. Construction of the project will impact all of our roadways & driveways due to heavy wheel loads, causing failure to light structural sections.  

7. Who will repair the damage to the existing trees, landscaping, roads & driveways now and in the future? How will it be monitored? How will E.I.D. pay for the cost of the removal, replacement and repair? Are they going to post a sizeable bond for 10 years?  

8. Are they going to install manholes at Fire Department approved intervals to allow for fire pumping access?  

9. Recorded access to the ditch, including the ditch itself, is not of record thru numerous parcels, The Title Companies are in the dark about the locations of some of the right-of-ways. What access routes & recorded right-of-ways is the contractor allowed to use?  

10. Show restricted Ingress/Egress on the Improvement Plans. The Contractor shall be restricted to limited & staked road way/haul routes to, from and staked limits of work areas. The Contractor should be fined if he exceeds the marked limits of construction.

11. Will all disturbed areas be landscaped with native plants/trees? Who maintains the landscaping and for how long. How watered?

Thank you for taking our comments & suggestions under consideration on the proposed project. I would be more than happy to assist you in obtaining a good solution to protecting our raw drinking water supply.

Kenneth N. Lewis
P.L.S. 3811, R.C.E. 24851

(530) 647-2523
P.O. Box 278
Pollock Pines, CA 95726-0278

email: lewisengsurv@att.net
COMMENT FORM
Environmental Impact Report
Upper Main Ditch Piping Project
Project No.: 11032

To submit a written statement, please complete the following information and comment below. You may hand to an attendant at tonight’s meeting, or submit to the address listed below by 5:00 p.m., July 16, 2015.

Please write legibly so that your comment can be included, thank you.

Name: Carole Smith    Organization: ______________________, or □ Resident
Address: 2860 Marilyn Drive, Pollock Pines, CA

Comment: The EID ditch has connected both ends of Pollock Pines or over 100 years and continues to provide a trail well used by walkers, equestrians, and bike riders. It also provides water for a habitat rich in plant and animal life. Found along the ditch are scarlet monkey flowers, penstemon, milk maids, Hartweg’s ginger, Indian rhubarb or umbrella plant, grand hound’s tongue, American dogwood, Pacific dogwood, big leaf maple, white-veined wintergreen, Sierra iris, miner’s lettuce, naked star tulip, brown bells (fritillary), false Solomon’s seal, checkerbloom, ferns, Sierra star flower, mountain violet, mountain strawberry, thimble berry, raspberry, and more plants. Also found are nesting mallards, ringneck snake, bear, deer, trout from the Forebay, crayfish, skunks, raccoons, ground squirrels, gray squirrels, various birds, banana slug, newts, and butterflies. I loved walking this beauteous ditch for the last 25 years with family and neighbors during all seasons. Because construction of this pipeline would destroy this special habitat upon which plants, animals, and people depend, I oppose the construction of the pipeline. The value of the open ditch to the local environment and community is is worth more than what can be gained by constructing a pipeline.

Comments may be mailed, e-mailed or hand delivered to:
Kristin Schaeffer, Environmental Review Analyst, El Dorado Irrigation District
2890 Mosquito Road, Placerville, CA 95667, e-mail kschaeffer@eid.org.
Visit www.eid.org to sign-up to receive project updates via e-notification.

Comments must be received by 5:00 p.m., Thursday, July 16, 2015.
To submit a written statement, please complete the following information and comment below. You may hand to an attendant at tonight’s meeting, or submit to the address listed below by 5:00 p.m., July 16, 2015.

Please write legibly so that your comment can be included, thank you.

Name: Marelyne Curtis  Organization: ______________________ or  □ Resident
Address: 2939 Biar Rd.  916-956-2140

Comment: The section of canal that you plan to build in goes through my property. My husband and I are against it, you have 23 miles of canal, you have chosen the most beautiful part beside the historical redirecting the canal closing this part will be the heaviest impact on the people of the community. After the meeting last month I understand “IT” is going to. I request that rebuild the whole ditch. You need to compensate the landowner for the loss of property value on their homes. They most to purchase the ditches because of the beauty of the canal. I question your information you give on the inspections rating. If it's true why can't you close in an area where it doesn't impact so many people. Once the pipe goes in and land is reclaimed there should be NO reason for people walking across my property except for EID doing their inspections.  

Marelyne Curtis

Comments may be mailed, e-mailed or hand delivered to:

Kristin Schaeffer, Environmental Review Analyst, El Dorado Irrigation District
2890 Mosquito Road, Placerville, CA 95667, e-mail  kschaeffer@eid.org.

Visit www.eid.org to sign-up to receive project updates via e-notification.

Comments must be received by 5:00 p.m., Thursday, July 16, 2015.
To submit a written statement, please complete the following information and comment below. You may hand to an attendant at tonight’s meeting, or submit to the address listed below by 5:00 p.m., July 16, 2015.

Please write legibly so that your comment can be included, thank you.

Name: Sally Storamski
Organization: __________________________, or ☐ Resident
Address: 2640 Blair Rd, Pollock Pines CA 95726

Comment: Please reconsider the decision to pipe the ditch. The impact will be devastating on wildlife and plants. It is a historic part of Pollock Pines and the Gold Rush era. It is an important part of our property. I am the sixth generation on this farm and would like the ditch preserved for many more generations.

Comments may be mailed, e-mailed or hand delivered to: Kristin Schaeffer, Environmental Review Analyst, El Dorado Irrigation District 2890 Mosquito Road, Placerville, CA 95667, e-mail kschaeffer@eid.org.

Visit www.eid.org to sign-up to receive project Updates Via e-notification.

Comments must be received by 5:00 p.m. Thursday, July 16, 2015.
To submit a written statement, please complete the following information and comment below. You may hand to an attendant at tonight’s meeting, or submit to the address listed below by 5:00 p.m., July 16, 2015.

Please write legibly so that your comment can be included, thank you.

Name: Taylor Staromski  Organization: Harris Tree Farm  or  Resident
Address: 2640 Blair Rd, Pollock Pines, CA 95726

Comment: I would prefer that the ditch is not piped at all. The ditch has been here for decades and lots of wildlife will be impacted by the piping of the ditch. Also, it's a very beautiful walking trail that many people enjoy walking on. By piping the ditch it would take away the beauty from the trail. Another reason why we should reconsider piping is because one of our neighbors has built an amazing bridge access it and every year they have their grandkids come to repaint it as tradition. This bridge was also expensive to build and would be devastating to take down. Piping the ditch would also mean taking down many huge trees which will cause global warming. These are a few of the many negatives of this situation, the only positive cut back on this is to help with the water loss. Are we really losing that much water to disturb all the nature and beauty that the ditch brings us?

Comments may be mailed, e-mailed or hand delivered to:
Kristin Schaeffer, Environmental Review Analyst, El Dorado Irrigation District
2890 Mosquito Road, Placerville, CA 95667, e-mail kschaef@eid.org.

Visit www.eid.org to sign-up to receive project updates via e-notification.

Comments must be received by 5:00 p.m., Thursday, July 16, 2015.
To submit a written statement, please complete the following information and comment below. You may hand to an attendant at tonight’s meeting, or submit to the address listed below by 5:00 p.m., July 16, 2015.

Please write legibly so that your comment can be included, thank you.

Name: Jane Harris Organization: Harris Tree Farm or Resident
Address: 2640 Blair Rd, Folloack Pines, CA 95726

Comment: I am in favor of not piping the ditch. It has been a water source for local wildlife and plant species for over 100 years. The EIR needs to address the impact on these.
The ditch has provided water to our farm since it was built, one-third of the ditch length goes through our property. Piping it will have a huge impact on our land and farming. We have advertised the walking path along the ditch to encourage people and spend some time in our area “agri-tourism”
The walkway along the water is a treasured community resource for walkers, bikers, horseback riders. Please spend some time walking this waterway before you pipe it! You may reconsider.

Comments may be mailed, e-mailed or hand delivered to:
Kristin Schaeffer, Environmental Review Analyst, El Dorado Irrigation District 2890 Mosquito Road, Placerville, CA 95667, e-mail kschaef@eid.org.

Visit www.eid.org to sign-up to receive project updates via e-notification.

Comments must be received by 5:00 p.m., Thursday, July 16, 2015.